EPIC ELEMENTS IN THE DRAMAS OF FRANK WEDEKIND

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JAMES RICHARD McINTYRE
1972

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Epic Elements

in the

Dramas of Frank Wedekind

presented by

James Richard McIntyre

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PhD degree in German

Mark O. Kistler

Major professor

Date Sept. 14, 1972

O-7639

ABSTRACT

EPIC ELEMENTS IN THE DRAMAS
OF FRANK WEDEKIND

By

James Richard McIntyre

Frank Wedekind's enigmatic position in the history of modern drama has long been disputed. While his contemporaries Hauptmann and Ibsen enjoyed continued recognition and success, Wedekind suffered failure after failure. The passing of time, however, has been favorable to Wedekind's recognition. Especially since the epic theater has come of vogue, Wedekind has been mentioned as a possible precursor of this type of drama. In this dissertation an attempt has been made to point out the distinctly epic qualities of Wedekind's dramas.

Since the term epic theater is rather general in and of itself, the study proceeds in chapter one with an outline in schematic form of the basic characteristics of this type of theater as described by Volker Koltz in his work Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama. This schematic presentation of the major elements of dramatic action

("Handlung"), composition ("Komposition"), time and space ("Zeit und Raum"), and characters and language ("Personen und Sprache") then serves as the working basis for the ensuing examination.

The second chapter centers on the problematic basis of eight dramas, and clearly reveals that Wedekind chose as the underlying basis of dramatic action the same type of archetypal, irreconcilable conflicts which are found in the works of Brecht and other authors of our own day. The two basic conflicts which run throughout Wedekind's works, those between the artist (outsider) and society (insider) and between man (instinct) and system (bourgeois morality), literally force a departure from the linear, closed form of action found in the Aristotelian drama. Since the problem itself cannot be solved, Wedekind, in typical epic fashion, seeks to demonstrate its full complexity through the use of contrastive exemplification (episodic reinforcement).

The third and fourth chapters, which deal with composition and the time-space relationship respectively, show that Wedekind employs three distinct methods of treatment with respect to these elements. The first (Frühlings Erwachen) exhibits the overriding importance of the scene as the basic dramatic unit, and totally ignores the unities of time and space. The second (Der Kammersänger) employs definite epic techniques in an otherwise Aristotelian

framework. The third (Der Marquis von Keith) adheres quite closely in all respects to the unities of time and space and to the Aristotelian principle of architectural composition.

The fifth and final chapter deals with the characters and language in two specific dramas, Frühlings Erwachen and Der Marquis von Keith. The examination illustrates that even in the latter drama, which follows for the most part the Aristotelian approach, Wedekind introduces a whole host of ambiguous and paradoxical characters who are molded by the irreconcilable conflict inherent in the modern society.

EPIC ELEMENTS IN THE DRAMAS OF FRANK WEDEKIND

By

James Richard McIntyre

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of German and Russian

1972

aus, außer, bei, mit, nach, seit, von, zu

immer mit Herrn Karp

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude, first of all, to Professor Mark O. Kistler for his kind assistance and patience as chairman of my doctoral committee. A debt of thanks is owed as well to the other members of the committee, Professor William N. Hughes, Chairman of the Department, and Professors Stuart A. Gallacher and Raimund Belgart.

Special appreciation and thanks must be offered to The Germanistic Society of America and the Fulbright-Hays Commission, whose generous grants allowed me to do preparatory research and study in Munich, Germany.

An ineffable amount of gratitude is due finally to the one person who has stayed by my side throughout the entire ride on the "Rutschbahn," my wife Jean.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> Und wie noch immer eine neue Wahrheit zunächst als Lüge empfunden worden ist, so wird auch ein neuer Weg als Abweg, ein neues Kunstbekenntnis als Unkunst empfunden. Was von den geistigen Kräften gesund ist, lebenerhaltend und fördernd und was nicht, wer soll es entscheiden?[1]

Frank Wedekind has always been, to a certain extent, considered to be an enigma. Almost every scholar who has dealt with the man and his works mentions at some point that it is finally time for Wedekind to be viewed in a "new light." What should this "new light" be? Generally this question has been narrowed down to a position on one side or the other of two mutually exclusive alternatives: either the spotlight of long withstanding recognition, or the yellow bug light which holds persistent, vexatious pests at bay. The spotlight is bright but illusive; it seldom shines directly on anyone for very long. The bug light is stationary, but dull; its effectiveness is restricted to an immediate area and the pests are never far away. Neither light has done much to illuminate our understanding of Frank Wedekind and his art.

The very fact that these arguments have persisted, however, seems sufficient proof of the viability of Wedekind's works and of the continued need for a truly

"new light," a need which has begun to be answered in recent years. Not, as in the past, with the futile goal of placing Wedekind in some convenient niche in German literary history by means of superficial comparison with contemporaries such as Gerhart Hauptmann, or cramming him into an artificial "ism" which, if at all, would best fit like an undersized strait jacket. From the beginning Wedekind has been recognized as a unique, highly individualized author, an outsider with respect both to his ideas and their expression in a personalized dramatic form. Finally this uniqueness is coming to be fully appreciated as a positive creative force. All of the accusations about Wedekind being drastically out of step with the times have proven to be quite true--he was in numerous ways far ahead of his time. Many of his ideas were or have been shown to be not blatant lies, but, much harder to accept, blatant, uncomfortable truths, often prophetic in nature.[2] His dramas, long considered unfit for production (in some cases even for publication[3]) from a moral as well as an artistic standpoint,[4] have exerted a far greater influence on modern theater than the isolated, lifeless style of literary Naturalism. His art was true art. Finally, Wedekind's "Weg" was an "Abweg," not in the sense of a wrong way, but rather a byway, a shortcut to the twentieth century.

This path does not, however, find its starting point with Frank Wedekind. It can be traced back to its

earliest manifestations in Greek drama, and forward to its widest point in theory and practice in the person of Bertolt Brecht, and even beyond Brecht to contemporary theater, including the Theater of the Absurd. Along the way it passes over other authors who, like Wedekind, have been misunderstood or neglected during their lifetimes, among others J. M. R. Lenz, Georg Büchner and Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Some of the more astute critics of the time, men like Paul Fechter[5] and Artur Kutscher[6] who took the time to gain the insight needed for true criticism, saw certain similarities between these authors and Wedekind from the very first. But it is only in recent years, with the immense amount of research being done on Brecht, that the direction of this path has clearly emerged and that Wedekind has become recognized as one of the definite landmarks on its course. It is the path toward epic theater. Up to now, however, Wedekind's position in this development has been asserted primarily through external association with the general trends leading to epic theater, or through restricted examples from one or two of his dramas.[7] It is the purpose of this dissertation, therefore, to examine Frank Wedekind's relationship to the epic theater through an internal analysis of his major dramas based upon the definition and structural characteristics of epic theater outlined below.

Before proceeding, however, it should be mentioned in passing that this "new" style of theater has had to face many of the same accusations as were faced by the men who formed it. Seen as a challenge to and a diversion from the old established theater, many of its concepts have been and some still are considered false. Inherent in its very name is the mixture of two genres, seen by some as a sacrifice of purity and consequently less artistic. Is the new way the wrong way?

> . . . wer soll es entscheiden? . . . Fortschritt wie Rückschritt besteht ja eben in einer Änderung des Empfindens von heute, das eben deshalb nie als Ideal gesetzt werden darf. Ob Fort- oder Rückschritt vorliegt, darüber läßt sich Sicheres von keinem Zeitgenossen sagen; die Nachkommen erst erkennen es an seinen Früchten.[8]

CHAPTER I

FRANK WEDEKIND AND THE EPIC THEATER

Brecht once remarked: "Die Prinzipien des epischen Theaters in wenigen Schlagworten zu entwickeln ist nicht möglich."[9] He then spent years proving the truth of his statement, creating a great deal of confusion while drawing a minimum of definite conclusions, eventually deciding that even the name epic theater was inappropriate and misleading.[10] It is primarily a result of Brecht's own efforts as a literary theorist, playwright and dramaturge,[11] however, that this term has become a coined generic label for a specific theatrical phenomenon, and that Brecht has frequently been designated as the rightful father of "his" prodigy. This latter claim need not be debated here, except to point out that epic theater will not and should not be restricted to the works and theses of Bertolt Brecht with his inherent emphasis on Marxist ideology. It is doubtful whether Brecht would ever have approved or desired such a severe limitation; it is fact that elements of epic theater can be traced back to the earliest Greek drama,[12] that Brecht was not the first to use the term[13] (nor did he invent the idea of "Verfremdungseffekt" so often attributed to him[14]), and that his dramas and theatrical

innovations never enjoyed much success in Marxist oriented areas other than Berlin.[15] For Brecht and for the present discussion the term epic theater represents a middle ground between the earlier, overly inclusive choice of "non-Aristotelian theater," and the final, somewhat exclusive (because of its obvious Marxist implications) transition to the expression "dialectical theater." It also represents a middle ground, because of its widespread application and general comprehensibility, among the numerous, equally inadequate alternatives such as Ziegler's "classical, tectonic" versus the "realistic, atectonic" structure of the drama,[16] Crumbach's subtitle of Dramaturgy of Contrasts,[17] or the Closed and Open Form in the Drama as Volker Koltz entitled his work on the subject.[18]

What then is epic theater? Brecht frequently referred to it as the "Theater des wissenschaftlichen Zeitalters,"[19] and it seems therefore only appropriate to speak in terms of this age by creating a very basic analogy. Every student has, at some point in his career, studied the fundamental structure of the atom: the nucleus, consisting of the positively charged proton(s) and the aptly designated, chargeless neutron(s), and the outside negative balancing force of the electron(s). Placed in the terminology of the drama, this structure closely approximates that of the classical (Aristotelian) drama in its purest form as exhibited, for example, in Goethe's

Iphigenie auf Tauris. Characteristic of this form is, in the words of Volker Klotz, "klares, zugespiztes Gegeneinander feindlicher Parteien, die sich deutlich in Aktionen (Spiel und Gegenspiel) und Personen (Protagonist--Antagonist) verkörpern . . ."[20] In the center stands Iphigenie, the proton protagonist, exerting her positive energies against the tyranny of King Thoas, the electron antagonist. Each of these figures is a representation of traits and ideas, as clearly symbols of positive and negative as the signs + and - for the proton and electron. They are what Klotz calls "Personifikationen der Eigenschaften,"[21] as much role as person. Just as the movements of the atom are determined by scientific laws, so also are the actions of Iphigenie and Thoas fixed by the laws of social status and predetermined personal traits. It is a battle of equals. "Duell, nach festen, anerkannten Spielregeln, zwischen zwei profilierten, gleichgearteten Gegnern"[22]--Iphigenie versus Thoas. At the outset the two are stalemated, locked in the stable equilibrium of opposing principles. One method of upsetting the stability of an atom is to bombard the nucleus with neutrons; Geothe achieves essentially the same end with the arrival of Orest and Pylades. Like the neutrons, they are catalysts for the ensuing action while remaining, on the whole, ineffectual chargeless particles in determining its final course. The instability created by the neutrons is, however, in both cases shortlived.

Once the actions and reactions have been set in motion they must move directly forward to a speedy and definite conclusion; in the atom in the form of conversion or disintegration, in the classical drama as dénouement or catastrophe. A new stability, a catharsis, must be reached. In the above examples the addition of two neutrons merely converts the atom in question, the hydrogen atom, to its isotope tritium, and in Goethe's drama Thoas, converted by Iphigenie's model to a new humane view of life, resigns himself to the free departure of his Greek captives.

The analogy could be carried out at length.[23] To do so here is not necessary. It should be stated, however, that there is an inherent problem with the analogy as it now stands. The problem (and the point of using this particular analogy) is, strangely enough, not that it is difficult to construe the different elements in such a manner that they fit a comparison, but rather the fact that everything fits too well. The reason this creates a problem, at least as far as the correspondence between science and fact and drama and reality is concerned, is quite simple. Neither atoms nor people exist in this isolated state. Matter is to the atom what society is to the individual. The single atom, the single person: both are caught up in a flux of actions and reactions which are as much determined by their surroundings as by their own individual characteristics. To pull either out of these surroundings,

to isolate a small, well defined elite minority within a vacuum of time and space which is governed by predetermined universal laws is to distort reality. Just as a lone atom can only be seen as a flat projection on a sheet of paper, so also is the classical drama a flat, non-dimensional projection on the stage. Both are like chosen textbook illustrations, or better yet, laboratory exercises, where it is already known that a given set of steps will lead to a previously determined result. Everything is set up and designated for you; you are told that a certain particle is a proton and a proton is always a plus, that a certain character is the "good guy" and he will always be good. By this method there is no chance for error, no possibility that you will be led astray to reach an incorrect or even alternate conclusion. There are no unknowns, no "x" quantities. But it is these unknowns, the exceptions to the rule and the as yet unruled, which make science a never ending challenge and life an incomprehensible puzzle. The "x" in life represents the unknown quantity of reality itself, and it is this total reality which the dramatists of the epic theater seek to portray. "Kunst," according to Brecht's view, "folgt der Wirklichkeit."[24] Therefore the subject matter of art must become matter itself, a matter comprised of atomized human beings colliding constantly with each other in the vast cyclotron of modern society. Quoting Brecht once again, ". . . die Katastrophen von

heute verlaufen nicht geradlinig, sondern in der Form von Krisenzyklen, die 'Helden' wechseln mit den einzelnen Phasen, sind auswechselbar und so weiter, die Kurve der Handlungen wird durch Fehlhandlungen kompliziert, das Schicksal ist keine einheitliche Macht mehr, eher sind Kraftfelder mit entgegenwirkenden Strömungen zu beobachten, die Mächtegruppen selber zeigen nicht nur Bewegungen gegeneinander, sondern auch in sich selber und so weiter und so weiter. Schon zur Dramatisierung einer simplen Pressenotiz reicht die dramatische Technik der Hebbel und Ibsen bei weitem nicht aus. Dies ist keine triumphierende, sondern eine betrübte Feststellung."[25]

Seen from this perspective, epic theater is not merely an innovation for the sake of newness ("l' art pour l' art"), like atonal music a stagnant step from a stagnant traditional form, nor was it created specifically as an alternative to that form. Rather it was a necessity, one answer to the "betrübte Feststellung" which modern society presents to the concerned playwright. This society is, in the mind of every dramatist akin to the epic technique from Lenz to the present, horribly diseased, a fungus dying from its own internal composition and growth. As Max Spalter put it in the introduction to his work on the dramatists of Brecht's Tradition, "They suggest . . . that the world is such a cesspool that it must be changed and that the world is such a cesspool that it cannot be changed."[26]

Despite Mr. Spalter's italics, however, the emphasis should be placed only on the "must." For while the epic dramatists are certainly pessimistic in their outlook and cynical in their pronouncements, it is equally certain that they are not nihilistic with respect to their goals. The possibility of and desire for change are inherent elements of the epic theater, are in fact its reason for existence. Change is the only hope. Brecht himself summed up his many years of theatrical experience with this view in mind when saying that "die heutige Welt auch auf dem Theater wiedergegeben werden kann, aber nur wenn sie als veränderbar aufgefaßt wird."[27] Since the possibility of an elixir, a cathartic cure-all, has become totally unrealistic in our age, there remains only one method to achieve this transformation: to expose the symptoms of our diseased society in such a manner that they are recognized, understood, and thereby perhaps avoided. It is, without doubt, a risky method offering no concrete solutions and seldom placing any blame. It is the method of trial and error, the scientific method, the method of the epic theater.

Epic theater is the theater of the scientific age. Its method is the scientific method, and the first step in this method is the posing of a question. "The essence of all science, for Brecht," quoting John Willett, "was scepticism: a refusal to take anything for granted: an active, burrowing doubt. . . . For nothing must be taken for

granted, in order that nothing may seem unalterable."[28] To effect a transformation it is necessary to question what already exists. To effect this transformation in the theater, to pose questions and expose symptoms rather than present stated facts and offer cures, to show a world of cross sections rather than just the top crust elite of the classical drama or the sordid "bottom slice of life" offered by naturalistic authors--to do these things it was necessary to first transform the theater itself. Brecht attempted to outline his views of this transformation of the theater (not, it should be mentioned, just the drama[29]) in his often quoted scheme of "Gewichtsverschiebungen vom dramatischen zum epischen Theater." The scheme, found in the notes to the opera Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny,[30] remains one of the most clarified statements of the open differences between the two forms and as such is worthy of repitition here. It reads:

Dramatische Form des Theaters	Epische Form des Theaters
Die Bühne verkörpert einen Vorgang	sie erzählt ihn
verwickelt den Zuschauer in eine Aktion und	macht ihn zum Betrachter aber
verbraucht seine Aktivität	weckt seine Aktivität
ermöglicht ihm Gefühle	erzwingt von ihm Entscheidungen
vermittelt ihm Erlebnisse	vermittelt ihm Kenntnisse
der Zuschauer wird in eine Handlung hineinversetzt	er wird ihr gegenübergesetzt
es wird mit Suggestion gearbeitet	es wird mit Argumenten gearbeitet

die Empfindungen werden konserviert	bis zu Erkenntnissen getrieben
der Mensch wird als bekannt vorausgesetzt	der Mensch ist Gegenstand der Untersuchung
der unveränderliche Mensch	der veränderliche und verändernde Mensch
Spannung auf den Ausgang	Spannung auf den Gang
eine Szene für die andere	jede Szene für sich
die Geschehnisse verlaufen linear	in Kurven
natura non facit saltus	facit saltus
die Welt, wie sie ist	die Welt, wie sie wird
was der Mensch soll	was der Mensch muß
seine Triebe	seine Beweggründe
das Denken bestimmt das Sein	das gesellschaftliche Sein bestimmt das Denken

This comparison thoroughly summarizes and complements everything which has been said thus far concerning the external aspects, the "what" and the "why" of epic theater. As can easily be seen from this comparison, for Brecht "das Wesentliche am epischen Theater ist es vielleicht, daß es nicht so sehr an das Gefühl, sondern mehr an die Ratio des Zuschauers appelliert. Nicht miterleben soll der Zuschauer, sondern sich auseinandersetzen."[31] The next step, then, is to turn to the internal aspects of the epic theater to see how the desired results are achieved.

Before taking this step, however, it must be remembered that the purpose here is not to discuss epic theater as such at length, but rather to merely outline a workable set of criteria for later use in the examination of Wedekind's dramas. The general question of epic elements

in the drama has been dealt with by numerous authors in various fashion. Its answer has filled entire books. Therefore it is necessary to present just the core of this material in some type of summarized form which is at the same time both brief and inclusive. The single work on the subject which best lends itself to this type of presentation, because of its thorough and methodic treatment of the primary structural elements of "Handlung" (dramatic action), "Komposition" (composition), "Zeit" (time), "Raum" (space), "Personen" (characters), and "Sprache" (language), is that by Volker Klotz, Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama. Klotz discusses each of these different elements first in relation to the closed (Aristotelian) drama and then in the open (epic) drama, thereby facilitating the same type of clear, summarized comparison as used above by Brecht. This method of schematic comparison will present the basic points of divergence, thus narrowing the actual discussion and definition to a minimum of clarification and suppletion of the separate lists and a more thorough treatment of those factors in the epic theater for which there is nothing comparable in the Aristotelian.

The first element to be considered is that of "Handlung," translated here as dramatic action, thus incorporating the concepts of story ("Stoff"), plot ("Vorgang") and theme ("Fabel"),[32] all of which are or

can be implied from the general German term "Handlung." Retaining throughout Brecht's placement of dramatic (Aristotelian) theater on the left and epic on the right, the first scheme reads:[33]

Einheit--Ganzheit	Kaleidoskop von Aspekten
Unersetzlichkeit der Teile	ersetzliche Teile
Unversetzbarkeit der Teile	versetzbare Teile
Nebenhandlung dient der Haupthandlung	Autonomie der Handlungen
linear und kontinulierlich	zyklisch und sprunghaftig
Exposition--Anfang und Ende	Demonstration--Mitte
zielstrebige Handlung	Ziel ist die Handlung
Idee	Kontrast
Höhepunkt	Integrationspunkte
Entstofflichung--Objektivierung	Dinghaft--Faktizität
Sublimation und Verinnerlichung	Konkretion und Offenbarung
Rhetorik--hören	Dynamik--sehen
verdeckte Handlungen--Resultat	gegenwärtige Handlungen--Ereignis
Verzicht auf Charakteristisches--das Allgemeine	das Charakteristische--das Spezifische, Einmalige
destillierte Aktionen	Fülle der Aktionen
Duell	Kampf
offene Zusammenhänge	verborgene Zusammenhänge
Schein als Sein--Illusion	Sein als Schein--Verfremdung
Ausschnitt als Ganzes	das Ganze in Ausschnitten
Atom	Materie

This particular scheme needs very little explanation in and of itself.[34] The primary differences between dramatic action in the Aristotelian and epic theaters can quite easily be reduced and clarified with the use of a few basic geometric principles concerning the nature of lines.[35]

Dramatic action in the Aristotelian theater, first of all, was characterized above by its definite linear construction, linear being defined here in its essential meaning as "of a line or lines." A line, however, is defined in geometry as a "moving point;" it has no beginning and no end as such, and if carried to infinity it will eventually form a circle. Therefore it is quite clear that the term linear as used by Brecht and Klotz to describe the action in Aristotelian theater falls into the very limited category of what is normally conceived of as a line, i.e. a straight line which joins and is the shortest distance between two distinct, interposed points, both lying on the same plane. Such a figure is designated geometrically not as a line, but as a line segment. A segment is, by definition, part of a greater whole and in this sense of necessity incomplete. At the same time, however, the mere fact that it is limited in and of itself, that it has starting and end points which are fully bridged, creates the illusion of totality, and the segment thereby becomes representative of the whole. Further, such a line segment has length only, since a line is infinitely thin and therefore lacking in breadth, and its motion, once begun, can only be forward in direction. As a result of this forward motion anything which lies beyond this particular segment, either vertically from its course or horizontally from its end points, is no part of the segment and therefore does not exist in relation

to it. For any point to be a part of the line it must be in the line, otherwise it will, by definition as a moving point, form a new line.

As limited by these geometric definitions, then, it is meaningful to say not only that dramatic action in the Aristotelian theater is linear, but that this type of theater can, as a whole, be termed linear theater. This latter assertion will be amply demonstrated once all the structural elements outlined above have been discussed; for the present, however, the underlying linear basis can be clearly demonstrated by applying the above definitions to the characteristics of dramatic action outlined in the first scheme (p. 15). The first four entries can all be discussed in relation to and as part of Aristotle's requirement of unity of action, the only unity which he actually prescribed in his Poetics (8), and the one from which all others (unity of time, place and to a certain extent character) are derived of necessity. For an action to have unity ("Einheit"), according to Aristotle, "the events of which it is made up must be so plotted that if any of these elements is moved ["Unversetzbarkeit der Teile"] or removed ["Unersetzlichkeit der Teile"] the whole is altered and upset. For when a thing can be included or not included without making any noticeable difference, that thing is no part of the whole ["Ganzheit"].[36] Unity of action in the Aristotelian sense, then, implies not only strict cohesion

and concentration, but also completeness; the end product must represent a unified whole constructed of inseparable, immovable parts.

Human conflicts, however, seldom come in such convenient packages. For this reason the dramatists of the Aristotelian theater are forced to work from the same principles as those outlined above for the line segment. The action presented is only a part or segment, usually the final "dramatic" moments, of a broader and more extended sequence of events. In Klotz' words it is an action, "die einen Ausschnitt aus einem pragmatisch, zeitlich und räumlich Größeren und Komplexeren darbietet."[37] Aristotle requires that these events be plotted, i.e. that the various events (points) are determined and interposed in advance in such a manner that any deviations are avoided, and that nothing extra is added. Essentially this is the same as saying that the shortest distance between two points is a straight, unbroken line, and that nothing exists in relation to the line (or line segment taken as a whole) which does not lie within the line. Since the line moves in only one direction and its starting point has been previously plotted, everything of importance lying behind this point, the necessary background information, must somehow be brought into the line segment. This necessity is served by the method of explanatory exposition. Emil Staiger alludes to precisely the same idea in his Grundbegriffe der

Poetik if one merely substitutes the word line for his term "Bewegung" in the statement: "Die Exposition soll kunstgerecht, das heißt, bereits in die große Bewegung verflochten sein."[38] Staiger goes on to say, "Ein Aufenthalt ist nirgends gestattet,"[39] the same point made by Klotz when he uses the term "kontinuierlich" in combination with linear. By the above definitions, however, the former term becomes redundant, since a line is a moving point.

Staiger adds further, "Episoden sind vom Übel."[40] Each episode represents, in essence, a new starting point and will, once again by definition, form a new and independent line, exactly what the Aristotelian dramatists seek to avoid. For this reason subplots are totally subservient to the main plot; they represent an extension of rather than a deviation from the main line or course of events. Other methods used to avoid such divergence are "Teichoskopie" or "Mauerschau," messenger reports and letters, techniques which conveniently supply condensed results of screened actions without the necessity of portraying the actual events, without moving off the line. While these methods are certainly epic in the sense of descriptive narrative, it should be pointed out that their function is actually quite different. It is not the "Verweilen mit Liebe bei jedem Schritte" which Schiller designated as characteristic of the epic form, nor is it an independent action; instead its function is to hurry the action along, to capsulize

and objectify necessary information in order to save time and avoid distraction. Such a method also complies with the general pattern of universal harmony in the aristocratic world of Aristotelian theater; chaotic scenes and barbaric actions are distilled into previously digested reports. We are told rather than shown and we are told only as much or as little as the author wants us to hear and in the form he chooses. Everything is turned away from the specific to the general, from dynamic outward actions to rhetorical inner descriptions--everything is brought into the line.

The end result of this "Ent--stofflichung" is the replacement of reality by illusion; since the spectator sees only the very limited world presented on the stage he begins to accept and <u>feel</u> his way into this world. In effect he becomes a part of the line and thereby loses his perspective as a spectator; feeling, then, takes over from reason. As a part of the line the spectator also has no breadth of vision and thought and he knows only what has been given to him (which now lies behind him). Ahead he sees the previously set end point, the culmination of the idea and the solution to the conflict in which he is now <u>involved</u>. Between lies a blank space. Since what lies behind is insufficient and meaningless until this gap has been bridged, his entire attention becomes focused on this final goal. He is, in Brecht's words, "verwickelt in

die Aktion" and as an active participant "gespannt auf den Ausgang." The impulse of forward movement as directed by the author (or the inherent motion of the line) has replaced all detached observation on the part of the spectator. If the author has been successful with his exposition and careful in his generalizations, the spectator has by this time lost sight of the fact that this little world on the stage is only a partial world, a segment of a long series of events. He has become so engrossed that the "Ausschnitt" has taken on the appearance of a "Ganzes," the line segment has become representative of the entire line. In the end he is relieved that things have reached a definite conclusion, but in the meantime he has lost sight of the parts in his desire to construct a whole, lost interest in the how and the why in his all-consuming desire to learn the what and the when. In accordance with our geometric analogy, one could say that the spectator has "gotten the author's line" in the truest sense of the phrase.

Epic theater, on the other hand, works from the same definition of the line as a moving point, but without the restrictions placed on the line segment. As mentioned above, a line carried to infinity will eventually form a circle. It is therefore justified to speak of the circular tendency of dramatic action in the epic theater and to designate this figure as open, since infinity can be

postulated but in reality never reached. This designation is in complete accord with the type of cyclical and apparently irreconcilable conflicts dealt with by the epic dramatists. They are not interested in a particular war or the sufferings of a single poverty struck family; they want to get to the roots of war and poverty as such, to pose the type of questions which force the spectator to think about his own personal and collective existence. Man is, after all, a collective animal and his knowledge of himself is reflected and enlarged by his knowledge of the world and vice versa. This interaction between the individual and society, between personal ego and collective nonego is what the epic dramatist seeks to stimulate, to provoke. C. G. Jung summarizes this aim in the following sentences which contain what Crumbach considers to be the "Urelement des epischen Theaters:"

> . . . die Menschheit steht immer an den Grenzen jener Dinge, die sie selber tut und doch nicht beherrscht.
> . . . geheime Unruhe benagt die Wurzeln unseres Seins. . . . Die Beschäftigung mit dem Unterbewußten ist uns eine Lebensfrage. Es handelt sich um geistiges Sein oder Nichtsein.
> . . . man muß es sich schon zugestehen: es gibt Probleme, die man mit den eigenen Mitteln nicht lösen kann. Ein solches Eingeständnis hat den Vorteil der Ehrlichkeit, der Wahrheit und der Wirklichkeit.[41]

These problems, "die man mit den eigenen Mitteln nicht lösen kann," are called archetypes by Jung; in essence they are the existential questions inherent in the nature of man. Such problems are infinite in scope and cyclical

in motion, just as is the straight line as defined above. They are certainly more adaptable to an epic than a dramatic treatment and structure.

The epic poet, however chooses such material as the underlying basis of action precisely because of the freedom offered by its openended breadth; as Staiger says, "Die Haupthandlung scheint . . . hier nur ein Vorwand, um möglichst viel einzelnes anzubringen."[42] The epic dramatist, on the other hand, considers the discussion of these problems a necessity, and the poet's freedom becomes the dramatist's form. Since he is limited by the very finite conditions of a stage presentation, the only way he can deal with such infinite questions is "möglichst viel einzelnes anzubringen." Klotz speaks of a "Kaleidoskop von Aspekten" and "das Ganze in Ausschnitten," both of which refer to the epic dramatist's desire, even need, to present not an illusive, mental totality, but a factual, empirical totality--a more total picture. He has no choice but to depart from the outer line or circle of formal plot in favor of a series of linked but independent actions. The circle gives him this breadth lacking in the line segment, and acts merely as a connecting thread for a myriad of line segments or, geometrically speaking, chords. The chords, as line segments, still represent the shortest distance between two points on the greater line (circle), but they are no longer on this line, rather they just intersect it at various intervals.

Seen in this geometric manner, it is quite easy to understand the function of the scene, defined here as a chord, in the epic drama. Each scene is like an independent line segment with meaning in and of itself and at the same time a link in a larger, infinite circular problem.[43]

Dramatic action in the epic theater is thus divided into two distinct levels. The outer level, the circle, contains the central, broad problem with which the author is concerned; the inner level, the chords, demonstrate this problem in all its complexity in various concrete instances. Klotz designates these levels as a "Kollektiv-" and a "Privatstrang"[44] and Crumbach refers to a "sinndeutendes Spiel" and a "Beispiel" ("bei--Spiel").[45]

While these terms express essentially the same relationship as the circle and the chord, the use of the geometric concepts offers one distinct advantage in understanding the function of these levels. The focal vantage point, the point from which the action on both levels is observed, lies neither on the outer circle nor the inner chords, but in the (geometric) center. This is the position of the spectator. The intertwined actions of the circle and the chord therefore function not only as a method of unifying the independent scenes, but also to keep the spectator from identifying with the action in either one, to keep him at the distance necessary for critical observation rather than emotional involvement. Every time

he starts being drawn into the chords of segmented action his attention is forcibly moved to another segment or pulled from the inner action to the external problem. Since there is no goal in sight in the form of an interposed conclusion, he is content to concentrate on the motion rather than its direction, the parts rather than the whole. There is no tension to move forward as was so necessary in the Aristotelian drama. This in turn gives the author the opportunity to present a totality of action and meaning, to show the specifics and vitality of actions rather than presenting them in a watered down rhetorical report. Despite its epic means, however, this type of drama allows for specifically that kind of action from which the word drama was originally derived, namely from the Greek verb "dran" meaning to do. The characters do something which is seen by the spectator, thus also conforming to the concept of theater in the truest sense of the word, as taken from the Greek "theasthai" meaning to see. This reduction of the theater to a "see and do" world of realistic factuality was exactly what Brecht sought as the new function of the stage, especially in relation to its purpose as a place of learning through entertainment.

The epic dramatist, then, merely uses certain epic means to achieve dramatic ends. These means are dictated by the subject matter chosen as the basis of the dramatic action. Having chosen this subject matter, it is clear

from what has been said above that the author must consequently alter his principles of composition, the next element of consideration. The basic differences in composition in the Aristotelian and epic theaters can be seen in the following scheme:[46]

Die Komposition geht von oben nach unten	Sie geht von unten nach oben
Betonung des Akts--geringes Gewicht der Szene	Szene als dramatische Urzelle
Analogie und Proportion	Wiederholung und Dispersion
Symmetrie (bilateral)	Asymmetrie
Konturen	Riβränder
Gliederung--Division	Montage--Addition
architektonische Einheit	architektonische Vielfalt
Handlungslinie	Bildkurve
Aufbau der Einzelteile wie den des Ganzes	durchgeführte Variation(en)
Unselbständigkeit der Teile	Unabhängigkeit der Teile

Both methods result in a whole which is greater than the sum of its parts. The Aristotelian dramatist, however, begins with a whole and then divides it up into its constituent parts or acts and then further subdivides these acts into scenes. The result is a symmetrical whole whose meaning can only be seen and understood when all of the parts have been properly placed together once again. The epic dramatist, on the other hand, works in the opposite direction. Instead of dividing a whole he adds parts. As Staiger states: "Das wahrhaft epische Kompositionsprinzip ist die einfache Addition. Im Kleinen wie im Groβen werden

selbständige Teile zusammengesetzt. Die Addition geht immer weiter,"[47] and further, "In epischer Dichtung nämlich häuft sich ein Werk aus Einzelheiten zusammen. Im problematischen [dramatischen] Stil muß das ganze klar sein, bevor der Dichter Art und Umfang der Teile bestimmen kann. Er stellt den Punkt fest, auf den es hinauswill, und überlegt sodann, wie alles auf diesen Punkt hin zu ordnen sei."[48] The "Szene als Urzelle" as Klotz puts it becomes the basic dramatic unit and the epic whole is then constructed from the bottom up, from the addition of scenes, rather than through division from the top down. Klotz' choice of the word "cell" coincides with Staiger's designation of the epic work as an organism; "Ein Organsimus ist, nach der Deutung in Kant's Kritik der Urteilskraft, ein Gebilde, dessen Teile Selbstzweck zugleich und Mittel sind."[49] As mentioned above, the whole is still greater than the sum of its parts, but only because the parts add up to a more inclusive empirical picture. Concern is not placed on proportion in a qualitative, architectural sense, but in a quantitative meaning only; larger amounts of factual information are presented to the spectator.

It should be stressed before proceeding, however, that the lack of symmetry in the epic drama does not connotate a lack of structural unity when seen in its total perspective. The fact that each scene (chord) has meaning in and of itself does not negate, does in fact

strengthen, the meaning and structure of the greater whole (circle). Each scene contains integral links which, when seen and placed together from the central position of the spectator, do have a relationship to each other and an even greater significance in relation to the whole. As Klotz puts it, "Es besteht mithin größere Affinität zwischen der kleinsten und der größten Einheit als zwischen den kleineren Einheiten untereinander."[50]

The next two elements, time and space, are relative to the aforementioned characteristics of the nature of the problems dealt with in the dramatic action of the epic theater. Margret Dietrich states: "Die neue Art der epischen Dramatik, die antinomisch bedingte Seinsweisen interpretieren will, lebt aus ontologisch eingestellten Blickrichtungen intellektueller und gefühlsmäßiger Prägung. Die Grenzsituation nicht nur als Raumbestimmung . . . sondern auch als Zeitbestimmung ordnet sich dieser ontologischen Blickrichtung unter," and continues, "Die alten Regeln von Einheit der Zeit und des Raumes haben ihre Gültigkeit verloren, wo Zeit und Raum als relative Größen empfunden werden. Die Forderung nach Einheit der Handlung wird durch die neue nach Einheit des Problems ersetzt. Diesem einen Grundgesetz gehorcht auch das epische Drama, das mit Raum, Zeit und Handlung sehr frei operiert, ja, das 'provokatorisch' die Einheit von Raum, Zeit und Handlung zerstört, um sich seinem eigentlichen

Anliegen, dem Sichtbarmachen des Problems, widmen zu können."[51] Thus the same factor which dictated the condensation of time and space for Aristotle can be seen in an inverse relationship in the epic drama; the broad, existential problems which the epic dramatist is forced to treat require an equal breadth of time and space.

The parallels of time in the epic and dramatic theaters show the following characteristics:[52]

Es gibt eine enge Eingrenzung der Zeit	Es gibt eine grenzlose Zeit
24 Stunden	? ? ?
gedachte Differenz der Zeitqualität	empfundene Differenz der Zeitqualität
bestimmte, kurze Zeiterstreckung	elastische, weite Zeiterstreckung
Sonderung von Gegenwarts- und Vorgeschichte	stete, fortwährende Gegenwart
Zeit als Rahmen	Zeit als Wirkungsmacht
reine Sukzession	dramatischer Augenblick
Zeitlinien	Punkte und Kontrapunkte
vorwärtstreibend--bewegte Zeit	Schwebezustand--reflektierte und reflektierende Zeit

Correspondingly space, treated frequently in conjunction with time because of their obvious inherent relationships, shows a similar pattern of necessary breadth and newly acquired significance as can be seen in the scheme:[53]

Einheit des Ortes--höfisch, arkadisch	Ortsfülle--die Welt
Raum als Rahmen--unbewegt und leblos	Raum als mitwirkender Teil der Handlung
keine "sprechende" Verwandlung des Ortes--statisch	Verwandlung des Ortes-Verwandlung des Geschehens=Verwandlung der Personen

zeitloser Raum	zeitbedingt- und zeitbedingender Raum
Natur und Außenwelt abschirmend	Totalität der empirischen Welt
Bedeutungslandschaft stilisiert--	deutende Landschaft echt--
Gesellschaftsraum	Lebensraum
Dinge=Züge (Projektionen der Eigenschaften oder des Problems)	Dinge=Funktionen (Gegenstände der Dingwelt)
Symbolwert der Dinge	Eigenwert der Dinge

Here again it is quite simple to equate the basic differences between time and space in the Aristotelian and epic theaters geometrically. The line, defined as a point moving forward in time and space and limited to the concept of an enclosed line segment, is incapable of allowing either spatial breadth or terminal extension. Therefore Aristotle's requirement of unity of dramatic action, based upon his choice of a limited (segmented) problem, requires by its very nature a corresponding limitation of both time and space. Staiger says of the Aristotelian dramatists: ". . . diesen Dichtern ist es gemäß, die Zeit zu verkürzen, den Raum zu verengen, aus einem ausgedehnten Geschehen den prägnanten Moment zu wählen--einen Moment kurz vor dem Abschluß--und nun von da aus das Viele zur sinnlich faß baren Einheit zusammenzuziehen, damit nicht die Teile, sondern die Fugen, nicht das Einzelne, sondern der ganze Sinnzusammenhang deutlich werde und nichts in Vergessenheit gerate, was der Hörer behalten muß. Sinnvoll schließt der Rahmen der Bühne eine solche Dichtung ein. Mit einem Wort: sie konzentriert."[54] Seen as the functional framework of

the Aristotelian drama, the requirements of a stage production literally force the structural elements of time and space to also function as framework. The spectator can extend his imagination only so far before the illusion of totality and the tense desire to reach a conclusion are lost; time (in relation to both the functional aspect of the dramatic work and the actual time spent sitting in the theater) and space must therefore be coherently regulated within this artificial world in the same manner as outlined above for the elements of dramatic action.[55] The end result of this regulation (concentration) is the total relativity of both elements in relation to the action which they enclose. Changes in time and space, if great enough to even deserve consideration, do not actually change anything; neither is in and of itself active.

The circular nature of the problems dealt with in the epic theater, on the other hand, not only calls for but also allows the expanse necessary to deal with these problems in a meaningful context. Since unity of action in the Aristotelian sense is impossible and therefore not attempted, the corresponding unities of time and place are also ignored. Quoting Margret Dietrich once again: "Der Zerstörung der Handlungseinheit parallel geht folgerichtig auch eine Durchlöcherung der logischen Kausalität. Der Kausalitätsnexus wird direkt an den

'Vorgang' gebunden und läßt einem alogischen Handlungsgefüge ebenso freien Spielraum wie er Raum- und Zeitbehandlung aperspektivische Gestaltung einräumt."[56] Time and space are, according to Einstein's theory of relativity, interdependent and relative to each other and to the motion with which they are associated. Together they form an unbroken continuum of the same type discussed above for the Aristotelian theater. The presence of matter, however, results in what Einstein terms a "warping" of this continuum (commonly known as gravitation) in such a fashion that the motion now describes a curve. This is precisely the same effect seen when "matter" is introduced as the subject of dramatic literature. Time and space must therefore function under the new categories introduced by the altered, circular nature of the motion; the new function of dramatic action in the epic theater calls for equivalent alterations of the time--space relationship and vice versa. Changes in time and space bring about concurrent changes in the motion and nature of the action relative to them; they become active forces with respect to the various structural elements.

Similarly, the objects placed within this expanded world also take on a different role. A single object, a clock for example, has or can have a totally different function in the two types of theater. Placed in the normal setting of the classical drama, this clock would more than

likely be merely another unnoticed "thing" among many pointing out the social standing of the main characters. It has no quality in and of itself, rather only in relation to the general quality of all things in this aristocratic world of high society. The same function could be performed by a candelabra, a jewelry box, etc., since its value is only of a symbollic nature. Even if used in a more concrete fashion to show the specific passing of time, its intrinsic value would still be overshadowed by its more general function as a factor of dramatic tension and the elapse of time as a factor of forward motion leading to a conclusion. The same clock located in the everyday world of the epic theater might also have nothing more than a figurative value. It may, for instance, symbolize the fact that a poor family once belonged to the upper class if it stands out as the only expensive item in an otherwise meager setting. Or it may have been stolen. Or it may be merely a factor of "Verfremdung," a strange object which is out of place and therefore conspicuous. But the very fact that it <u>stands out</u>, that for one reason or another we take notice, already gives it greater individual importance than had previously been the case. In addition, its ticking noise or intermittent chiming (in the Aristotelian theater it is seldom that we even realize whether or not the clock actually works) may combine with spatial elements such as an overcrowded hut or an

expansive, empty room, to show the immediacy of both time and space. The amount of sound generated is interdependent with the amount of space in which it resounds and vice versa. The ticking of the clock forces this realization on the person situated within the bounds of these time--space coordinates, and thereby has a direct and active influence on his behavior. The moment this realization reaches the mind of the character it is clear that the clock, as a clock, has a distinct value in relation to the elements of time, space and action, even if the end result is nothing more than someone smashing it or throwing it out the window.[57]

The possibility of exactly this type of spontaneous reaction on the part of a character in the Aristotelian drama is all but inconceivable, in the epic theater quite feasible. The people in the epic theater are just that; normal, everyday people whose behavioral patterns (if, with all the variation involved, one can even speak meaningfully of true patterns) are conditioned by the reciprocal interchange between the individual and the world around him. Therefore it is impossible to "characterize" these people in advance into categories of plus and minus. As Crumbach states: "Es fehlt keineswegs an ethischen und psychologischen Motiven, doch hat der Zuschauer sie aus den Handlungen der Personen zu deduzieren; unmöglich ist es, auf Grund der gegebenen

Beschaffenheit eines Charakters Reaktionen vorauszuberechnen."[58]

The characters of the epic theater, then, must also be viewed in light of the circular problematics of vital reality, as can be seen in the scheme:[59]

Die Charaktere gehören einem hohen Stande	Die Charaktere haben keinen Standesvorbehalt
Elite	Alltagsmensch
tragikwürdig--kann von oben fallen	tragisch--sind schon unten
einseitig und geformt	plastisch und formend
einfache Ganzheit	komplexe Gespaltenheit
Typus--Rolle	typisch--Mensch
Personifikation der Eigenschaften	Eigen-schaften
Protagonist--Antagonist	Monagonist--Antagonismus
Schuld und Unschuld	jeder schuldig, jeder schuldenfrei
Ordnungder Emotionen	Gefühlsumbrüche
kalt	sensitiv
Ratio--Bewußtsein	Gefühl--Dasein (So-sein)
selbstbewußt--sieht das Ganze	unsicher--sieht das Nächste
Reflexion--Abstand zur Aktion und zu sich selbst	Ahnung--spontanes Agieren und Reagieren
Mündigkeit	unmündig oder beschränkte Mündigkeit
Entwicklung	Erstickung
allverbindliche Weltanschauung	schaut die unverbindliche Welt an
geringe Zahl der Figuren	vielfigurige Welt
Kommunikation--Sprache	Verstummen--Pantomime und Geste
Vertrauen	Furcht
Vertikalbindung--geistig, wörtlich	Horizontalbindung--physisch, körperlich
Nebenfiguren als Abspaltungen der Helden--keine Randfiguren	atmosphärische aber gerundte Randfiguren--keine Helden

Real people of the real world--nothing more need be said except: look around, look in the mirror. The reality

which will be seen is reflected, even if with a certain amount of functional (not, as in the Aristotelian theater, purely artificial) artistic distortion, in the characters of the epic theater.

Correspondingly these people speak (once again with given functional exceptions) in a normal, everyday idiom. Their language, the final structural element to be considered, is consistent and interdependent with all of the elements discussed previously. Exclamation, pause, broken words and unfinished sentences, gesticulation in the place of vocal expression, etc. all reflect the increased difficulty of <u>true</u> communication as opposed to the flowing rhetoric of stichomythic sentences in the Aristotelian theater. In the latter the various unities result also in a unified language framework ("Sprachraum"); the fact that all of the characters are from the same class, for example, will condition speech patterns to a very narrow point of divergence. Therefore one should keep in mind everything which has been said thus far concerning the relationship between function and purpose as the determining factors of structure when reading this final comparison of structural elements, namely that of language. It reads:[60]

Die Sprache ist einheitlich--Sprache des "hohen" Stils	Die Sprache ist pluralistisch--Stilmischungen
Versstil	Prosastil
Herrschaft über die	Beherrschtsein von

Sprache	der Sprache
logische Argumente	spontanes Aus-sagen
schlüßig--Folgerung	assoziativ--Reihung
Satzgefüge	Satzgeschlinge
hypotaktisch	parataktisch
deduktiv und explicit	induktiv und implicit
einheitliche Perspektive	polyperspektivisch
Konjunktion von	Addition von
Perioden	Partikeln
homophones Sprechen	polyphones Sprechen
Abhängigkeit der Teile	Selbständigkeit der Teile
Beschreibung--urteilt	Evokation--beschwört
Sentenz--begründet	Sprichwort--deutet
Zielbewegung	Bewegung als Ziel
Dialog als Duell--sprechen miteinander	Dialog als Selbstaussage--sprechen nebeneinander oder durcheinander
Austausch--Stichomythie	Ausdruck--monologartig
Monolog enthält Für-und Gegenargumente	Monolog enthält Gefühle und Gedanken
Entschlüsse fallen in der Sprache	Entschlüsse werden durch die Tat gezeigt
klare Wahl	Symptomen
beschränkte Metaphorik--Mythologie, Historie und Literatur	offene Metaphorik--Bibel, Volkslied, Sprichwort und Märchen
gebundene Metapher--traditionell verkoppelt	ungebundene Metapher--extemporierte Bilder
das Allgemeine	das Augenblickliche

True to the nature of the characters and situations presented in the Aristotelian theater, the language is characterized above all by coherence and composure. The characters recitate the progressive line which the author has formulated and polished in advance. Logical thought, not immediate action and reaction in verbal form, dictates the use of articulate speech in even the most extreme circumstances. The same type of regulated "duel" which characterized the dramatic action is reflected in the dialogue. As Klotz says, "Der Dialog in Sentenzen ist R e d e d u e l l.

Er hat mit der höfischen Kunst des Fechtens vieles gemeinsam, zusammen mit der dramatischen Grundfigur des Duells entspricht er dem höfisch-aristokratischen Raum des geschlossenen Dramas. Duell wie Sentenzendialog werden nach festen Regeln ausgefochten."[61] The total lack of immediacy in this studied phraseology is also evident in the use of metaphor; the impression left is not that of the specific object being described, but rather that of the more general object to which it is compared. Further, the source of the metaphors employed is directly related to the literate aristocratic world pictured, and therefore not always understandable to the common man.

Again one need only use his normal capacities of sensory perception to discern the differences between this language and that used in the epic theater. If one places himself, for example, in the middle of the "street scene" which Brecht designated as a model for the epic theater,[62] the interaction of all the elements of time, space, action and personality on the speech of the person involved would certainly be perceptible. The heat of anger, the feeling of being trapped by the persistent inquiry of passers-by, the realization that you are losing time, the misinterpretation of your actions and/or motives, the wishful thought that nothing had happened--all of these factors work together to produce a chaotic mixture of exclamatory outburst, frustrated stammering, inexpressable gesticulation or

total silence. The traits listed above are thus quite self-explanatory in light of the breakdown of communication in today's world.

In summary, then the following statements can be made concerning the general nature of the epic theater:

1. The epic dramatist is concerned with the situation of the world as it exists and has existed, and therefore wishes to use the theater as a vehicle of change.

2. If this change is to be relevant it must be generally applicable. He therefore chooses as the basic problem of his works one of the broad, irreconcilable conflicts which exist between the individual and his, our world.

3. The breadth of such conflicts forces the dramatist to spring the normal bounds of a unified dramatic world through the employment of epic means; he forsakes the artificial, illusive totality of linear segmentation in favor of the freedom and breadth offered by the empirical totality of a circular structure.

4. Since these conflicts are infinite in nature, the figure (circle) described must be designated as open.

5. This open structure, the fact that beginning and end points are not imposed in advance, has in turn as its most immediate effect the release of tension ("Spannung") as a factor of the inherent forward motion toward a goal so prominent in the linear, Aristotelian theater. The spectator is therefore content to concentrate on the motion (action) itself.

These five points form the general basis of the outer or first level of structure in the epic theater. The basic factor in determining this structure was the breadth and complexity of the problems which the modern dramatist must deal with; purpose (viable change) determines problem

(existential archetypes) which in turn determines structure (epic circularity). The epic dramatist is, however, still bound by the requirements of the stage. He must therefore introduce a second, inner level of structure in order to make the presentation of the problem feasible for stage production.

6. The outer level or circle therefore serves primarily as the unifying, interpretive framework for a series of chord-like scenes (and/or scenes within scenes) which demonstrate the problem in various concrete instances or examples. In addition, the interaction between circle and chord serves to keep the spectator from identifying with the action on either level.

7. These scenes are characterized above all by their independence (meaning in and of themselves), their contrasting variety, their multiplicity and their specific reality.

8. Time, place and characters are correspondingly freed from the bonds of artificial unity, and take on an active, interdependent role in determining behavior.

9. Language as an element of behavioral expression is now determined by the circumstances of time and place as well as the inherent factors of varied personalities.

10. Architectural, linear unity is thus replaced by scientific, empirical totality in a stagable form through the combination of circle and chord.

The epic dramatist, then, constructs a real world in which he demonstrates real problems. To keep the spectator at a distance from the reality which he presents he frequently introduces elements (so-called "Verfremdungseffekte" [see n. 34]) which make this very real world seem strange.

These elements distort without actually altering the given object, person, etc., in such a manner that we are forced to consider them in a new light, to reorient our previous values. They combine with the interaction of the two levels of structure and the lack of a positive conclusion to keep the spectator in the position of a critical, thinking observer. He is provoked; he becomes mentally active. This mental activity geared toward the reorientation of values will (if the dramatist has been successful) lead to the original goal of constructive change.

"Die Werke Wedekinds handeln wie die Jedes echten Dichters nur von ihm."[63] The truth and import of this statement by Paul Fechter cannot be overstressed. It is impossible, despite the current trend toward the study of literary works as independent bodies,[64] to gain a full understanding and appreciation of Frank Wedekind the dramatist without some insight into the man. As Max Spalter so convincingly points out, the authors designated as the precursors of the epic theater share with Brecht not only certain dramatic techniques, but also a common temperament characterized above all by cynicism, frustration, aggressiveness and a desire for radical change. It is therefore no accident whatsoever that their dramas have taken on a correspondingly radical form; the stage is an outlet for and a visual confrontation with their own inner conflicts. As was demonstrated above, it is

this combination of purpose and problem which determines the structure of the epic drama and theater.

For the sake of necessary brevity, Kutscher's excellent three-volume biography of Wedekind, which in itself reads like an epic drama with Wedekind as the lonely "non-hero," can be graphically summed up in one word: estrangement. Wedekind lived his entire life as an outsider, estranged from his parents, his wife, his contemporaries and most basically from himself. He was living testimony to the internal dualism so often expressed in the conflict between the artist and society in the works of Thomas Mann. It is perhaps for this reason that Mann considered the final scene between Scholz and Keith in Wedekind's Der Marquis von Keith to be ". . . das Schrecklichste, Rührendste und Tiefste, was dieser tiefe, gequälte Mensch geschrieben hat."[65] Scholz and Keith are not two enemies fighting each other in the form of antagonist and protagonist; they are two antithetical sides of Wedekind's nature demonstrating his own inner antagonism. The Scholz-Keith antithesis never reaches synthesis, unless perhaps years later in Brecht's Baal, the central character of which is decidedly patterned after Wedekind.

The same inherent personal traits which led the dramatists of the epic tradition to the theater as an outlet for existential conflicts also led them to the

conclusion that the existing theater was not prepared, either physically or mentally, to satisfy their new demands. Thus they further shared a common personal desire to bring about change not only through but also in the theater, and a similar feeling of frustration in the realization of the fact that the target of their attacks, bourgeois society, controlled their only weapon, the theater. Brecht was the first to successfully break through this barrier, and as a result has received a great deal of credit for innovation in the theater. That much of this credit is to a certain extent undeserved can be easily proven by comparing, for instance, his "Neue Technik der Schauspielkunst"[66] with Wedekind's "Schauspielkunst: Ein Glossarium."[67] Both authors critize the naturalistic style of acting from the same basic premises and with many of the same suggestions for change. One could, however, go back even further. Compare for example the following quotes:

> Woher [hat Hans Sachs] das Zutrauen zu der Einbildungskraft seines Publikums. Weil er sicher war, daß sie sich aus der nämlichen Absicht dort versammelt hatten, aus der er aufgetreten war, ihnen einen Menschen zu zeigen, nicht eine Viertelstunde.[68]

> Kurz und gut, [ich erregte Kopfschütteln und Achselzucken], weil ich von der barbarischen Voraussetzung ging, daß der Zuschauer für sein Geld etwas hören und sehen will. Schlechterdings bin ich wirklich der Uberzeugung, daß unser literarisches Theater seit zwanzig Jahren erstens zu wenig Theater und zweitens viel zu literarisch ist.[69]

Either statement could have come from Brecht in his criticism of the "culinary" theater of our own day; in fact, the latter was made by Wedekind at the turn of the century and the former by J. M. R. Lenz in 1774.

Throughout his theoretical writings and personal letters Wedekind made beseeching personal appeals to the theatrical profession on all levels to at least attempt a production of his dramas before writing them off as morally and technically unstageable. When nothing resulted from these challenges but rebuke, he resorted to the only remaining solution; in 1898 he accepted a position at the Ibsen Theater in Leibzig as secretary, director and, most importantly, as an actor. He was thus given his first opportunity (followed by numerous others in similar positions in theaters throughout Germany) to not only direct his dramas in the manner in which he intended them to be performed, but to literally show his own interpretation of the dramatic personages who were so much a part of himself. Wedekind's career as an actor can best be described as successfully unsuccessful. That is to say his acting was extremely beneficial in relation to the general understanding and acceptance of his works by the theater and the audience, many of whom came just to see Wedekind himself, but his actual talent never progressed beyond that of the common dilettante. Even this latter fact, however, can be viewed from a positive aspect.

Because of his true lack of ability, Wedekind always remained an actor playing a role; the audience was at all times aware of the fact that they were seeing not Scholz or Keith, but a poor actor, and more specifically a poor actor who they knew to be Frank Wedekind. He thus unknowingly fulfilled to the utmost Brecht's basic concept of "Verfremdung" as a technique of acting in that he always kept the audience and himself at a distance from his role.

One further personal factor which relates Wedekind to the other dramatists leading to the epic theater, and which is reflected directly therein, is that of speech. The characteristics outlined above for the language used in the epic theater are at least to a certain extent the result of the author's own speaking habits and the observation (and corresponding influence) of his language environment. For Wedekind this environment included the majority of Europe, from the lowest class bordel to the best hotels and restaurants. His own strange idiom, developed during his isolated youth at the castle Lenzburg, is therefore combined with numerous others to form a dramatic dialogue characterized primarily by its individuality, variety and precision. It is therefore not at all surprising to find that most critics now consider Wedekind to be one of Brecht's primary language sources. While numerous examples could be given either directly

or indirectly showing this influence, one particular and fully coincidental comparison comes to mind which illustrates excellently their similar views on the function of language as precise expression. Kutscher relates the following concerning Wedekind's speech: "Wedekind erstrebte Einfachheit des sprachlichen Ausdrucks. Eine Bemerkung aus der Pariser Zeit wendet sich gegen Nietzsche, der anstatt 'Ich ärgere mich, wenn ich das Kamel sehe,' sagt 'Meine Seele ärgert sich, wenn mein Auge das Bild des Kamels sieht.'"[70] Martin Esslin uses a surprisingly comparable example for Brecht: "To say 'pluck out the eye that offends thee' is far less effective than 'If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out.' Here the language itself implies and compels the corresponding action."[71]

There would be no difficulty in continuing to relate Wedekind's personal life to those of the other dramatists leading to the epic theater, and to show that these factors directly influenced the formation of that theater. There is neither reason nor necessity to do so here. One last illustration will serve as both summary and conclusion. Consider the following as the final scene of a Wedekind drama:

> Eine große Trauergemeinde hatte sich eingefunden, die Stadtvertretung, Männer der Wissenschaft und Kunst, die Literatur und die Theater . . . ; dazu Reste der Schwabinger Bohème, Freudenmädchen und Halbwüchsige, die dem [Herrn] 'so etwas wie die letzte Ehre erwiesen oder doch wenigstens ihre Neugier befriedigen wollten.' Schon in der Leichenhalle gab es Gedränge und unwilliges

> Gemurmel, weil alles noch einen Blick in den offenen, blumenüberwuchteten Sarg tun wollte, eine Malerin aber den Raum für sich hatte absperren lassen, bis das Publikum die Schranken durchbrach. Auch in der Aussegnungshalle, um den Katafalk, 'schaute sich die bunte Schar hinter den Herren im schwarzen Rock und Zylinder. . . . Nun folgte ein groteskes Zwischenspiel. Als der Zug sich in Bewegung setzte, 'geriet der Knäuel unwillkommener Zaungäste in wellenförmige Bewegung; und plötzlich hasteten sie, einer den anderen überholend, dem Sarge voran, nur ja die ersten am Grabe zu sein und auch von dem Schauspiel dort nichts zu versäumen. Wie die Wilden stürmten sie im Galopp querfeldein . . . Heinrich Lautensack, seiner geistigen Auflösung nahe, setzte mit einem Filmoperateur hinterher und rief dauernd in das Gefolge, wie man sich zu halten und wohin zu blicken habe. Am Grabe enstand ein peinliches Durcheinander. Den Rednern, die sich nur schwer Platz und Gehör schaffen konnten, wurden die Hüte vom Kopf gestoßen und die Blumenspenden zerdrückt. Es kam zu mühsam gedämpften Auseindersetzungen, zu lauten Weinkrämpfen und anderen unliebsamen Szenen.' . . . endlich stürzte Lautensack hervor, warf sich am Grabe nieder und schrie, indem er seinen Kranz in das Grab schleuderte: 'Frank Wedekind, dem geliebten Meister, sein getreuster Schüler!'[72]

This final line tells you that the above scene, so full of Brechtian estrangement, was in fact Wedekind's burial.

CHAPTER II

DRAMATIC ACTION

> Verzeihung, Exzellenz, wir stehen hier auf der Bühne.--Auf einer wirklichen Bühne--auf der wechselvollen Bühne des großartigen unberechenbaren Lebens . . . [73]

Aristotle's requirement of a unified dramatic action, a unity characterized not only by its linear progression but also by its artificial totality, was shown above to be the dominant factor in determining the entire structure of this particular form of drama. Dramatic action in the epic theater, on the other hand, was characterized above all by its circular freedom and open breadth. This freedom, however, must be viewed as a freedom of necessity, since dramatic action was shown to be the threefold result of: (1) the author's original purpose, (2) the problems which must be dealt with in order to serve and achieve that purpose, and (3) the structure which he must choose in order to deal with such problems. The epic tradition in the theater therefore has as its origin the common desire on the part of all its followers, without exception, to change the world as it exists and has existed, and particularly the world which is reflected in their own

society. This common goal dictates, despite differences of personal preference or historical emphasis, a choice of broad, existential problems which in turn require a circular, epic-like structure.

Frank Wedekind's position in this development is quite clearly determined from the outset by the problematics which he chose as the basis for his dramatic production. Wedekind saw the primary function of his dramas in the necessity to expose the hypocrisy of the reigning bourgeois society and the corresponding need to attack the equally hypocritical representation of this society in the contemporary realistic (naturalistic) theater of Ibsen and Hauptmann. He chose as the primary target for his dramatic exposés a most sensitive area which this and every previous society had wished and attempted to avoid: sexual morality. Wedekind, like Freud, saw sex as a driving instinct in most overt human behavior, an instinct which should be understood and appreciated rather than repressed and degraded. For Wedekind, if money is the root of all evil then sex is the root of all pleasure, and the two are generally grafted together to grow into a weak and withered little weed of the species Homo sapiens, who is consciously or unconsciously trapped in a constant conflict between instinct and system. It is precisely this innate conflict in modern man, that between instinct and system, between the inalienable individual rights

and the demands of modern society, which forms the core of the dramatic action in a Wedekind drama. Good and evil, sex and material gain, reach a personified culmination in one of Wedekind's favorite and most frequently employed figures, the prostitute or, far more Wedekindian, "Freudenmädchen."

It hardly seems necessary to point out that this general subject matter far exceeds the bounds of a unified and total dramatic presentation. The universality of the sexual drive as a basic human instinct and the singularity of each particular personal reaction to this instinct are not matters which can be limited to a given time or place or a specific social class. The desire for material wealth is common to all mankind; the attempts to gain wealth are as varied as the people employing them. Any treatment of these questions which hopes to be meaningful and instructive enough to bring about fruitful change must show both their general nature and their specific implications, their universality and their singularity. Wedekind does exactly that by employing the two levels of structure outlined above as typical of and necessary for the presentation of dramatic action in the epic theater; the outer, circular level introduces the broad, irreconcilable problem which is then demonstrated in all its complexity in the inner chords or scenes.

Wedekind's dramatic works include twenty complete dramas, a number of fragments and a variety of related

works such as pantomimes and dance pieces intended for the theater. This production spans a period of forty years, beginning in 1877 at the modest age of thirteen with the fragmentary attempt Eine Szene aus dem Orient, and ending in 1917 with his last complete drama, Herakles. It is therefore quite obvious that it is necessary to place some type of limitation on the present discussion rather than proceeding at random. In line with what has been said above concerning the two major conflicts which Wedekind selected as the basis of the action in the great majority of his works, it is possible to designate two groups of dramas which illustrate quite well his basic structural techniques, the development of these techniques throughout his career, and their relationship to the characteristics of dramatic action in the epic theater outlined above in the first scheme. The first group, consisting of Frühlings Erwachen (1891), the two "Lulu Plays," (Erdgeist [1893] and Die Büchse der Pandora [1901]), and Franziska (1911), has sexual vitalism in the foreground, with bourgeois materialism playing an important but somewhat secondary role. The second group, Der Schnellmaler oder Kunst und Mammon (1889), Der Kammersänger (1897), Der Marquis von Keith (1900) and Die Zensur (1907), tends to reverse this emphasis toward the material values, especially as these values relate to the position of the artist in conflict with middle class society.

The first group of dramas represents an excellent illustration of what has been said concerning the unwillingness and inability of the modern dramatist to fully resolve the existential questions which he himself poses and of the inherent open, circular nature of these problems. Each of these works offers in essence a continuation of what psychologists would refer to as the cycle of sexual development, and each is therefore a continuation of the previous, incomplete work. While it could hardly be argued that Wedekind intentionally followed the "scientific method" used by the psychologist to come to grips with the problems arising from sexual aggression or repression, this is approximately what he does. These dramas are actually nothing more than a series of semi-factual episodes from individual case histories which give the audience the opportunity to sit by the proverbial couch and come to its own conclusions about what they have seen and heard. Despite the fact that many of the "facts" presented in these cases have been altered or distorted out of proportion in order to provoke the lethargic spectator into active concern, most nonetheless have, as a study of Wedekind's biography proves, a certain amount of factual authenticity. This is especially true of Frühlings Erwachen, Wedekind's first major drama and the structural and thematic model for his entire dramatic production.[74]

Georg Büchner made a tremendous step forward in the development of the modern theater when he centered the dramatic action of an entire drama on the existential agony of a single pathetic creature by the name of Woyzeck. Over fifty years later Wedekind went one step further by peopling his Frühlings Erwachen with a number of such victimized innocents. As Spalter states: "Action does not revolve around a single hero or protagonist but a gallery of types such as Brecht would employ to demonstrate individual variations of a basic human dilemna."[75] The dilemna being faced is that of the internal anxiety which accompanies the arousal of sexual awareness in the adolescent entering puberty and the corresponding external conflict resulting from the attempt of prudish adults to morally degrade and mentally repress this completely natural physical phenomenon. These problems are clearly age-old and universal, while each individual's reaction to them is unique and personal; thus the subject matter itself leads quite independently to the two levels of action commonly found in the epic theater.

The empirical scope of Frühlings Erwachen becomes extremely evident when one attempts to meaningfully summarize the action in a brief form. Essentially three fourteen year old children, Moritz Stiefel, Wendla Bergmann and Melchior Gabor, emerge above the others as central figures. Moritz, insecure and increasingly neurotic, is

driven by the pressures of school, family and sexual anxiety to suicide. Wendla, the personification of naïveté, becomes pregnant with Melchior's child and dies an unnecessary death resulting from an attempted abortion arranged without her knowledge by her parents. And Melchior, intelligent and overly worldly for his age, is sent to reform school for having written a treatise on human reproduction for Moritz and for "seducing" Wendla, but manages to escape and in the final scene is convinced of the need to continue living by a masked apparition who appears in the cemetery where Moritz and Wendla are buried. Suicide, seduction, an escape from jail--this alone seems like more than enough action for a single drama and certainly provocative enough to incite the average nineteenth century audience. This outline is, however, at very best skeletal. Among other things it does not include, in addition to the full depth and implications of the above actions, the poignant scenes involving some of the other children, such as Hänschen Rilow's almost psychopathic flight of sexual phantasy (II, 129-131) and his later experience of innocent homosexuality with Ernst Röbel (II, 165), or the fate of Ilse, victim of a meager and undisciplined homelife which leads her to the dubious freedom offered by life as a prostitute. The bleak seriousness of these scenes is countered by the natural, humorously innocent manner in which the children

discuss their plight, and by the interspersing of bitingly comical scenes, such as the brilliant teachers' conference (II, 143-148), which caricature the dehumanized adult world with an irony equal to that of Brecht or Dürrenmatt.[76]

Wedekind makes no concentrated attempt to fully develop any of these various facets of action. They are thrust upon the spectator one after the other without expositional commentary and often with no immediately visible relationship to each other. Many, such as the scenes devoted to Hänschen Rilow, do not move the main action forward in the least--in fact it is difficult if not impossible to discern a single line of progressive action even in relation to the three central characters--and could seemingly be moved or removed at will. The random appearance of this epic volume of events is, however, quite superficial; they are neither unnecessary nor unstructured. Their function is that of empirical exemplification or episodic reinforcement, a function which not only justifies and requires their inclusion in relation to the author's purpose of attacking a problem by recognizing a maximum number of its potential symptoms, but also lends a certain amount of external unity through their association with this greater problem or whole. The vibrant immediacy and general implications of the action contained in these scenes are far more important to Wedekind than their possible outcome (or lack thereof),

and the depth and independence of each keep the spectator from concentrating on anything other than that which is presently taking place. The release of dramatic tension which results from this stress on action rather than artificial forward motion is achieved further by Wedekind's technique of foreboding impending actions, a method also used frequently by Brecht to control the spectator's interest. Wendla's eventual fate is prefigured in the very first scene when, in answer to her mother's statement: "Wer weiß, wie du sein wirst, wenn sich die anderen entwickelt haben," she replies: "Wer weiß--vielleicht werde ich nicht mehr sein" (II, 98). Similarly, Moritz alludes to his violent demise as early as the fourth scene with the comment: "Wenn ich nicht promoviert worden wäre, hätte ich mich erschossen" (II, 113), and his references to the story of the "Königin ohne Kopf" (II, 121 and 137) are personified in the final scene in the graveyard, when Moritz himself appears with his head under his arm. These hints of what is to come serve not only to alleviate the tension of baited expectancy by supplying the spectator with advance notice; they also function as threads of unification (Klotz' term "Integrationspunkte") woven throughout the drama to assist the spectator in relating the various segments of action to the greater whole. All of these threads are brought together in the masterful graveyard scene which concludes the drama. As Klotz

states: "Die Szene zwischen Melchior, dem toten Moritz und dem vermummten Herrn . . . fängt die Diffusion der vielen Partikularerlebnisse, -leiden und -tragödien dieses Stücks auf und zeigt, daß es bei all den scheinbar isolierten Geschehnissen um nichts anderes ging als um den Kampf zwischen Lebens- und Todestendenzen."[77]

This final scene merits special consideration as a milestone in the development of modern drama. Action, which has proceeded at a breakneck pace, is brought to a resounding halt in order to present one last unifying overview of what has taken place. This technique, later employed quite frequently by Frisch and Dürrenmatt, not only allowed Wedekind to demonstrate the interrelation of the seemingly autonomous events of his drama, but also to put them in the proper perspective through narrative comment in the person of The Masked Man, no doubt the author himself. Wedekind was certainly aware and desirous of the <u>effect</u> which this figure, Brechtian in its narrative function and estranging being, would have on his audience. "This mysterious intruder," quoting Spalter, "is as blatant a departure from realistic technique as the sight of Moritz carrying his head on his arm. 'Verfremdung' is a pertinent concept here; Wedekind abruptly demolishes an atmosphere with which we can identify and creates an atmosphere that can only startle us to wonder and reflection. He makes us realize by his grotesque antinaturalism that

in essence his play has been about Eros versus Thanatos as much as it has been about adults versus adolescents."[78] This latter statement, similar to the one above by Klotz, is born out by the coldly ironic and yet uncondemning nature of the pronouncements made by The Masked Man concerning the fates of the children. When he tells Melchior that Wendla would have given birth to a normal, healthy child had it not been for the attempted abortion (II, 171) and assures Moritz that his parents would have survived the shame of his not being promoted to the next class (II, 173), he is not placing blame directly on the parents in either case. They too have had to suffer the consequences of their mistaken deeds. Like Brecht, Wedekind saw the society which engendered these tragedies as the sole culprit in a system which makes everyone losers. Also like Brecht, he offers no suggested means to beat this system except to live, even if life means nothing more than basic endurance, on the tenuous hope that things will and must change. It is pertinent to note that this affirmation of life, consistent with Wedekind's desire for impartiality in relation to the question of guilt, comes from a member of the adult world, The Masked Man, at the same time that Moritz is attempting to convince Melchior of the peace found in death. As Wedekind himself realized, the plausibility of this affirmation would have been greatly reduced had he reversed the two roles, would in

fact have bordered on the ridiculous considering Moritz' escape from life through death. The following statement from "Was ich mir dabei dachte" affirms his desire to leave the door to the future part way open: "Es widerstrebte mir, das Stück, ohne Ausblick auf das Leben der Erwachsenen, unter Schulkindern zu schließen. Deshalb führte ich in der letzten Szene den Vermummten Herrn an" (IX, 424). This "Ausblick auf das Leben der Erwachsenen" finds its realization in the "Lulu Plays," which are peopled with adult versions of the children presented in Frühlings Erwachen.

The brief scene between Ilse and Moritz in Frühlings Erwachen (II, 137-141) is a miniature prelude of what is to come in Erdgeist and Die Büchse der Pandora. In these latter works Wedekind offers an epic overview of a world very similar to that which Ilse refers to as "die Priapia," a bacchanalian labyrinth of sex, violence and greed inhabited by strange types from all stations in life. The similarity ends, however, when Ilse invites Moritz to join this communal existence. Caught in what Spalter so succinctly connotes as the conflict of "innocent humanity wedged in between instinct and system,"[79] Moritz begrudgingly yields to the latter. His suicide, an act of youthful impulse, deprives him more than anything else of the chance to come to the eventual realization that the powers behind this system, bourgeois adults, do not follow their own

rules. They are, in fact, the outgrowth of the "Priapia." By refusing Ilse's invitation Moritz has, in Wedekind's cynical view, refused life; in the confrontation between innocent sin (Moritz' suicide) and sinful innocence (Ilse's sexual instinctualism) there is no choice between right and wrong--the choice is that of life or death.[80] Thus, while the system appears to triumph in this instance, it is Ilse, the representative of instinct, who claims the ultimate victory, which is the simple ability to endure.

The action of Erdgeist resumes where this scene ends. Ilse has come of age as Lulu, the embodiment of sexual instinct, and the men around her, fully bereft of the innocence and sense of shame which held Moritz back, can no longer control their own natural desires.[81] The cycle has merely progressed, or better regressed, to adulthood, and the basic outer conflict between instinct and system is extented to a new plane. The irreconcilable nature of this problem is well illustrated in the fact that instinct, which now has the upper hand, produces no better results than did bourgeois convention. Action in the "Lulu Plays" consists of nothing more than the systematic destruction of a series of men who come into contact with Lulu until eventually, at the end of Die Büchse der Pandora, she meets her match in Jack the Ripper and is herself destroyed.[82] Spalter says of Lulu: "She serves as the focus for activity which allows Wedekind once again

to stress the inextricable connections between Eros and Thanatos. Her sexuality is the inevitable prelude to masculine suicide, whether by deadly weapon or sheer physical collapse."[83] Lulu remains the central figure unifying the two dramas, but her function is hardly that of a heroine in any sense of the term. The subtlety of her nature makes her at once both victim and victimizer without actively or even consciously trying to be either. She sums up her own paradox existence in the statement: "Ich habe nie in der Welt etwas anderes scheinen wollen, als wofür man mich genommen hat, und man hat mich nie in der Welt für etwas anderes gehalten, als was ich bin" (III, 95). Sex is her morality, which puts her in direct conflict with the moral values of bourgeois society, while she actually exists apart from that society; in essence she is "beyond good and evil."

The entire structure of the dramatic action surrounding Lulu, whom Klotz would term the "zentrales Ich," is extremely reminiscent of Brecht. Erdgeist is introduced with a tendentious prologue delivered by an animal trainer who, in the manner of a barker, is attempting to entice an audience into his arena.[84] It is obviously Wedekind himself speaking when the trainer attributes the lack of success which his show has faced to the complaisant artificiality of contemporary theater and the corresponding inability of the acting profession to perform anything

more demanding than a common soap opera. Two successive passages from this prologue will serve to illustrate Wedekind's vindictive cynicism:

> Schlecht sind die Zeiten!--All die Herrn und Damen,
> Die einst vor meinem Käfig sich geschart,
> Beehren Possen, Ibsen, Opern, Dramen
> Mit ihrer hochgeschätzten Gegenwart.
> An Futter fehlt es meinen Pensionären,
> So daß sie gegenseitig sich verzehren.
> Wie gut hat's am Theater ein Akteur!
> Des Fleischs auf seine Rippen ist er sicher,
> Sei auch der Hunger ein ganz fürchterlicher
> Und des Kollegen Magen noch so leer.--
> Doch will man Großes in der Kunst erreichen,
> Darf man verdienst nicht mit dem Lohn vergleichen.
>
> Was seht ihr in den Lust- und Trauerspielen?!--
> H a u s t i e r e, die so wohlgesittet fühlen,
> An blasser Pflanzenkost ihr Mütchen kühlen
> Und schwelgen in behaglichem Geplärr,
> Wie jene andern--unten im Paterre:
> Der eine Held kann keinen Schnaps vertragen,
> Der andre zweifelt, ob er richtig liebt,
> Den dritten hört ihr an der Welt verzagen,
> Fünf Akte lang hört ihr ihn sich beklagen,
> Und niemand, der den Gnadenstoß ihm gibt.--
> Das w a h r e Tier, das w i l d e, s c h ö n e Tier,
> Das--meine Damen!--sehn Sie nur bei mir. (III, 8)

Thus it is not only the prologue form and distancing effect produced by this speech which bring Brecht to mind, but the very content and intent of Wedekind's attack.

The action itself, once again characterized above all by the dominant principle of demonstrative example, is also constructed in Brechtian fashion. The repetitive nature of the fates of Lulu's victims in Erdgeist, Dr. Goll, the artist Schwarz and the newspaper magnate Schön, robs the action involved of any element of tense expectation; in each case it is a matter of preconditioned fact. One

is reminded of the similar inevitable tragedies of the three children in Brecht's Mutter Courage. Courage is as much the personification of material possession as is Lulu of sexual instinct; Lulu's body is in essence her "Planwagen." Each is merely the central, unifying figure in a series of separate actions which end in the demise of those near to them as the inadvertent result of their very nature. Neither is in fact the demonstrable cause of these tragedies, and neither learns enough from them to avoid further tragedy. Their lives are as open and aimless as the circular problems which they represent, and each of the separate actions which they unify is nothing more than another station on this course.[85]

The exterior appearance of Erdgeist is thus actually quite deceiving. Action does not progress through the four acts into which it is divided; each act comprises its own action, with its own time, place and climax. Once again Wedekind makes no attempt at exposition, and at times he seems to introduce characters only to get rid of them as soon as possible. Dr. Goll, about whom we learn nothing more than his lascivious desires and protective nature, dies of a heart attack already in the fifth scene of the first act when he finds Lulu and Schwarz together on the sofa in a compromising situation. The "wild beast" was uncaged for only a brief moment, enough to wreak destruction. Schwarz, the dominant male figure time-wise in the first

act, is eliminated in the second when he slits his throat after finding out about Lulu's background from Schön, most of which the audience is also learning for the first time. Two acts, two deaths--the pace of the action increases with the increase of Lulu's freedom. Her part in the first two deaths was more or less passive. Her marriages to Goll and Schön were not her making and their fates were only indirectly her responsibility. The man who made the arrangements, Dr. Schön, now becomes her target and she is literally on the prowl.[86] By the end of the third act she has him where she wants him, but the ultimate kill is saved until the end of the fourth and final act when, in a choice between his life or hers, she fells him with five bullets in the chest.

The serious nature of these actions is constantly put into sharp, estranging contrast by the almost farcial manner in which they are presented. Goll's death is preceded by a wild scene with Schwarz chasing Lulu around the room in a madcap frenzy; Schwarz' death is followed by a conversation which relates Schön's unfortunate concern not for Schwarz, but for the implications the latter's death will have on his own affairs. The entire last act might well be labeled the final anticlimactic farce. Schön, the symbol of bourgeois mentality and power, must face the devastating irony of seeing his house turned into a living "Pripia," or, as Sol Gittleman so aptly terms it,

"a Marx Brother's madhouse."[87] The door to Lulu's cage is now wide open, and human insects have invaded like ants at a picnic. Hiding behind curtains, under tables or wherever possible are Schigolch, Lulu's mysterious father-follower, Rodrigo Quast, a brainless weight lifter, Alfred Hugenberg, a high school student, the Countess Geschwitz, a lesbian, and most important in a prominent position on the couch with Lulu Schön's own son Alwa. All have come to feast on the flesh. What greater revenge could there be for Moritz (Frühlings Erwachen) than to have such a setting for the death of the system personified? The drama even ends on this note, with Hugenberg's paradoxical remark: "Ich werde von der Schule gejagt!" (III, 97).

The implicit contrast of tragedy and travesty in the structure of Erdgeist is brought into even sharper focus by the way Wedekind consistently alienates the stark realism of the surroundings in which the action takes place (Schwarz' studio, his elegant salon, a theater dressing room and Schön's drawing room respectively). Lulu herself functions in this bourgeois atmosphere as a basic, living "Verfremdungseffekt." As Wilhelm Emrich states: "Auffällig an der Lulu-Tragödie ist zunächst die Tatsache, daß hier inmitten einer klar gegliederten und begrenzten modernen gesellschaftlichen Wirklichkeit ein Wesen auftaucht, das in keiner Weise bestimmbar ist: Lulu besitzt keinen Familiennamen, weiß nichts von Vater und Mutter, wird von

jedem Mann anders genannt: Lulu, Mignon, Nelly, Eva. . . .

. . . . . .

Sie scheint also eine unbedingte Sphäre zu repräsentieren, die sich in keine bedingte Realität und begrenzte, menschliche Vorstellungswelt einfangen läßt."[88] Lulu is at once both "real and unfamiliar," and her very presence forces reorientation. Even when she is not there in person, the picture which Schwarz painted of her in Pierrot custume, the significance of which will be discussed below, is ever-present as a unifying intermediate of her powers. It is interesting to note that in the only act where this picture is not present, the third act of Edrgeist, Lulu herself dominates the action and Wedekind resorts to more direct methods of alienation. Nothing could be more Brechtian than the manner in which Wedekind takes advantage of the theatrical setting of this act to discuss the drama which is actually taking place in front of the spectator through his personal mouthpiece, Alwa Schön. Alwa, a dramatist by profession, is asked by Lulu: "Warum schreiben sie Ihre Stücke denn nicht wenigstens so interessant, wie das Leben ist?"; his (Wedekind's) answer: "Weil uns das kein Mensch glauben würde" (III, 64). When Lulu returns to the stage Alwa goes on to say:

> Über die [Lulu] ließe sich freilich ein interessanteres Stück schreiben. . . . Erster Akt: Dr. Goll. Schon faul! Ich kann den Dr. Goll aus dem Fegefeuer zitieren, oder wo er seine Orgien büßt, man wird m i c h für seine Sünden verantwortlich machen. . . . Zweiter Akt: Walter Schwarz. Noch unmöglicher! Wie die Seelen die letzte Hülle abstreifen im Licht solcher

> Blitzschläge!--Dritter Akt?--Sollte es wirklich so fortgehen?! (III, 65).

The question is, of course, rhetorical; Alwa knows as well as the audience to whom this supposed monologue is clearly directed that it will and must continue as long as Lulu is alive.

The victory of instinct over system in Erdgeist, Lulu's dominance over and murder of Schön, proves as impotent as the reverse situation symbolized by the death of Moritz in Frühlings Erwachen. Lulu's active part in the killing of Schön, despite the fact that it was virtually self-defense, has involved her in the real world, with tangible implications. Die Büchse der Pandora finds her not on the prowl, but on the run. She is hunted like a rabid wolf, complete with the pack she had assembled in the last act of Erdgeist. Like wolves they are held together only by the instinct which is centered in their common desires, and they are willing to devour each other at the moment of a first sign of weakness. Lulu must face the ironic truth that the "Priapia" is nothing more than a lower class hell, and not the paradise to which Wedekind had alluded in the previous work.

The prologue and first act of Pandora directly reflect the fact that Wedekind was forced, for one reason or another, to divide his original "Monstretragödie" into two separate dramas.[89] The "Prolog in der Buchhandlung"

is extremely dull and constrained compared to that of Erdgeist, and its full import is clear only if the spectator or reader is familiar with the latter drama and its public history.[90] The same can be said of the first act, which artificially unites the two dramas through a series of brief conversations. This attempted exposition, never Wedekind's forte, is distinctly different from that of the average Aristotelian drama. First of all, it comes at a point which is undeniably the center of one drama and not the actual beginning of another. It is more like an "Integrationspunkt," to use Klotz' term, than an exposition. Wedekind fills us in on what has happened since Schön's death, but this information is little more than confusing without the background of Erdgeist. The plot which he conceived to free Lulu from the jail sentence she received for Schön's murder is reminiscent of Mission Impossible, with an equal number of omissions and inconsistencies.[91] Further, Alwa Schön, to whom the authorship of Erdgeist is now directly attributed, makes comments which function much more as aristic justification than as dramatic exposition. The entire conversation is actually a series of personal narratives directed to the audience and not to one another.[92]

It is significant that Lulu herself does not appear until the final scene of this first act. Her presence is catalytic. Instantly artificial rhetoric is replaced with

dynamism, and the act closes with Lulu seducing Alwa on the very couch where his father had bled to death in the previous scene, the symbolism of which can be understood once again only in the context of Erdgeist. While perishing on this same sofa Schön had uttered to his son the prophetic words: "Du bist der Nächste . . . " (III, 96).

The action of Pandora once again belies the classical appearance of its division into three acts. Unities of time and place are ignored even more than in Erdgeist; the first act takes place in Schön's home in Germany approximately one year after his death, the second and third are separated by an indefinite number of years and are set in Paris and London respectively. Both introduce a variety of new characters, whose function and background become clear only as the action continues. With Schön's death the drama reached its "peripetia," but neither Lulu nor the action fall gracefully from this point. The second act finds the wolves in their den of iniquity. Wedekind does not spare the bourgeois in his genre painting of the underworld. To the original pack of Schigolch, Geschwitz, Rodrigo and Alwa Schön he adds a variety of "upper class villains," including the banker-broker Puntschu, the journalist Heilmann, Marquis Casti-Piani and the society favorites Mageleone and Bianetta Gazil. The action unfolds the following facts: Puntschu has involved the entire group in a fraudulent stock deal which

leaves everyone except himself bankrupt; Heilmann is prepared to use his writing talents to expose the group and thereby create a lucrative sensation; Casti-Piani has dual professions as a police spy and a white slave trader, and is attempting to extort Lulu into accepting a position in an African bordel; Magelone has infected all the males with syphilis and, having lost all her charm and money, concedes to allow her twelve year old daughter to take up where she left off; Bianetta is simply a high class whore out for fun. The "old friends," however, are not to be ignored in this interplay: Rodrigo is threatening to turn Lulu over to the police if she does not give him money, and is subsequently murdered by Schigolch; Geschwitz is made an accomplice to the murder when she makes the ultimate sacrifice of sleeping with Rodrigo in order to set him up for the kill; Alwa has devised a gambling scheme, only to find that the stock he has won from everyone is worthless; Lulu herself devised the plan to get rid of Rodrigo and barely misses a return trip to prison by escaping at the last moment to London. Certainly one cannot speak of the falling of a tightly knit, unified line of dramatic action in this context. The variety and hectic pace of these actions relate directly to the characteriscs of epic theater, and the autonomy of each is well illustrated by the fact that not only certain scenes could be moved or eliminated, but also the entire

act itself could be dropped. Its function is purely empirical, and Wedekind could logically have proceeded to the final act.

Wedekind concludes his drama with open-ended paradox. Lulu, penniless and weary, must totally violate her nature by selling her body, which is her soul and being, on the streets. This act represents not only the sacrifice of what little freedom and innocence she had managed to retain since Schön's death; it also places her directly in the realm of common, vulgar reality.[93] She is no longer "das wahre Tier," a fact which is best illustrated in the final scene with Jack the Ripper. It is she, the living symbol of the irresistable sexual urge, who must beg her murderer to come to bed, even if it meant doing so for free.[94] Lulu's death in the hands of a sex-murderer spares her the degradation of succumbing fully to the powers of the system, but leaves the spectator with a perplexing problem of interpretation. The problematics of the "Lulu Plays" offer in many respects an antithetical presentation of the conflict dealt with in Frühlings Erwachen; the lack of a synthesis stands out clearly in Moritz' view of Ilse as "Dieses Glückskind, dieses Sonnenkind--dieses Freudenmädchen auf meinem Jammerweg!" (II, 141) and Lulu's startlingly contrastive words: "Gibt es etwas Traurigeres auf dieser Welt als ein Freudenmädchen!" (III, 175).

Lulu's death merely illustrates the eternal conflict inherent in the antinomy of two value systems, neither of which is absolute. Emrich explains the results of this conflict in a purely Brechtian context: "Da diese Wertsphäre künstlerisch nicht mehr positiv objektiviert werden kann, sondern nur noch indirekt durch Negation alles Gestalteten geahnt zu werden vermag, verweist sie den Zuschauer zurück auf sich selbst, zwingt ihn, das Unaussagbare selber zu finden, selber zu 'leben.' Die Tragödie springt hinein in den Zuschauerraum, hebt ihre in sich geschlossene ästhetische Seinsweise auf."[95] The impossibility of solving such problems on the stage itself is shown through the fate of Alwa (Wedekind): "Seine Tragödie," quoting Emrich once again, "ist die Tragödie der Tragödie: Er will eine Sphäre bewußt machen, die durch das Bewußtsein aufgehoben wird. Er will etwas künstlerisch zum Verständnis erheben, was durch Verstehen Mißverstehen erzeugt."[96] This problem is the basis of and reason for the existence of the epic theater. It is interesting to note that the only one to understand and accept both value systems is a person who belongs to neither: Geschwitz. As an outsider she is able to see through the illusion which others accept as reality. As she says: "Die Menschen kennen sich nicht--sie wissen nicht, wie sie sind. Nur wer selber kein Mensch ist, der kennt sie" (III, 187).[97] The realization of this

simple truth on the part of the spectator is presumably the ray of unreleased hope which lies at the bottom of Pandora's Box.

Franziska, the final drama to be treated extensively in Wedekind's sex cycle, is an extremely interesting variation of the same basic problem. Whereas Frühlings Erwachen and the "Lulu Plays" merely show the consequences of blind societal principles, Franziska is centered around a girl who wants to learn the rules of the game before it is already lost. She therefore tells her first suitor, whom she has already seduced: "Aber ich möchte doch gerne erfahren, wer ich denn eigentlich bin. Wenn wir uns heute heiraten, dann erfahre ich in den nächsten zehn Jahren nur, wer du bist" (VI, 114). Unlike Lulu and to a certain extent her predecessor Ilse, both of whom are object examples of the collective being "Weib," Franziska desires to be a person.

The action of Franziska is an intended play on that of Geothe's Faust, with a number of specifically Wedekindian twists. First of all he creates a "female Faust" only to turn full circle and have her make a deal whereby she will have two years of supposed freedom and fulfillment--as a man. Veit Kunz, Wedekind's modern Mephisto, is an insurance agent, a bourgeois profession which aligns him with the likes of Schön and Casti-Piani and, for Wedekind, certainly puts him in league with the

devil. The first three acts center on Franziska's (now known as Franz) bizarre Faustian existence. An "Auerbach's Keller" scene in a wild nightclub, which ends in typical Wedekind fashion with a murder, is followed by a grotesque version of the Gretchen story. Franziska is married, as Franz, to a simple girl by the name of Sophie, who commits suicide when she learns from her brother (enter Valentine) that Franz is a woman, a fact which is quite undeniable at this stage since Franziska is pregnant with Kunz' child.[98] The next station finds Franziska and Kunz at the court of the Duke of Rothenburg, apparently Wedekind's equivalent of the Grecian world of Faust II, where both become involved in the domestic problems of the Duke, who is about to lose his kingdom. The stark modernity of this act is culminated in the final scene, where Wedekind directly foreshadows Pirandello by totally destroying the illusion of reality on the stage through the use of a play within a play. The confusion of "Sein und Schein" results, as in Priandello's Sei Personaggi in Cerca d'Autore (Six Characters in Search of an Author), in the actual death of one of the actresses.[99] Her final words are pure, provocative Wedekind: "Wer bedauert mich? Gibt es ein höheres Glück--als auf offener Bühne--vor versammelten Volk--nackt zu sterben!" (VI, 184).

The phantasy world of the first three acts is left in the fourth, and the action literally begins again from

the beginning and runs a separate course. Franziska and Kunz are now married, and what looks like a union of bliss in the first scene, set at the castle where the action began at the outset of the drama, is quickly dissolved. Franziska's contentment with Kunz is abandoned as she becomes involved in an affair with the actor Breitenbach, who is acting with her in a play written by Kunz.[100] The latter, disillusioned with the institution of marriage which he had come to accept as sacred, attempts to commit suicide, but is saved at the last moment in order to witness the perplexing scene with which Wedekind concludes not only this drama, but the entire sex cycle. A number of years have elapsed between the fourth and fifth acts when Breitenbach and Kunz decided to look up Franziska, with whom they have lost contact. What they find is startling to say the least. Franziska, the last of the "Freudenmädchen," has become totally "domesticated." As a mother and soon to be wife she has found peace with the world and with herself.

Wedekind could not have conceived of a more violent, estranging contrast with which to conclude his cycle. It is all but impossible to uncategorically assert what he intended with this final act of Franziska. Certain critics have argued that Wedekind had come to the realization that there was no sense fighting a useless battle and that Franziska's final contentment is symbolic

of his resignation to the system. Others view it as an intended mockery of that same system. Perhaps the best explanation, however, comes in the final words of the drama itself. Wedekind has come full circle to return to his point of departure in Frühlings Erwachen. He ends his cycle with the hope of better things to come for the children of the future when he says of Franziska's child:

> In der mag ein Befreier wiederkehren. Gedeihen wirst du, denn du bist geliebt! (VI, 217)

This apparent conclusion is thus nothing more than the departure point for the repetition of the cycle with the addition of one new element--the hope for change.

It is pertinent at this point, before proceeding to the second group of dramas, to merely list those additional works which thematically and structurally relate to the sex cycle: Elins Erweckung (1886), Fritz Schwigerling: Der Liebestrank (1891/92), the four pantomimes Die Flöhe, oder Der Schmerzentanz, Der Mückenprinz, Die Kaiserin von Neufundland and Bethel, all of which appeared in 1897, Das Sonnenspektrum (1894), Totentanz later renamed Tod und Teufel (1905), Musik (1906) and Schloß Wetterstein (1910). Each of these works could appear as a separate chapter in Wedekind's "novel" on sexual development. They are integrated not only by their relationship to the greater problem with which they deal, but also through various threads of unity

such as the reintroduction of characters, parallel situations and hidden links of contrast.

The second set of dramas was selected not only because of the shift of emphasis from the "homo sexualis" to the "homo economicus," but also to illustrate Wedekind's use of epic techniques in an essentially Aristotelian framework. The free expanse of time and space which was found in the dramas of the sex cycle is lacking here; each of the present works takes place over a very limited period of time, with little or no change of location. The estranging phantasy which had progressively become more functionally apparent in the former works has been tempered here to an occasional grotesque or comical scene, and on the whole stark realism prevails throughout. The number of characters introduced has been drastically reduced (Die Zensur has only four, Der Kammersänger eight), and in many cases the role of minor characters is purely functional, without direct bearing on the action or the central figures. The total amount of action itself has been comparatively lessened and it is far more concentrated. Despite these factors, however, it is still possible to show a definite underlying relationship between these works and the epic theater.

Der Schnellmaler oder Kunst und Mammon, Wedekind's first complete drama and consequently one of his weakest, will be treated only briefly. The purpose of including it

is twofold: it introduces the central problem dealt with in the works of this group ("Kunst und Mammon") and it illustrates the earliest manifestation of epic tendencies in Wedekind's most outwardly Aristotelian work. The problem of the outsider, and the artist-aesthete in particular, attempting to relate to and find a place in a society whose religion is economics was unfortunately all too real for Wedekind. It was a conflict which he was never able to solve either in his dramas or in real life, and it is not surprising to find that the light comedy of Der Schnellmaler is totally lacking in the bitter irony and self-caricature of Der Kammersänger and Die Zensur. Thomas Mann, whose success aided him in becoming an "insider," still felt that he was different in some way from the remainder of society; Wedekind's consistent failures and open strife made him know he was different.

The first factor which separates Der Schnellmaler from traditional drama is the relationship of the adversaries. Fridolin Wald, a striving young artist, and Dr. Steiner, a wheeler-dealer extortionist, are not really locked in a protagonist-antagonist dual over the hand of Johanna, daughter of rich businessman Pankratius Knapp. Each is actually fighting the system, Fridolin on the side of art, Steiner as the representative of mammon. Fridolin wins, but only because Steiner is exposed as a fraud and even more so because one of Fridolin's paintings

has been a success and art has therefore become lucrative. He sells his painting and, as Spalter puts it: "The moment he does so, he is quick to exploit the power of materialistic success; aesthetic idealism goes right out the window. Shrewdly, he knows that the girl he wants can no longer be kept from him by a family whose values are entirely materialistic."[101] Wedekind's conclusion is thus facetious, since the fusion of art and money does not actually solve the individual conflict.

The action of Der Schnellmaler is very similar to the comedy of Raimund and Nestroy, whose works are full of elements later employed by Brecht for their distancing effect. Wedekind frequently has the characters, especially Steiner, speak directly to the audience in asides. Dramatic irony, inherently "verfremdend," is used effectively in a scene which has both Fridolin and Johanna pathetically waiting to die after taking what the audience knows to be simple sugar water and not poison. The combination of serious intent in Fridolin's desire to die rather than give up his art and the humorous way he arranges his wake only to find out that he is free of the necessity to die could presumably have been the model for the scene where Jussup conveniently pops up from his deathbed in Brecht's Kreidekreis. A number of scenes, such as the one where Steiner is teaching Johanna how to write poetry by counting her fingers to make "feet" and

another which pictures Fridolin burning with jealousy as Steiner flirts with Johanna while he is painting a picture to the constantly changing beat of a piano, are inserted purely for their comic effect and have little to do with the basic action, which they halt rather than move forward.

One could argue that all of these techniques are merely inherent to the fact that Der Schnellmaler is and was intended to be a comedy, and that Wedekind was therefore totally unaware of the relationship being contended here. While this may be true at this stage of his development, it does not negate the future implications, nor does it alter the fact that comedy does have the same tension breaking function as Brecht's techniques of estrangement. It could be presumed, in fact, that Wedekind learned from his own drama the same art of attention-getting which Brecht learned only years later from the films made by Charlie Chaplin. It has already been amply illustrated above, for example, that Wedekind consciously employed many of these same techniques to release the tension of the action of Frühlings Erwachen, a serious tragedy written only two years after Der Schnellmaler.

The lighthearted, superficial treatment of the artist-society conflict in Der Schnellmacher tends to overshadow the underlying sardonic tone, and the specious conclusion gives the drama at least the appearance of closed unity. The next drama to be discussed, Der

Kammersänger, clearly imparts the full import of this seemingly irreconcilable conflict as well as Wedekind's cynical, anti-idealistic approach to it. Der Kammersänger might well be termed a one act drama of epic proportion; few authors have concentrated such a wealth of powerful and complex action into such a small work. As one would expect in a one act drama, the expanse of time and space is extremely limited. The entire drama takes place in one hotel room within a span of time which would best be measured in minutes, confining limitations for the resolution of the fates of three separate individuals. Tension is totally replaced by a matter-of-fact complacency which gives the action the appearance of static dynamism. There is, in fact, no line of action as such, but rather a series of scenes which unfold the nature of the central figure, the royal court tenor Gerardo.

In "Was ich mir dabei dachte" Wedekind characterizes Gerardo as "eine durch den Erfolg aufgeblasene Philisterseele, die sich des Erfolges wegen für einen Künstler hält und von allen Erfolgsanbetern dafür gehalten wird. Nicht ein großer Mensch, wie er selber zu sein glaubt, sondern eine Mücke in fünftausendfacher Vergrößerung" (IX, 428-429). He is personified ego, a descendant of the cold realism of Melchior, Schön and Casti-Piani. Three people come to seek salvation from their public god, and all three are dismissed. The first, Miss [sic.] Coeurne,

is an "opera star groupie," a teenager who feels she is in love with her hero and is willing to sacrifice everything to serve his desires. She is spared a regretable existence when Gerardo sends her on her way with a warning that others may be more willing to take advantage of such a provocative situation. Even the apparent kindness of this act, however, is based on selfish motives. He tells her flatly: "Rechnen Sie einfach mit meiner Z e i t! . . . Wenn nun jedes . . . Mädchen dieselben Ansprüche stellen wollte wie Sie?--Was in aller Welt würde dann aus meinem Gesang?--Was würde aus meiner Stimme?--Wohin käme ich denn mit meiner Kunst?" (III, 210). The next, the unsuccessful composer Dühring, does not get off so lightly. As a lover of pure art he wishes to gain Gerardo's backing for an opera which represents his life's work and which he feels is a great contribution. Instead of support he is given a lecture on the hard realities of the economics of the aesthetic world ("Wir Künstler sind ein L u x u s a r t i k e l der Bourgeoisie, zu dessen Bezahlung man sich gegenseitig überbietet." [III, 244]), and finally departs crushed when Gerardo offers him money just to get rid of him. The final visitor does not depart; she is left in a chair with a bullet in the head when Gerardo rushes off to meet the train that will take him to his all-important next engagement. Helene Marowa, wife, mother and lady of society, had come to beg Gerardo, with whom she had had a steady affair, to

marry her. He must refuse her on the simple basis of the fact that his contract does not allow him to travel with ladies or to marry. She remarks dumfounded: "Ich begreife nicht, wie ein--anständiger Mensch einen solchen Kontrakt unterschreiben kann"; his simple answer: "Ich bin in erster Linie Künstler, und dann bin ich Mensch!" (III, 230). He attempts to convince her of the fullness of her life and the responsibilities she has toward her family and has apparently succeeded until he makes the false move of asking for one last kiss. She has reached her limit, and when she gets up to leave she calmly takes out a revolver and shoots herself.

Quite obviously this action does not fall into the category of linear totality. Each of these visitors represents a separate dramatic situation, and each enters and departs without introduction or further reference. They are merely three examples from hundreds of similar events in Gerardo's life. Following Helene's death the hotel manager placidly remarks: "Beunruhigen Sie sich nicht, Herr Kammersänger. So was kommt öfters bei uns vor" (III, 240). Neither the action nor the characters, except for the potential hope for Miss Coeurne, develop, and there is nothing which resembles a solution to the problem itself. Dramatic intensity is the sole guide to the placement of scenes; as far as the events themselves are concerned they could come at any place, be left out, or increased with further examples.

The scene with Dühring is one of Wedekind's most potent and cynical presentations of the two sides of his own artistic career, as well as a reflection of his unsuccessful battle (Dühring) with Hauptmann (Gerardo).[102] The length of the individual comments frequently puts them much more in the category of programmatic narrative than actual dialogue. One of Dühring's extended harangues, however, is masterfully interrupted with the following stage direction:

> GERARDO hat sich schließlich an den Kamin gelehnt und scheint, während er mit der Rechten auf der Mamorplatte trommelt, etwas hinter dem Paravent zu bemerken. Nachdem er sich neugierig orientiert, reckt er plötzlich die Hand aus und zieht eine Klavierlehrerin in grauer Toilette hervor, die er, mit vorgestreckter Faust am Kragen haltend, vor dem Flügel durch zur Mitteltür führt. Nachdem er die Tür hinter ihr geschlossen, zu Dühring 'Bitte, sprechen Sie ruhig weiter!' (III, 216).

Seldom has a "Verfremdungseffekt" been more timely employed. This one simple action serves multifold purposes; it breaks Dührings speech, which had become overly serious and almost boring, lends a comic effect to the entire scene, and clearly demonstrates the fact that Gerardo wasn't even listening to what he had to say. Equally Brechtian but somewhat more subtle are the frequent repetitions of situations and phrases, as for example when Gerardo tells Helene that he could not have turned her away originally because it would have hurt his image as a romantic figure, despite the fact that he had just refused Miss Coeurne on similar

grounds. His entire conversation with Helene is actually a contrastive repeat of the scene with Miss Coeurne, only from a different standpoint.

Gerardo survives the conflict between art and society because his life is his profession, his dubious pleasure is his work. His successor, Keith, survives because he makes all work a form of pleasure, he makes living well his profession. Both have the necessary elasticity to snap back from disaster because of their egocentric attachment to life, even if this means nothing more than a hellish existence.

Wedekind himself summarized the basic content of Der Marquis von Keith as: "Das Wechselspiel zwischen einem Don Quichotte des Lebensgenusses (Keith) und einem Don Quichotte der Moral (Scholz)" (IX, 429). While this sufficiently describes the juxtaposition of these two contrasting figures, representative once again of two sides of the author himself, it hardly does justice to the entire scope of this work. While Keith emerges immediately as the definite protagonist for the ensuing action, Scholz could by no means be considered the antagonist. His role is essentially that of a passive alter ego to Keith, and action involves him only indirectly through its final implications. The actual antagonist is bourgeois society, primarily as embodied in the figure of Consul Casimir. Keith's cynical realism and gift for

manipulation of both money and people are matched step for step by Casimir, who is eventually able to gain the upper hand from his position as an insider in the system. Keith climbs to the top of the economic ladder only to find that Casimir has cut off the steps behind him, and when he falls he is all alone. The fall, however, does not break him. He has been up and down before; his final words in the drama: "Das Leben ist eine Rutschbahn . . ." (IV, 98).

Der Marquis von Keith is one of Wedekind's few dramas which has a definite plot, a line of action which runs forward throughout the work. Keith has devised a fanciful, adventurous scheme to build an entertainment center, his "Feenpalast." As usual his entire plan is based purely on speculation, and the action basically revolves around his attempt to get the monetary and social backing of the three main "caryatids" of the Munich economy, and finally of the one man who will insure the cooperation of the others, Casimir. This plot, however, merely serves to introduce a number of subplots which illustrate contrasting examples of the outsider-insider conflict in bourgeois society. The individual actions and reactions are of more importance than the underlying basis of the action itself. The central contrasts are of course those between Keith and Scholz, and between Keith and Casimir. The next outstanding set is the

polarity of Molly Griesinger and Anna, Countess of Werdenfels. The former is a simple girl who has stayed at Keith's side through thick and thin and loves him for himself; the latter, a divorcee, is having a combined sex and business affair with Keith, and is using him while he is abusing her. Anna has learned the harsh rules of the game and ends up engaged to Casimir when she sees that Keith has lost out and is no longer necessary; Molly retains her simplicity and finally commits suicide when she thinks that Keith has won and that she is therefore not necessary. Further, there are the individual and collective contrasts among the various members of Keith's collection of parasitic artists, most of whom hardly reach the class of a respectable dilettante, and the members of high society who are supposed to lend legitimacy to Keith's project. Finally, the last act powerfully illustrates Keith's basic antipathy to everyone else as the epitomy of an outsider. The "Tatmensch" who showed everyone else the way must literally crawl at the feet of those over whom he had felt superior.[103]

Contrast is also the basic structural principle in the presentation of the action. The hectic pace of certain action packed scenes is alternated with others, primarily between Scholz and Keith, which slow almost to a static narrative. Hermann Casimir, a pompous little creep and a worshiper of Keith to his father's chagrin,

weaves in and out of the action adding a comic effect through his over-seriousness. Keith's artists also lend comedy in their realistic impossibility, and they generally appear following a conversation of a serious nature. Scholz himself is pathetically humorous at times, and serves even in this function as a contrast to Keith. Keith's own speeches also contain a great deal of repetitive contrast depending on his conversation partner, and, as was true with Gerardo, he is quite ready to use the same basic argument for different purposes.[104]

The final drama, Die Zensur, encompasses only three scenes in one act. The only action as such comes in the final scene when Kadidja, mistress of the author Burdian, realizes that her lover has tired of her and she commits suicide by jumping from his balcony. The remainder of the work consists of conversations between Burdian and Kadidja in the first and third scenes and between Burdian and the private secretary of the Emperor, Dr. Cajetan Prantl, in the second. Wedekind has literally gone to the case study method of psychology, and it is now obviously himself who is being examined. The audience cannot help but come to the distancing realization that Burdian, the figurative author of Die Büchse der Pandora, is a poorly disguised Wedekind. Burdian argues with Prantl over the artistic and moral values presented in Pandora from a purely Wedekindian standpoint, and is extremely convincing until

Kadidja enters. She is wearing a new costume which is extremely revealing, which seems ample proof to Prantl that everything Burdian had said was facetious and that the author is just as debauched in his personal life as he appears in his dramas. Burdian, despite the fact that he has never been anything but constructive in his works, is concerned with the fact that he may never be understood and accepted in society, and sees Kadidja as the nearest scapegoat. He feels that if he can get away from her for a short period of time he might be able to work things out in his mind. She sees his more basic motives, however, and takes her life on the basis of her better instincts.

Die Zensur is in essence not an epic drama, and, despite the fact that the outline above shows certain epic elements, the point will not be debated on that basis. Die Zensur is included here primarily because it defends the novel ideas which Wedekind presented in his works and the methods and actions which he used to illustrate these ideas or problems. Essentially this work defends those very factors which have been shown above to relate Wedekind to the epic theater. One sentence will serve to justify the relationship between this work and the ideas of Bertolt Brecht:

> In keiner meiner Arbeiten habe ich das Gute als schlecht oder das Schlechte als gut hingestellt. Ich habe die Folgen, die dem Menschen aus seinen Handlungen erwachsen, nirgends gefälscht. Ich habe diese Folgen überall immer nur in ihrer unerbittlichen Notwendigkeit zur Anschauung gebracht (V, 125).

Wedekind stood on this truth throughout his life; he was never sure if he was ever heard or understood.

Other works which belong thematically to this group are Die Junge Welt, later renamed Kinder und Narren, (1889), So ist das Leben (König Nicolo) (1901), Hidalla, oder Karl Hetmann, der Zwergriese (1903-04), Oaha, Die Satire der Satire (1908) and to a certain extent his two works based on classical sources, Simson (1913) and Herakles (1917).

The next chapter, Composition, will expand on and fill in many of the aspects presented here in very summary form. The purpose of illustrating the basic relationship of the above dramas to the characteristics of action in the epic theater has been accomplished. This material will now serve as an outline basis of reference for the ensuing examination of the more specific topic areas.

CHAPTER III

COMPOSITION

> Ich begann zu schreiben ohne irgendeinen Plan, mit der Absicht zu schreiben, was mir Vergnügen macht.[105]
> Wedekind on Frühlings Erwachen

The basic principle of composition in the Aristotelian theater was shown above to be division; the dramatist begins with a unified whole, which is then divided and subdivided into acts and scenes. The end result of this process is the total subservience of each of the parts to the greater whole. As Staiger says: "Kein einziger Teil ist sich selber oder dem Leser genung. Er bedarf der Ergänzung. Der folgende Teil genügt wieder nicht, er wirft eine neue Frage auf oder fordert ein neues Supplement. Erst am Schluß steht nichts mehr aus und wird die Ungeduld befriedigt."[106] Everything is geared toward the all-important conclusion, and the action itself is more a factor of forward motion than of singular events. Further, the symmetrical geometric figure described by the line of action is, as Klotz points out, bilateral; "das Wichtigste steht auf kleinstem Raum in der Mitte."[107]

The dramatist of the epic theater, on the other hand, adds. The scene, whose importance in the Aristotelian

drama is minimal and segmented in relation to the entire line of events, becomes the basic unit of meaning and function in the epic. Each scene represents an individual chord-like example of a greater circular problem which, because of its breadth and scope, cannot be artificially limited to a single unified line of action. Within the scenes repetition and variation take the place of pure forward progression, and frequently the relationship of the scenes to each other is less than their meaning to the outer problem. Attention is therefore focused on the action itself rather than its motion, since the epic dramatist is out to demonstrate and not to "reach" a point.

The great majority of Wedekind's dramas are patterned to a certain extent after the basic model which he established in Frühlings Erwachen. Frequently compared with respect to composition to the works of Lenz and Büchner, even this early drama exhibits a very well developed episodic technique. It is clear from the epigrammatic quote which introduces this chapter that Wedekind proceeded from the bottom up; he had no preimposed points of departure and destination, he had nothing to divide. The entire drama consists of nothing more than a series of episodes from Wedekind's own past, episodes which are added together in such a fashion that their individual import is

relavant to but not lost in the meaning of the total picture.

As has been mentioned above Frühlings Erwachen, as with most of Wedekind's dramas, has no apparent exposition. It is only after the drama is well under way that the spectator realizes in retrospect that the essential conflict is set in the very first scene. In a brief and seemingly unimportant conversation concerning the length of a dress, Wendla Bergmann and her mother demonstrate the basic generation and communication gaps which will later have such devastating consequences. Wendla's inadvertent comment that she may not be alive when the other children grow up hardly seems portentous at this point, and it is impossible to surmise that Mrs. Bergmann's motherly concern will eventually make her an accomplice to what is in essence the double murder of her daughter and unborn grandchild. This harmless introduction to the central conflict between youthful impulse and adult repression is not, however, the only function of this apparently isolated scene. Wedekind's use of heightened repetition becomes clear when this same basic scene is repeated in the second and fifth scenes of the second act. Mrs. Bergmann's prudish approach to her daughter's maturation becomes more serious when the topic of conversation turns from dresses to making babies, both of which she discusses from the same ignorant standpoint. Her inability to tell

Wendla the truth about reproduction in the second conversation leads to the unfortunate circumstance that Wendla, despite the fact that she is fully pregnant, still does not know what it is all about in the third. Further, Mrs. Bergmann serves throughout as an implicit vehicle of unifying contrast with respect to her ideas on the raising of children as exhibited in her own comments, as well as in those of Wendla. The most obvious antithesis is Mrs. Gabor, whose enlightened treatment of Melchior puts her in a class by herself in Wedekind's world of bourgeois boors. In addition, there are the implied contrasts with parents who are met only through their children, as for example Martha, who receives frequent beatings and Ilse, whose parents' lack of concern is certainly comparable to Mrs. Bergmann's over-concern. Finally, there is the central contrast between her childish approach to sex as compared to the adult manner in which the children discuss the same topics.

The deceiving importance of this first scene thus becomes clear through the various threads which link it to the remainder of the work. Wedekind develops his drama almost totally from within and, as Spalter points out, the spectator " . . . can pick up a great deal merely by the way scenes alternate. Thus, Wedekind concludes one episode with the smug know-nothingness of petty professors and begins another with a chance meeting between Melchior

and Wendla in the course of which these two young people reveal a complexity unsurmised by their elders; indicates in one scene that adolescents are all too aware how obsessed with sex the adult world is, and in the next scene shows how adamantly sex information is denied those on the threshold of adulthood; proceeds to comment on Mrs. Bergmann's puritanism with a scene of histrionic onamism; footnotes a scene in which Melchior seduces Wendla with a scene in which the former's mother cautions Moritz against impulsive behavior that will not stand to his credit later."[108] Spalter could, however, have gone both further and deeper. His outline does not include, for instance, the masterful placement of the teachers' conference scene, the most humorous and sardonic in the entire drama, between the scenes which depict Moritz' final mental depravation and his funeral. Nor does it mention the contrasts contained in the scenes themselves, such as the funeral scene just mentioned, which first shows the callous, selfish attitude of the adults before ending with a tender and sensitive note as two of the children, Martha and Ilse, vow to keep Moritz' memory alive with flowers. And between these two Wedekind places yet another contrastive element when one of the boys, Otto, remembers that Moritz has gotten out of a five Mark bet, because his suicide proves that he could not make the grade.

Frühlings Erwachen consists of nineteen scenes, none of which begins where the previous scene ended. In fact only four of these scenes, the first scene of the drama and the second scene of the second act, both of which take place in the Bergmann living room, and the second and seventh scenes of the third act, both in the graveyard, have the same setting. The lack of a smooth transition between scenes is well illustrated in the jump from the first to the second scene. Not only are we introduced to a new set of characters in a different setting but, as Klotz also points out,[109] the scene begins on a note of irrelevance with Melchior's blank remark: "Das ist mir zu langweilig. Ich mache nicht mehr mit" (II, 99). The conversation then proceeds nonchalantly from this point without any reference to the first scene, to the game or whatever it was that just ended when Melchior quit and with no hint as to the importance or background of the group of boys who are now before us. The third scene then repeats this same break, only this time we are introduced to a group of girls, one of whom is Wendla, who serves as a link to the first scene by her presence and whose mention of Melchior shows the first tie among the three.

The introduction of the three central figures in a group situation serves two purposes. First of all it allows Wedekind to introduce characters whose individual appearances later are linked by these brief encounters to

the fates of the three main characters. Secondly, the unobtrusive manner in which the main characters eventually emerge from their peers lends them realistic validity as children among children. None of the three is weird or an outcast whose tragedy stems from the fact that they did not fit in the normal pattern of youth. Wedekind does not allow the parents such a nice excuse. Melchior, Moritz and Wendla do not stand out as anything other than the children of their respective parents, and their normalcy is not negated by their inherent differences of personality.

The division of Frühlings Erwachen into three acts is purely mechanical, and has little in common with the pyramidal structure of the classical drama. There is literally no traditional exposition. The characters and actions develop themselves from within, and new characters are introduced throughout bringing new strands of action. Each scene contains its own unity, and the greater unity comes not from the progression through the acts, but from the relation of the scenes to the outer problem. The acts actually function more as sum totals of the implications of the various strands of action than as divisional units. Not only is there no central climax in the middle of the drama, but it would be difficult to ascertain what might even be considered a true climax or turning point. Nor is there a cathartic conclusion at the end. Two of the

main characters, whose importance is essentially equal, have already died meaningless deaths, and the third has nothing more at the end than mere existence.[110]

As Klotz states, the proximity and natural relationship between the elements of dramatic action and composition is extremely close. Both are the inherent result of Wedekind's choice of the broad problem of sexual repression as the basis of action in Frühlings Erwachen, and once this problem was established most questions concerning the relationship between action and its final compositional form take on the rhetorical validity of the chicken and the egg. The majority of what has been said above in the first chapter concerning the autonomy of the scenes, the lack of a unified line of action, the various methods by which the action is held together, the lack of a specific conclusion, etc., is all information which pertains to both elements, and it is therefore not necessary to repeat it here. Suffice it to say that Frühlings Erwachen has been shown to exhibit every one of the characteristics of compositional technique found in the dramas of the epic theater.[111]

While Frühlings Erwachen serves as the underlying pattern for most of the dramas which followed, Wedekind does make certain interesting and pertinent alterations. Following the order used in the first chapter, Erdgeist exhibits a number of basic differences in composition. The scenes, first of all, take on the traditional form

of "Auftritte," beginning and ending with the entrance or departure of one of the characters. This technique is facilitated by the fact that each act has a single setting. Despite the fact that this limitation does not prevent Wedekind from introducing new characters at random or from filling a large volume of scenes (nine in the first act, seven in the second, ten in the third, eight in the fourth) with a variety of individual, dynamic actions, it does place the scene in a somewhat subservient role with respect to the act. The acts, however, also take on a new function. Unlike the classical line of action which builds throughout the acts, Wedekind starts a new action in each act which is expanded within the act itself. Lulu destroys Goll and conquers Schwarz in the first act, destroys Schwarz in the second, conquers and then destroys Schön in the third and fourth. The contrastive singularity of these separate and singular tragedies is overshadowed by the basic element of repetition. The acts, in essence, take over the basic function of the scene in Wedekind's compositional breakdown; each act is an autonomous episode in the saga of Lulu.[112]

The total artificiality of this type of scenic division, well illustrated by a scene in the fourth act which consists of nothing more than Geschwitz poking her head through a door and then disappearing after saying to herself: "O Gott, da ist jemand . . . " (III, 82), is

totally departed in Die Büchse der Pandora, which has no individual breakdown into scenes whatsoever. It is not, however, difficult to presume where the divisions would be placed, and the fact that they are not specifically marked does not alter the basic form of composition. The acts still function as superimposed scenes, and Wedekind could have conveniently concluded the action with either of the escape scenes which come at the end of the first two acts. Certain differences are, on the other hand, detectable. The second act introduces a number of action strands in the persons of Casti-Piani, Puntschu, etc., which are left incomplete and come much closer to the type of autonomous actions presented in the scenes of Frühlings Erwachen. Similary, each of Lulu's clients in the third act has a primarily episodic function. Each enters and exits without introduction or follow-up, and the action contained in each visit is separate and certainly singular. Despite the fact that Lulu's fall is inevitable at this stage, Wedekind avoids the final tragedy through the employment of this series of retarding moments which, unlike the single ray of hope or change evident in such scenes in the classical drama, merely give Wedekind the opportunity to show one more set of human parasites. The action itself actually builds at this point rather than falling off. The first customer, a pathetic mute by the name of Hunidei, is harmlessly comical and grotesque in

his speechless gesticulation. The second, Kungu Poti, heir to the throne of Uahubee, becomes violent when Lulu asks to see his money in advance, and takes out his wrath by killing Alwa, after which time he departs without ever reaching the bedroom. The third, the academician Dr. Hilti, who has come to Lulu to learn what his life as a student had not permitted him either time-wise or monetarily, stands as a comic and helpless creature between the previous violent scene with Kungu Poti and the concluding scene with Jack. Wedekind could clearly have constructed a meaningful and intense drama from the action presented in this act alone, and the jagged contours and independent variety presented in these repetitive visits or scenes are certainly comparable to those of Brecht and the other authors of his tradition.

As was mentioned above, Wedekind was forced to divide his original composition into two separate dramas. While this division was shown to account for a number of the weaker points in the structure, it does not negate the fact that even the original drama was decidedly and consciously asymmetrical. The potential turning point, Lulu's murder of Schön, would have come approximately in the middle, but the basic passivity of Lulu's role in the action to this point and the autonomy of the separate fates of Goll, Schwarz and Schön still belie a true bilateral division. Further, it must be stressed that

Lulu's position as the "zentrales Ich" is primarily a function of unification, and Wedekind is as much interested in the various actions and individuals who revolve around her as in Lulu herself. With few exceptions, Lulu's actions are expended in her role as an innocent catalyst for the actions and reactions of others. Finally, the inconsistent length, import and function of the various scenes is as much evident in the original as in the final versions.

Franziska exhibits another technique of compositional subdivision, one which illustrates not only Wedekind's reliance on the basic functional unit of the scene, but also his totally inconsistent and mechanical use of the act. The lack of a set pattern of division is clear from the outset. The first act consists of two "Bilder," the first of which is further divided into three scenes, which apparently function once again as "Auftritte," while the second introduces characters and separate conversations with no internal divisions whatsoever. The gap between the two "Bilder" or tableaux, which are separated by an indefinite period of time and totally different setting (from a common living room to a wild Berlin nightclub), is accentuated by the fact that the second breaks in on the middle of two conversations, neither of which has anything to do with anything. The spectator is merely thrown into the middle of this new

situation and is left on his own until the entrance of Kunz and Franziska, whose manly transformation is immediately startling. The gap is widened even further by the fact that the prose dialogue of the first act has been replaced by rhymed verse, and the poet Laurus Bein, estrangingly introduced by an invisible chorus, intensifies the use of verse in his poetic monologues and the balladesque songs which he and Kunz inadvertently insert. The direct line from Wedekind to Brecht was seldom more evident than in this tumultuously vivid scene.[113]

Quite obviously the only factor which necessitates the placement of these tableau-scenes in one act is the question of length as a function of time; the first simply does not last long enough to require a pause for the spectator, so Wedekind adds another segment to it purely for the sake of a theatrical production. The abrupt transition between the two and the total autonomy of each certainly rules out the possibility that they were divided from a previously constructed whole characterized by a single, unified line of action.

The "Bild"-tableau divisions are thus equal to what has been shown above to be the essential function of the scene in Frühlings Erwachen and the acts in the "Lulu Plays." The seven remaining tableaux are unequally spread throughout the last four acts, a fact which stresses their autonomical function within the larger act designations.

The fourth act, like the first, contains two such tableaux scenes, neither of which has further internal divisions. The first shows Kunz and Franziska alone in a brief scene of promising bliss; the second finds Franziska in a similar state of passion, but now her partner is Breitenbach, who appears for the first time in the drama. The scene then proceeds to show the total destruction of the marriage which had seemed so promising only moments, but now years, before. The second and fifth acts in turn contain only one such tableau each. The former is entirely devoted to Wedekind's genre painting of the grotesque and unhappy marriage of Franz(iska) and Sophie, the latter depicts Franziska in her setting of idyllic domestication, and serves somewhat as a last refuge for the various strands of action. Each exhibits the same basic characteristics of autonomy (and especially the second) and lack of immediate relevance as were illustrated above with the first two tableaux. The third (second act), however, continues in verse while the final act combines its realistic setting and action with the corresponding use of the normal prose idiom, which is also used throughout the fourth act and in the majority of the third. The third act itself, finally, consists of three tableaux which differ slightly from the others. While each has its own setting, the time span is quite progressive through the three, and the jumps between each are attenuated by

the fact that characters and themes are for the most part common to each of them.

The chaotic appearance of the composition of Franziska is due primarily to Wedekind's concentration on stations of action rather than linear progression. It is once again only in retrospect that the spectator realizes that the autonomous events presented actually trace the circular rotation of Franziska's life, from her total repungance toward marriage in the first scene to its full acceptance in the last. The hell of bourgeois marriage becomes essentially her promise of a heaven on earth. The circular problem quite naturally runs an equally circular course.

Der Schnellmaler oder Kunst und Mammon departs very little from the basic compositional principles of the traditional three-act drama. Its relationship to the epic theater, as was mentioned in the first chapter, is not a factor of its essential structure, and it is therefore not necessary to include it here. The same can be said of Wedekind's "Schwank," Fritz Schwigerling: Der Liebestrank, and each of his four pantomimes, all of which adhere quite closely to the principles of division and symmetrical proportion in their respective composition. And despite the stark modernity of language and existential conflict, this is also true of the basic composition of Der Marquis von Keith.[114] There is a definite line of action which is

followed from beginning to end, and the climax and turning point lie in the third act, with the party celebrating the opening of the "Feenpalast" and Keith's first mistake, the forgery of the telegram of congratulations in Casimir's name. The unities of time and place are followed quite closely, and it is fully clear that Keith, in his function of a picaresque, Krull-like non-hero, is the main character. Action does not revolve around him, as was the case with Lulu, it is developed along with him. The subservience of the action to its outer division is accentuated by the fact that there are no demarcations for scenes. The subplots which develop clearly have their own validity with respect to their function as examples of the outsider-insider conflict, but this validity is relative to the figure of Keith. Even the final scene between Scholz and Keith, singled out by Thomas Mann for its powerful modernity and contrast, functions as an element of traditional composition, since Scholz' refusal to give Keith the resources which would have allowed the latter to retain control of his enterprise releases the final retarding possibility which might have saved Keith from the ensuing catastrophe.

Der Kammersänger, on the other hand, returns to the techniques of epic composition and excellently illustrates the point made above concerning the relationship between the acts and scenes of Erdgeist. Each drama

depicts the singular fates of three specific individuals, but Erdgeist places these individual actions in act units, whereas Der Kammersänger inserts them in three scenes of a drama which consists of only one act. The autonomy of these events in the latter drama is, however, more pronounced. Goll, Schwarz and Schön are all introduced to the audience within the first two scenes of the drama, and their initial contact is linked to previous mutual associations. Miss Coeurne, Dühring and Helene Marowa, on the other hand, have not met each other and do not meet in the drama, and only the latter has had any previous contact with Gerardo. The lack of expositional commentary to introduce these figures is equally true with respect to Gerardo himself; the entire drama, in fact, functions primarily as a continued exposition of Gerardo's character.

The autonomy of the scenes in Der Kammersänger is further illustrated by the fact that Gerardo makes no direct reference to any of the events from one scene in any other scene. The elements of contrast and repetition are purely implicit, and the spectator must find the threads of unity himself. In addition, the remaining seven scenes merely serve to ironically point out the fact that Gerardo, who is "not in" for any visitors, is never left alone to practice for his next engagement. All of these factors finally add up to the sum total of

Gerardo, K. K. Kammersänger, and nothing else, for, as he readily would admit, there is nothing else.

Die Zensur, the final drama treated above, stands in a class alone. It is totally clear from the content of the drama that Wedekind wrote it primarily for the purpose of defending his ideas on stage. His principles of composition are therefore geared to this purpose. The artificial action, or better lack of action, between Buridan and Kadidja in the first and third scenes is introduced primarily to give Wedekind a frame of dramatic meaning in which to introduce the all-important center scene between Buridan and Prantl. As a result of this over emphasis on his own pronouncements, Wedekind does not sufficiently develop the motivation for such a serious conclusion, with Kadidja's suicide. The entire work is extremely weak, and its composition is hardly comparable to that of either the Aristotelian or the epic drama. Wedekind totally departs from his normal principle of demonstration of a general problem for the sake of almost pure discussion of a personal conflict, and the spectator quickly reaches the unfortunate realization that the author is merely talking to and with himself.[115]

Three additional dramas merit special comment with respect to certain unique elements of composition. Das Sonnenspektrum, termed by Wedekind "Ein Idyll aus dem modernen Leben," contains no act or scene divisions

whatsoever, and consists of nothing more than a series of introspective looks at a "spectrum" of girls of joy and their respective clientele. Eros, for once in Wedekind's dramas, is not contrasted with Thanatos; the mutual joy of both sexes is displayed in an atmosphere and setting which seems more like a Sunday picnic in the park than a bordello. There is no real action and the drama merely progresses through a series of separate, contrasting conversations. Wedekind's enlightened approach to prostitution is stressed by the fact that many of these light but educationally provocative chats are between the house madam and a doctor who constantly attends to the mental and physical problems which might arise from the profession. These two, as well as all of the girls, show their basic sensitivity to one of the weird questions of their existence when Elsie, a shy young virgin, wishes to join them. She is treated not with coarse remarks or harsh realities, but more like a toy doll who can be looked at but not touched by anyone, a strange and touching reaction considering what she had come here for and what one would expect. The drama ends with a ballad from the poet-singer Eoban, and the content of his song depicts a hope that is seemingly shared by all, the hope that Elsie may be spared her virginity.

König Nicolo oder So ist das Leben, like Franziska, is divided into acts which are once again superimposed

over the basic units in the form of tableaux-"Blider." The first line of the drama immediately places the work in a Brechtain context; Nicolo's words "Nur kein Gelächter!" (IV, 105) bring to mind at once Brecht's famous "Glotzt nicht so romantisch" placard. The action of the drama revolves around the episodes in Nicolo's life following his being deposed and replaced as king by a common butcher. The fact that there is a central basis of action does not, however, prevent Wedekind from employing epic techniques of composition as it did in dramas like Der Marquis von Keith. The drama reads, in fact, like a modern version of Simplicismus as we follow Nicolo through his varied and various adventures. Scenes repeat each other frequently as Nicolo constantly returns to the court from which he has been banned and then banned once again. Dramatic irony is employed throughout, as for example when Nicolo is hired to serve as the court jester for King Folchi, his replacement. Nicolo, whose similarity to Brecht's Azdak is at times striking, does not go through life without learning from his previous errors. The entire drama is based, in fact, on the juxtaposition of comical scenes of light content and scenes which ironically depict the sad and bitter lot which Nicolo has come to realize as his own.

Musik, finally, introduces Wedekind's most well developed drama based on documentary materials. The entire

plot is based on a factual story which Wedekind had read in the newspapers, and he developed his line of action on facts. More important, however, is his use of specific titles which, if placed on placards as one would assume, serve to distance the audience from the drama, as well as to summarize in Brechtian fashion the ensuing action. The introduction of each scene in this manner thus takes the melodramatic aspects of tension away, so that the spectator can fully concentrate on the actions themselves, and it hardly seems necessary to point out Brecht's frequent use of exactly the same method.

Two factors should be perfectly clear at this point. First of all, it has been amply demonstrated that a number of Wedekind's dramas do in fact follow the characteristics outlined above as typical for the composition of the epic drama. Secondly, the remaining dramas, which follow the traditional principles of composition as found in the Aristotelian drama with few major alterations, still contain elements which link them directly to the epic theater. This latter assertion will be clarified in the next chapter, which discusses the function of time and space in Wedekind's dramas, and even more so in the final chapter on characters and language.

CHAPTER IV

TIME AND SPACE

> Was schiert mich das Theater! Unsere kühne
> Tagtäglichkeit erreicht's bekanntlich nie.
> Das menschliche Gehirn sei meine Bühne,
> Mein Lieblingsregisseur die Phantasie.
> From the prologue to Die Büchse der Pandora
> (III, 120)

The function of time and space in the Aristotelian drama was shown above to be directly relative to the type of artificially segmented dramatic action which they enclose. Aristotle's requirement of a unified dramatic action, a unity characterized by its linear totality, dictates a corresponding limitation of both time and space. Each functions primarily as a framework or hollow container into which the action is artificially compressed, and neither has an ascertainable effect on the action itself. The Aristotelian dramatist's attempt to create an illusive, credible totality within the inherent boundaries of a stage presentation literally forces the narrow restrictions which he places on time and space.

The epic dramatist, on the other hand, cannot abide such severe limitations. He must have free reign over time and space in order to demonstrate the empirical complexity and vast implications of the archetypal problem which serves

as the basis of the action presented. Time and space therefore fluctuate freely from scene to scene without regard to consequential linear progression of events or stylized unity of location. Frequently such shifts reflect or actively influence corresponding changes in the behavior and/or mental state of the characters involved and thus work directly upon the action itself. The autonomy of the scenes or episodes is therefore accentuated by the fact that each contains its own "here and now" co-ordinates of time and space which interact with each other and with the action, with the result that what is taking place is often a factor of when and where it is taking place and vice versa.

Fluctuations in time and space thus function in combination with the concurrent changes in action to show the basic repetitive nature of the archetypal, irreconcilable problems being dealt with in the epic drama. Such conflicts can and do occur anytime and any place. Frequently the exact same series of events takes place despite great shifts in location or time period; man, caught between system and instinct, is in essentially the same trap. The various stations of time and sapce merely reinforce the underlying existential complexity of man's constant battle with himself and his environment. The active influence of temporal and spatial factors changes the situation and the specific reaction to the general problem, but the

circumstances which brought about the conflict in the first place remain essentially the same.

Frühlings Erwachen serves as an excellent example of Wedekind's use of epic techniques with respect to his treatment of the elements of time and space. A general overview clearly illustrates from the outset a very marked departure from the Aristotelian unities. As mentioned above, seventeen of the nineteen scenes which comprise the drama have different locational settings,[116] none of which has a specific spatial or temporal relationship to the scene which preceds or follows. The action jumps from station to station, and each shift of location has a corollary effect on the movement of time. As Klotz states: "Der szenische Raum, der sich mit nahezu jedem Szenenwechsel ändert, wirkt beim Zustandekommen unmittelbarer Zeiteindrücke negativ: er macht die Zeitbewegung, den Verlauf, vergessen. Indem er die Zeit bewältigt, lenkt er von ihr ab. Fortwährend Gegenwart beschwörend--Voraus- und Rückblicke entfallen, da alles mittelbar dargeboten wird--, entrechnet, tilgt er fast den Eindruck ihrer vorwärtsfließenden Bewegung."[117] Further, the indefinite and rather lengthy extension of the time period covered is determined of necessity by the problem with which the drama is concerned. Quoting Klotz once again, "In Wedekinds Stück ist es . . . die private biologische Zeitphase der Pubertät, mit der sich die Akteure

auseinanderzusetzen haben. Die Zeit ruft hier eine Zuständlichkeit hervor, die ihrerseits, um sich zu aktualisieren, einer gewissen Zeitspanne bedarf."[118] The specific, limited movement of time is replaced with an uneven chronology of temporal events whose relationship to the general time period covered, the age of pubertal awakening, is greater than to that of the specific time of each scene. The actual time span covered is slightly more than six months, a fact which is essentially irrelevant for each separate scene, and basically worth mention only because it represents a sufficiently realistic amount of time to cover the various events and developments portrayed.[119]

The majority of the scenes in Frühlings Erwachen, unlike the Aristotelian drama, take place not in large, aristocratic rooms, but in the open expanse of nature. The freedom of such surroundings is a direct reflection of the free and natural demeanor of the children. The indoor world, the world of artificial trappings and walled isolation, belongs to the adults, whose narrow-minded attitudes correspond totally with their restricted environment. The effective use of spatial effects to accentuate the basic conflict and contrast between the children and their elders is well illustrated by comparing the first scene of the second act with the first scene of the third. The former begins: "Abend auf Melchiors Studierzimmer.

Das Fenster steht offen, die Lampe brennt auf dem Tisch" (II, 119). Both the evening mood and the open contact with the out-of-doors have a direct influence on the conversation between Melchior and Moritz. The pensive tone of their speech is reflected in the serious serenity of the sounds of nature which creep in through the open window. "Dem wirren, dunklen Treiben in ihrem Innern," quoting Klotz, "entsprechen die huschenden und verschwommenen Bewegungen draußen in der mondbeschienenen Natur, den halb nur geahnten Vorgängen ihres Körpers und ihrer Seele das nächtliche Weben im Garten. Innen- und Außenraum, die Knaben und die Natur befinden sich im Zustand verbundener Gefäße."[120] Moritz slowly becomes aware of this contact and says to Melchior:

> Ich fühle mich so eigentümlich vergeistert. Betaste mich bitte mal. Ich sehe--ich höre--ich fühle viel deutlicher--und doch alles so traumhaft--oh, stimmungsvoll.--Wie sich dort im Mondschein der Garten dehnt, so still, so tief, als ging er ins Unendliche.--Unter den Büschen treten umflorte Gestalten hervor, huschen in atemloser Geschäftigkeit über die Lichtungen und verschwinden im Halbdunkel. . . . Wollen wir nicht hinunter, Melchior? (II, 120).

The children are thus drawn by the power of nature by the contact, or to use Klotz' term, "Raumverbindung" which Wedekind establishes through the open window. The conference room scene which begins the third act, on the other hand, shows the attempt of the adults to close off the outside world. The majority of the discussion among the teachers revolves around the simple question of whether

or not a window should be opened in order to allow some fresh air (almost symbolic for fresh ideas or attitudes) into the stuffy, isolated room. A window is finally opened only to be immediately closed because of the draft which it created. When it is suggested that the other window then be opened, only one person has noticed or remembered that it has been walled over for a number of months. The lack of contact with the outside world has not even been recognized. Therefore the solution to the problem is made quite simple; as long as the remaining window is to remain shut, it might as well be bricked up also. The conference room itself thus becomes a spatial representation for the isolated pedants who are enclosed by its four walls. The symbolic value of this spatial isolationism is emphasized by the fact that Melchior is totally stifled in his attempts to communicate rationally in such an artificial atmosphere.

This scene also illustrates Wedekind's use of specific objects which function not only in the Aristotelian manner as simple projections of the characters, but also as elements with inherent, meaningful value. It is by no means accidental that two portraits, specifically designated by Wedekind himself as Pestalozzi and Rousseau (stage directions, II, 143), hang conspicuously behind the conference table. Any number of pictures could have been chosen to symbolize the basic environment of a conference room

setting, but as the conversation progresses it becomes clear why Wedekind chose these particular portraits. Pestalozzi's vast educational reforms, based on the idea of first trying to understand children before attempting to teach them, are totally lost in the phoney pedantry and false morality of the theachers, whose concern for artificial propriety blots out even a partial consideration for Melchior's situation and welfare. Similarly, Rousseau's writings on the influence of societal customs and habits on personal behavior and moral codes go totally unheeded; his call back to nature is answered with windows that are walls. These portraits thus serve to bring into sharp contrast what one would expect in such a setting, and what actually transpires.

That Wedekind was conscious and desirous of the effect produced by the open window in Melchior's study and the portraits in the conference room is testified in their specific mention in the respective captions to these scenes. They are, in fact, the only objects singled out by Wedekind as requesite stage effects. The majority of the stage direction headings, in contrast, state only the general spatial atmosphere or situation and make no mention whatsoever of descriptive scenic details. The first scene of the drama, for example, has the simple heading: "Wohnzimmer." The second caption doesn't even state a definite place or setting and reads merely:

"Sonntag abend." The realistic simplicity of each episode is consequently reflected in the very basic and commonplace settings in which they take place, and it was therefore not necessary for Wedekind to list elaborate directions on how and what to place on the stage.

At the same time, however, these general settings have a greater effect on and relationship to the action which they enclose than do the more embellished rooms of the Aristotelian drama. Space is not merely a hollow framework or "Sprachgebäude" in which lines are exchanged between characters. There is constant physical and mental contact between the characters and their surroundings, and the open breadth of nature excludes no one from its bounds. The children smell and pick the flowers, are affected by the rustling of leaves and the bubbling brook, and walk aimlessly through the fields just to be out-of-doors. Following her seduction Wendla is drawn out of her room to combine the pleasure of her new natural state with the natural surroundings of the garden (II, 134); when her pregnancy confines her to her room she longs to get out, ". . . im Abendschein über die Wiesen gehen, Himmelsschlüssel suchen den Fluß entlang und mich ans Ufer setzen und träumen . . . " (II, 161). Previous to his suicide Moritz contrasts his own inner turmoil with the serenity of nature: "Es herrscht eine seltene Ruhe in der Natur. Nirgends etwas Grelles, Aufreizendes. Himmel und Erde

sind wie durchsichtiges Spinnewebe. Und dabei scheint sich alles so wohl zu fühlen. Die Landschaft ist lieblich wie eine Schlummermelodie--'schlafe, mein Prinzchen, schlaf ein' . . . " (II, 135). Nature is quite obviously singing Moritz' death song; even in tragedy Moritz can harmonize with personified nature even though he could seldom communicate with real persons. It is thus not surprising to find that he equates his death with the simple departure from the spatial isolation of a lifeless, crowded room: "Besser ist besser.--Ich passe nicht hinein. Mögen sie einander auf die Köpfe steigen.--Ich ziehe die Tür hinter mir zu und trete ins Freie" (II, 135).

Finally, the last scene of Frühlings Erwachen clearly illustrates Wedekind's use of spatial effects to denote the passage of time and to integrate the various strands of action. The previous scene found Hänschen Rilow and Ernst Röbel basking in the warmth of an early autumn evening. Now, as Melchior stumbles madly through the graveyard he remarks: "Die Blumchen wären heut' noch erfroren!--Ringsum ist die Erde kahl . . . Im Totenreich!--(II, 166). The situation, the time of year and Moritz' inner desolation are all reflected in this simple statement on the general setting. In his haste Melchior topples a tombstone, which turns out to be that of Moritz, thus relating back to the former scene in the graveyard and, when the latter appears with his head in hand, linking

the action as far back as the first scene of the second act when Moritz first relates the story of the "Königin ohne Kopf." Melchior then notices the grave of a young girl and learns from the inscription that it is Wendla. At the same time, the spectator gets his first definite impression of how much total time has passed since the beginning of the drama by subtracting the dates on the tombstone, May 5, 1878 to October 27, 1892, from the first mention of specific time in the drama, Wendla's fourteenth birthday in the first scene. The graveyard setting therefore serves as a final meeting place for the three main characters, whose separate fates are interrelated here through the introduction of people through "things."[121]

Frühlings Erwachen, it should be mentioned, stands out not only in Wedekind's dramas as fulfilling an exceptional number of the characteristics of time and space found in the epic theater, but in the entire history of world drama.[122] Wedekind himself approaches this total correspondence in only one other work, König Nicolo, but even here the full impact of time and space as direct determinants or implicit factors in the actions and reactions of the characters is not as strong, especially with respect to the immediate power of nature as a working force in the drama. This is not to say, however, that the remaining dramas do not exhibit a distinct departure from the normal Aristotelian unities of time and space; on the

contrary, the majority of Wedekind's works employ a sufficient number of epic characteristics in the treatment of time and space, primarily as a result of their broad basis of problematics, to include them as examples of epic theater.

The "Lulu Plays," for instance, span an indefinite period of years, and time as a factor of tension building motion is totally lacking. Within the acts, which were shown above to have the same function as the scenes in Frühlings Erwachen, time progression as such is totally irrelevant, and between each act there are indeterminable gaps of months and/or years. Once again the action consists of various episodic stations of development, each of which contains its own constellation of time and space. Each act of Erdgeist takes place in a different room; each act of Die Büchse der Pandora also takes place in a different room, but each of these rooms is also in a different country. These shifts in space serve, as in Frühlings Erwachen, to reflect corresponding shifts in time, as Lulu's rise and fall can be traced from her entrance in Schwarz' simple studio, to her pinnacle of freedom and power in Schön's luxurious salon, to her final degradation and corruption in the meager attic in London.

While the intimate contact with nature which played such an important role in the spatial technique of Frühlings Erwachen is totally absent here, the essential symbolism of

these walled rooms as barriers is still quite evident. Wedekind himself, through the person of the animal trainer in the prologue, sets up the equation between people and animals and rooms and cages. Lulu, "das wahre Tier, das wilde, schöne Tier" (III, 8), stands out in this atmosphere of bourgeois domestication as a vital, restless force of nature, much like the powerful young panther in Kafka's Ein Hungerkünstler, whose instinct to devour flesh was at once both revolting and magnetic and who, like Lulu, radiated freedom through his body even when caged. The analogy reaches its peak in the fourth act of Erdgeist when Lulu turns Schön's bourgeois home into a living managerie comparable to the circus world setting established in the prologue. The elaborate scenic detail, which at first seems to function merely in the Aristotelian fashion as a reflection of social status and upper middle class atmosphere, serves as a direct contrast to the base animals who have come to inhabit the premises. In fact, it even stands in direct contrast to Schön himself, whose contempt for all things bourgeois is sardonically mocked by this setting of materialistic possessions as a reflection of his desire for social propriety.

Further, Wedekind's use of contrastive settings to denote a different basis of action can be seen by comparing the luxury of this scene with the total poverty of the final scene of Die Büchse der Pandora.[123] The stage is set as follows:

> Eine Dachkammer ohne Mansarden. Zwei große Scheiben in der Flucht des Daches öffnen sich nach oben. Rechts und links vorn je eine schlechtschließende Tür. Im linken Prozenium eine zerrissene graue Matratze. Rechts vorn ein wackliger Blumentisch, auf dem eine Flasche und eine qualmende Petroleumlampe stehen. Rechts hinten in der Ecke eine alte Chaiselongue; neben der Mitteltür ein durchsessener Strohsessel. Man hört den Regen aufs Dach schlagen; unter der Dachluke steht eine mit Wasser gefüllte Schale. (III, 172)

Even before the scene opens the spectator is struck by the stark divergence from the previous settings. Space is used here not only to symbolize Lulu's progressive demise, but also as a form of Brechtian anticipation for the action which is to follow. Wedekind's masterful choice of stage effects tell the spectator as clearly as the words of a placard that Lulu has reached the lowest of all possible depths, and that the end is therefore inevitably near. More than in any other act of either drama, the characters are mentally and physically aware of the influence of their surroundings; they are trapped together in a modicum of time and space, and they react overtly to both by constantly bickering and orally expressing their past freedom and present confinement. Even Jack, one of the lowest species of all humanity, is revolted by the poverty of Lulu's quarters: "Nicht einmal ein Handtuch haben die Leute hier!--Eine furchtbar ärmliche Höhle!" (III, 193).

Lulu's portrait in Pierrot costume deserves special mention as perhaps the single most outstanding example of Wedekind's use of objects in space whose inherent value

far exceeds their simple symbolic function as mere things among other things. Emrich explains the basic meaning of the Pierrot custume itself as follows:

> Ihre [Lulu's] Verkleidung als Pierrot . . . bezeichnet exakt ihre tatsächliche Rolle in der Gesellschaft. Pierrot ist seinem Ursprung nach der scheinbar einfältigste, niedrigste, von allen geschlagene Diener, der aber gerade auf Grund seiner ungetrübten Einfalt und Unschuld unausgesetzt seine Herren entlarvt, bloßstellt und überlistet, die Herrschenden beherrscht und an der Nase herumführt. . . . Dazu kommt, daß die Pierrot-Figur stets--schon in dem berühmten Bild Watteaus--mit einem undefinierbar traurigen Ausdruck dargestellt wurde und zumeist sowohl in ihrer Kleidung wie in ihren Gesichtszügen eine verwirrende Mischung von trügerischem Schein und scheinloser Natur, von Verstellung und Offenheit zeigt. Das trifft auch auf Lulu zu: Lulu erscheint einerseits immer natürlich und offen . . . Andererseits scheint ihr ganzes Wesen überhaupt nur auf Verstellung angelegt zu sein. Jedem zeigt sie sich anders.[124]

As with the pictures of Rousseau and Pestalozzi in the conference room, Wedekind was obviously intent to place more meaning than simple decoration in this particular object. The function of this picture is summed up perfectly in the dual meaning in the compound German noun "Sinnbild" ("Sinn"/"Bild"); on the one hand it stands as a <u>symbol</u> for Lulu herself, and on the other contains its own inherent descriptive <u>meaning</u> as a <u>picture</u>. Throughout the drama it serves to integrate the action, especially when Lulu is not present in person, and at the same time functions to show both what Lulu was and to a certain extent always must be, and what she actually is during each of the temporal stations of action. The fact that

the picture already exists before the drama opens and even precedes Lulu onto the stage clearly illustrates the fact that Wedekind begins the action in the middle of an extended period of time and action; that the picture is still hanging conspicuously on the wall in the final scene is symbolic of the fact that Lulu's person is survived by her principle, and that the problem itself does not end with the drama. Finally, it is interesting to note that the only time the picture is missing, the third act of Erdgeist, Lulu herself is in costume for her theater performance and the same double image attained through the use of the picture is achieved even here by the fact that Lulu is constantly positioned in front of a mirror, and the real person is still confronted with an image which combines illusion and reality.

The same general non-Aristotelian approach to the elements of time and space found in the "Lulu Plays" are also evident in a number of Wedekind's other dramas, including Die junge Welt, the pantomimes Die Flöhe oder Der Schmerzentanz and Die Fürstin Russalka, Hidalla, Musik, Oaha and Franziska. Each of these dramas spans a number of years, reflecting once again various stations of existence in the lives of the main characters, and while the variety and number of spatial settings vary, each does employ a series of different or altered locations which function essentially like those outlined above in

the "Lulu Plays." The one-act dramas (Der Kammersänger, Tod und Teufel and Die Zensur), on the other hand, necessarily take a totally different approach to the time-space relationship which, despite the fact that a type of unity is maintained throughout, is also distinctly different from that found in the Aristotelian drama.

Der Kammersänger serves as perhaps the most distinct example of Wedekind's use of a completely contrastive technique of time and space as opposed to that of the dramas discussed above, and especially Frühlings Erwachen. The entire drama covers a period of forty five exactly measured minutes and never moves from the original setting in a common hotel room. Unlike the Aristotelian dramatist, however, Wedekind does not use these restrictions to create an artificial situation. The amount of time, first of all, is derived solely from the fact that Gerardo has only three quarters of an hour before his train departs for Brussels. Time therefore has nothing to do with the "final dramatic moments" of an extended, momentous series of events. There is no need to present an exposition in order to bring the spectator up to date, since everything which takes place in the drama evolves from within and is essentially relevant only to this period of forty five minutes. Further, the specific motion of time does not reflect a corresponding build-up in the action, since each of the three visitors represents a totally autonomous and unrelated event. The

almost total lack of action as such, combined with the fact that there is no real end point which must be reached, results in an almost total lack of tension on the part of the spectator. Gerardo is the only one who is concerned and tense about the fleet passing of his precious seconds. His constant refrain: "Ich muß morgen abend in Brüssel den 'Tristan' singen!" adds tempo without a corresponding tension (except in himself), and reflects more than anything else the arrangement of his life around false priorities. Wedekind clearly uses this restricted time basis to mock the import of Gerardo's existence and not, as in the Aristotelian drama, to build up to a fateful moment of great implications. Wallenstein, for example, contemplates for hours the final decision which will eventually prove his fate, and the spectator becomes tensely impatient for the great moment which in fact never comes; Gerardo, on the other hand, decides his fate on the following basis: "Wenn ich abreise, bin ich ein Unmensch, und wenn ich hier bleibe, bin ich ruiniert, bin ich kontraktbrüchig! Ich habe noch (auf die Uhr sehend) eine Minute und zehn Sekunden. Rasch, ich muß verhaftet sein!" (III, 240). This ridiculously exact and short amount of time, accentuated by the mention of the precise number of seconds, is obviously nothing more than a complete mockery of Gerardo's unheroic nature.

Wedekind's choice of location also reflects a certain amount of divergence from the normal pattern found in the Aristotelian drama. First of all, there is an inherent and obvious relationship between time and space. The temporal nature of the action is directly reflected in the transient nature of the hotel room setting; the significance of the room is limited by the amount of time covered by the drama. Except for the conspicuous placement of the piano and the number of bouquets strewn around in various places, there is nothing particularly characteristic about the room itself. Instead of placing the action in Gerardo's dressing room or some other more obviously related setting, Wedekind chose a location which is essentially neutral to all of the characters, thus allowing each to emerge on equal ground through their own actions and words. This is especially true of Gerardo who, trapped alone in this neutral situation, must fend for himself not only as a star but also as a person. He is forced into showing a certain amount of true emotion when placed in face to face contact; he cannot "play the role" as he would be able to do if he were in his own theatrical element.

As in Frühlings Erwachen, the four walls of this hotel room represent isolation and lack of communication. Gerardo must speak to these people because he cannot escape from them, but at the same time he is not able to

communicate with them. Gerardo simply does not have "room" for these people; they merely walk in and out of his life, just as he enters and leaves his hotel room. Everything is based on transience--his living quarters, his acquaintances, his career, even his own basic existence. The vacuum of time and space which surrounds Wedekind's drama is, unlike that of the Aristotelian drama, not at all artificial. For Gerardo it is unfortunately all too real. His life as a public idol brings with it a combination of the real and the artificial which must be sustained if success is to continue, and which can exist only in the isolation of a vacuum. Walls are Gerardo's defense from the outside world, and an invasion of his privacy is equal to an attack on his inner self.

Wedekind's remaining dramas adhere quite closely to the normal unities of time and space, and therefore need not be discussed here. The final chapter will deal with Characters and Language, both of which demonstrate a very positive relationship to the epic theater in almost every one of Wedekind's works.

CHAPTER V

CHARACTERS AND LANGUAGE

A u f s c h r e i e n!--A u f s c h r e i e n!--
D u s e i n, I l s e!--P r i a p i a l!--
B e s i n n u n g s l o s i g k e i t!--D a s
n i m m t d i e K r a f t m i r!--D i e s e s
G l ü c k s k i n d, d i e s e s S o n n e n-
k i n d--d i e s e s F r e u d e n m ä d c h e n
a u f m e i n e m J a m m e r w e g!-- --O!--O!
-- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- --
-- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- --

Moritz in Frühlings Erwachen (II, 141)

The unities of time, place and action which have been shown to characterize the Aristotelian drama (in the Brechtian sense) can only be maintained by placing corresponding limitations on the characters who people this uniform world. Consequently, the characters are not only limited in number and importance, but also in their singular social standing as members of the aristocratic elite or as burghers following the strict standards of the middle class. The unilateral nature of these characters, reflected in their common idiom, mode of behavior and system of values, is determined by the fact that they are all variations of one and the same type. The conflict, which Klotz so aptly compares to the formality of a duel, is fought between two specific characters who emerge above the others almost

immediately as protagonist and antagonist. The contest is regulated by the rules of society, whose predetermined values also dictate the eventual outcome, since clear lines exist between right and wrong, guilty and innocent. Further, the conflict is not fought with actions, but with words. Decisions are weighed carefully in advance through verbal debate or reflective monologues, both of which closely follow a pattern of stichomythic logic which directly reflects the characters' mastery of the language and their ability to stand at a distance from any given situation. The general principle of linear unity is thus maintained all the way down to the level of the consequential flow of the hypotactic sentence structure.

Characters and language in the epic drama, on the other hand, constitute what might well be termed a melting pot of humanity, which also readily includes species of the inhumane. Each character represents an autonomous unit of personality and function, and each speaks his own personal idiom which, like his basic traits, is frequently determined by his situation and environment, and liable to change at any moment. Communication, the basis of contact between the characters of the Aristotelian drama, is almost totally lacking in a pure form, and often words are replaced with spontaneous actions, frustrated gestures or a total dumfounded nothingness, all of which reflect the existential isolation of modern man. Despite the fact that their speech

is that of the common man, they seldom understand each other because most of what they say is merely a form of self-evocation. Each is caught up in his own battle for survival against each other and against the world; there are no heroes and no sinners, instead there are only those who continue to struggle and those who succumb to forces which are beyond their control.

Wedekind's general relationship to the epic theater with respect to the elements of both characters and language is seemingly incontestable. Few authors in the history of world drama have created such a wide variety of distinct human types or so effectively employed such a confluence of characteristic speech patterns. Despite his frequent use of denigrating caricature and sardonic distortion, Wedekind always combines enough of the real with the fictional to leave the impression of potent viability. As has been mentioned above, there is hardly a single character in a Wedekind drama who does not have a realistic counterpart, and the majority of the language used by these figures is patterned either after his own strange idiom or reflects that of some specific person or group. Wedekind himself, it must be stressed, plumbed even the lowest depths of human society, and like Brecht he had a constant ear for the unusual and yet characteristic phrase, and an eye for the atypical types who frequent the establishments of the underworld. He lived between this

world and that of the normal bourgeoisie, and as a true member of neither was able to study and appreciate both from the position of an outsider. His characters reflect not only the distinct contrasts between these levels of society, but also their inherent and all too frequently ignored similarities. The two basic factors which separate the classes are money and power; the one thing which they both have in common is an instinctual desire for sex. While Wedekind's sympathies clearly lie with the outsider and the adventurer, his negative picture of the average bourgeois oppressor is never able to fully belie his begrudging respect for the security and influence which the insider enjoys. His characters fight the same basic conflict between instinct and order, man and society, the outsider and the insider, which was, from the beginning and at the end, his own.

The full variety of characters and language techniques employed by Wedekind in his various dramas clearly represents a volume of material which is beyond the scope of the present study. Therefore, since the nature of the material demands a certain amount of specific exemplification, only two dramas, Frühlings Erwachen and Der Marquis von Keith, will be treated in detail. This choice is based not only on expediency, but also on the fact that these dramas illustrate the majority of Wedekind's basic language patterns and introduce most of the general types

of characters who frequently reappear in the remaining dramas. In addition, Der Marquis von Keith was specifically chosen to show the definite correspondence between characters and language in this drama and the elements outlined above as characteristic of the epic theater, despite the fact that time, space, composition and, to a certain extent, dramatic action, adhere quite closely to the characteristics of the Aristotelian drama.

Wedekind does not precede Frühlings Erwachen with an annotated list of dramatis personae and, as has been mentioned above, the majority of the caption-headings for each individual scene offer little or no information about the characters themselves. Instead each of the characters (who number thirty four by specific count) enters the stage as an unknown entity, and is introduced and developed totally from within through the action itself. Further, the simple neutrality of the various settings does not immediately reflect, as in the Aristotelian drama, the situation, social standing and personal traits of the people enclosed therein. Settings such as the conference room and the corridor of the reform school stand, in fact, in direct contrast to the people found there; the former is filled with ignorant pedants, the latter with innocent children, including Melchior, who are being corrupted rather than reformed. Changes in location frequently introduce not only new characters, but also, because of

the spontaneous interaction between space and characters, new and altered traits of characters who have been previously introduced. Wedekind's book of characters, simply stated, has no cover, and there is much which must be read in between the lines.

The Aristotelian drama is dominated by unilateral variations of two types of characters and language, that of the aristocratic nobleman and the average bourgeois. Frühlings Erwachen, in distinct contrast, is peopled with a wide variety of characters and character types (primarily from the middle class) each of whom, despite the fact that they fall into three basic classifications, exhibits a singular individuality in personality and speech, and none of whom transcends the bounds of common everyday reality.

Wedekind's drastic and total departure from the world of the Aristotelian drama is clearly established from the outset by the simple fact that the first and most important grouping of characters consists of ordinary children between the ages of fourteen and fifteen. Moritz, Melchior and Wendla have nothing in common with the educated, experienced, self-confident maturity of a Wallenstein or Maria Stuart, nor have they reached any heroic heights of power, influence or social standing from which they might tragically fall. Their tragic significance results from their total, isolated insignificance; instead of falling, they are unceremoniously stepped on while they

are still down. What happens to Wallenstein and Maria Stuart could happen to no one else because of what they represent and who they are. What happens to Moritz and Wendla could and might happen to any of the other children in the drama, because they are nothing more than examples of an archetypal problem of human existence. The classical hero also has the distinct advantage of knowing the rules of the game and the nature of his specific enemy, whereas Moritz, Melchior, Wendla and the other children are blindly fighting an uncontrolled and uncontrollable battle against forces which never become personified in the form of a single, definite antagonist.

The pathetic adults who make up the second general group of characters represent much more a contrastive foil to the children than a truly hostile foe. It would be totally unjust and inappropriate to assert, for example, that Mrs. Bergmann or Mr. Stiefel are actively and knowingly working to bring about the demise of Wendla and Moritz. They are instead merely doing what they think is right in a world where right and wrong have become relative, undefinable terms. As representatives of a system over which they have no control and whose rules and values they themselves do not fully understand or follow, these adults are to a great extent as helpless and isolated as their offspring. Certainly Mrs. Bergmann is as guilty as Wendla if one is to determine guilt by association, but each is

equally innocent if the question is to be decided on the basis of malicious intent. The communication and generation gaps represent solid barriers between the children and all of those who might come to their assistance; parents, teachers, even the pastor, are characterized by a total inability to express meaningful values or viable alternatives.

Mrs. Gabor and The Masked Man stand out distinctly in a separate classification between the children and the other adults. Their rational, mature approach to life and its problems, clearly reflected in the clarity and consequential nature of their speech, constitutes the only positive affirmation of existence. The totally irreconcilable nature of the conflict is, however, stressed by the fact that even Mrs. Gabor must eventually give in with despair and begrudgingly agree that Melchior must be sent to the reform school. This negative concession on the part of the only adult in the entire drama who represented the sole positive hope for change caused, in turn, Wedekind's decision to introduce The Masked Man,[125] whose estranging appearance in the final scene is purely Brechtian in both nature and function. While still unable to explain the complexities of life, he is at least able to convince Melchior that existence is something and therefore better than nothing, and the latter sums up the total obscurity of today's world with the words: "Wo dieser Mensch mich

hinführt, weiß ich nicht. Aber er ist ein Mensch . . . " (II, 173).

Wedekind introduces the characters in these group situations not only to stress the everyday normality of all the people involved, but also to accentuate the contrasts which lie both between and within each group. The general divisions are further subdivided on the basis of function and personality and not, as in the Aristotelian drama, according to their roles as major and minor figures. Wedekind's primary vehicle of characterization and personal contrast is most definitely the full variety of speech patterns used by the different figures, the function and efficacy of which are best illustrated through specific examples.

The children, first of all, speak in an idiom which for the most part corresponds to their general age group and commonplace interests. Frequently, however, their mundane conversations are infused with a type of worldly wisdom and philosophical seriousness wholly unbefitting a fourteen year old. Take for example the realistically simple manner with which Moritz and Martha view the raising of children:

> Moritz: Ich habe mir schon gedacht, wenn ich Kinder habe, Knaben und Mädchen, so lasse ich sie von früh auf im nämlichen Gemach, wenn möglich auf ein und demselben Lager, zusammenschlafen, lasse ich sie morgens und abends beim An- und Auskleiden einander behilflich sein und in der heißen Jahreszeit, die

> Knaben sowohl wie die Mädchen, tagsüber nichts als eine kurze, mit einem Lederriemen gëgurtete Tunika aus weißem Wollstoff tragen.--Mir ist sie müßten, wenn sie so heranwachsen, später ruhiger sein, als wir in der Regel sind (II, 100-101).
>
> Martha: Wenn ich einmal Kinder habe, ich lasse sie aufwachsen wie das Unkraut in unserem Blumengarten. Um das kümmert sich niemand, und es steht so hoch, so dicht--während die Rosen in den Beeten an ihren Stöcken mit jedem Sommer kümmerlich erblühn (II, 108).

The natural simplicity of both the basic ideas and their expression, especially Martha's masterful analogy, stand in distinct contrast to the striking truth of what is being suggested. The full import of the contrast, however, comes in both cases in what follows. Moritz' mature philosophy on the raising of children is placed in total juxtaposition to his lack of knowledge about where they even come from; Melchior replies to Moritz' theory: "Die Frage ist nur, wenn die Mädchen Kinder bekommen, was dann?", to which Moritz asks astonished: "Wieso Kinder bekommen?" (II, 101). Similarly, Martha's further statement that her aunt Euphemia for some reason has no children, is answered by Thea's sarcastic reply: "Gänschen!--weil sie nicht v e r h e i r a t e t ist" (II, 108).

Contrast, which has been shown throughout to be the overriding structural principle in the epic drama, is not only evident in the exchange of dialogue, but even within single passages. Melchior follows his coldly harsh statement: "Das Leben ist von einer ungeahnten Gemeinheit. Ich hätte nicht übel Lust, mich in die Zweige zu hängen.", with

the simple reaction of a little boy who has been kept waiting for his treat: "--Wo Mama mit dem Tee nur bleibt!" (II, 120). Moritz' prosaic description of nature on the evening of his death, which was quoted above (p. 116), continues: "'. . . schlafe, mein Prinzchen, schlaf ein,' wie Fraülein Snandulia sang. Schade, daß sie die Ellbogen ungraziös hält!" (II, 136). Further below in the same fatalistic monologue he clearly demonstrates an astonishing mixture of heroic resignation and naïve sentiment with the words:

> Ich brauchte wohl ein Jahr, um in Gedanken von allen Abschied zu nehmen. Ich will nicht wieder weinen. Ich bin froh, ohne Bitterkeit zurückblicken zu dürfen. Wie manchen schönen Abend ich mit Melchior verlebt habe!--unter den Uferweiden; beim Forsthaus; am Heerweg draußen wo die fünf Linden stehen; auf dem Schloßberg, zwischen den lauschigen Trümmern der Runenberg. -- -- --Wenn die Stunde gekommen, will ich aus Leibeskräften an Schlagsahne denken. Schlagsahne hält nicht auf. Sie stopft und hinterläßt dabei doch einen angenehmen Nachgeschmack . . . [sic.] Auch die Menschen hatte ich mir unendlich schlimmer gedacht. Ich habe keinen gefunden, der nicht sein Bestes gewollt hätte. Ich habe manchen bemitleidet um meinetwillen (II, 136-137).

The almost incoherent juxtaposition of spontaneous thoughts and verbal reactions contained in each of these passages illustrates not only the emotive thought process of these children, but also their pathetically honest approach to the complexities of existence. Unlike the Aristotelian adult, they are totally caught up in a flux of time, space and inner emotion, and their words directly reflect a very muddy labyrinthine stream of consciousness. As Spalter

states: "Even when Wedekind gives us ostensibly natural dialogue, he has his characters ruminate in such a way that we get the equivalent of short monologues interspersed throughout the play; he is less concerned with doing justice to the texture of real-life speech than with extending the scope of dialogue to define the nature of the world in which his characters function."[126]

The abrupt, paratactic nature of the above quotes (coordinating conjunctions are almost totally absent), characterized by the frequent use of ellipsis to accentuate the difficulty of putting thoughts into coherent words, is taken to the full extreme in the quote from Moritz which serves as a caption to this chapter. Sentence structure is completely ignored in a series of frustrated outcries containing nothing but pure emotion. Moritz literally vomits the inner agony of his soul onto the stage and, having cleared his system of life's disgusting bile, calmly goes to his death: "Jetzt ist es dunkel geworden. Jetzt gehe ich nicht mehr nach Hause" (II, 142).

Wedekind could hardly have chosen a more potently contrastive follow-up to this scene of violent emotion than the teachers' conference. Having just seen and heard a child being driven to death by his incapacity to adjust to life, we are now confronted by a group of ridiculous pedants who are in essence total anti-life. Professors Affenschmalz, Knüppeldick, Hungergurt, Zungenschlag and

Fliegentod are, under the direction of rector Sonnenstich, discussing the implications of Moritz' suicide and Melchior's treatise on sexual reproduction. Their names characterize not only their personalities, but also, in the case of Zungenschlag, his speech. His comment: "Es he-herrscht hier eine A-A-Atmosphäre wie in unterirdischen Kata-Katakomben, wie in den A-Aktensälen des weiland Wetzlarer Ka-Ka-Ka-Ka Kammergerichtes" (II, 144), illustrates both his stuttering speech and also, despite the fact that he is actually referring to the air in the room, an unconsciously apt depiction of the outmoded intellectual basis of the ensuing discussion. The debate, most of which revolves around the opening of a window and not Moritz and Melchior, is carried on in a type of stilted "Kanzleideutsch" reminiscent of the introductions to letters written in the period of Early New High German. Melchior's constant attempts at rational discussion are totally suffocated in this atmosphere of artificial rhetoric; generally he never gets beyond the words "Ich habe . . . " before he is stifled by rector "Sunstroke." The grotesque satire which runs through this entire scene is frequently interrupted by pure slapstick comedy in the form of Habebald, who functions almost like a page to this group of medieval academic knights. His mimical line: "Befehlen, Herr Rektor!", is also his only line throughout the scene, and his "habebald" reactions to every

command clearly show that Wedekind was aware of the effects of gestural, non-verbal theater.

The entire scene at Moritz' grave could be quoted from beginning to end as a masterpiece of instant characterization and human contrast. Wedekind presents three distinct levels of emotion expressed in words, beginning with the harsh condemnation of the adults, passing over the boyish curiosity of Moritz' male friends, and ending with the tender and deep sentiment of the girls. Pastor Kahlbauch, whose name and meaninglessly wordy service clearly align him with his cohorts in the academic profession, is more concerned with clarifying Moritz' sinfulness than with praying for his innocent soul. Mr. Stiefel's constant refrain: "Der Junge war nicht von mir!" (II, 149-150) shows not only his own unfeeling reaction, but also the lack of love and understanding which drove Moritz to his death in the first place. Gesture once again accompanies words as each adult utters his lines while throwing dirt into the grave, an act which seems to symbolize the burying of their own sins. They are followed to the grave by Ernst, Hänschen, Georg, Robert and Otto, whose eager desire to learn the gory details (Georg: "Hat sich die Pistole gefunden?" Robert: "Man braucht keine Pistole zu suchen!" Ernst: "Hast du ihn gesehen, Robert?" [II, 151]) continues only until the topic of the next day's lesson enters the conversation,

and the mundane realities of existence extinguish any further interest in the former topic. Martha and Ilse are the last to leave the cemetery and, after placing flowers on the grave and vowing to keep Moritz' memory alive forever, Wedekind cannot close the scene without one last, violent contrast, and the scene ends with Ilse's graphically simple depiction of what she saw after Moritz shot himself.[127]

The mature, rational clarity of Mrs. Gabor and The Masked Man represents, as do their total personalities, a middle position between the extreme polarity of a Mr. Stiefel and a Moritz or Melchior. One passage from Mrs. Gabor serves to illustrate a totally different basis of language and character. Mr. Gabor has just suggested that Melchior be sent to reform school for having written his sex documentary (his seduction of Wendla is as yet unbeknownst to Mrs. Gabor), to which she replies:

> Ich vertrete dir den Weg, solange ein Tropfen warmen Blutes in mir wallt! In der Korrektionsanstalt ist mein Kind verloren. Eine Verbrechernatur mag sich in solchen Instituten bessern lassen. Ich weiß es nicht. Ein gutgearteter Mensch wird so gewiß zum Verbrecher darin, wie die Pflanze verkommt, der du Luft und Sonne entziehst. Ich bin mir keines Unrechtes bewußt. Ich danke heute wie immer dem Himmel daß er mir den Weg gezeigt, in meinem Kinde einen rechtlichen Charakter und eine edle Denkungsweise zu wecken. Was hat er denn so Schreckliches getan? Es soll mir nicht einfallen, ihn entschuldigen zu wollen--daran, daß man ihn aus der Schule gejagt, trägt er keine Schuld. Und wäre es sein Verschulden, so hat er es ja gebüßt. Du magst das alles besser wissen. Du magst theoretisch vollkommen im Rechte sein. Aber ich kann mir mein einziges Kind nicht gewaltsam in den Tod jagen lassen! (II, 153-154).

The basic difference between this mode of expression and that of everyone else in the drama can be seen in the fact that every sentence contains logical, positive content. Unlike the children she has a mastery over the language which is reflected in consequential verbal thoughts; unlike the other adults, and especially the teachers, she uses this maturity of speech to communicate and not just spew out meaningless phrases. Unfortunately, however, communication was not enough to counteract the instinctual drive which arose in her own son, nor did it break through the existential barriers in which Moritz had enclosed himself.[128]

Frühlings Erwachen, as has been frequently mentioned above, is Wedekind's clearest contribution to the epic theater with respect to its correspondence to each and every one of the basic elements of structure and form. These few examples of the various characters and language techniques, which constitute the rule and not carefully chosen exceptions, clearly illustrate his complete and total departure from the characteristics of characters and language in the Aristotelian drama. Der Marquis von Keith, on the other hand, has thus far been related to the epic drama only on the basis of it underlying problematics. The discussion which follows, however, will clearly demonstrate that the characters and speech patterns employed in Keith are also positively related to those of Brecht and his tradition.

The total polarity of the two main characters, Keith and Ernst Scholz, illustrates from the outset the lack of unilateral traits based on social class and a common "Weltanschauung." Keith, first of all, is the product of a strange background, which he describes in the words: "Ich bin Bastard. Mein Vater war ein geistig sehr hochstehender Mensch, besonders was Mathematik und so exakte Dinge betrifft, und meine Mutter war Zigeunerin" (IV, 10-11). As a result of this mismatch in marriage, which immediately brings to mind Thomas Mann's similar heritage, Keith aptly sees himself as a "Kreuzung von Philosoph und Pferdedieb" (II, 11), and has lived his life accordingly as a picaresque adventurer. His brutally realistic philosophy, based on the amorality of a used car dealer, has always allowed him to climb ever higher on the social ladder, but in the end his minor violations of the business rules force him to flee like a gypsy.

Scholz, on the other hand, comes from the upper crust, and as a result of his altruistic morality has attempted to work his way down to the level of common people. Formerly Count Trautenau, he has assumed a new name to reflect his desire for commonplace anonymity, just as his counterpart has taken on the title the Marquis von Keith to assist in his pretentious aspirations for influence and power. Even compared to that of Keith, however, Scholz' life has been a disaster. As an overly ambitious

railroad official he had indirectly caused the death of fourteen people; as a form of repentance he then married the poorest girl who first crossed his path, which resulted in a totally impossible fiasco from which he eventually had to literally buy himself out. Money, unfortunately, had not been able to solve his own personal problems, and he has now come to Keith to try the life of a "Genuß-mensch" (pleasure seeker). The basic contrast between the two philosophies of Keith and Scholz can be seen in the following simple exchange:

> Scholz: Ich habe mich schon allen Ernstes gefragt, ob nicht mein ungeheuerer Reichtum der einzige Grund meines Unglücks ist.
>
> Keith empört: Das ist Gotteslästerung!
>
> Scholz: . . . Hätte ich von Jugend auf um meinen Unterhalt kämpfen müssen, dann stände ich bei meinem sittlichen Ernst und meinem Fleiß, statt ein ausgestoßener zu sein, heute wahrscheinlich mitten in der glänzendsten Karriere.
>
> Keith: Oder du schwelgtest mit deinem Mädchen aus niedrigstem Stande im allergewöhnlichsten Liebesquark und putzest dabei deiner Mitwelt die Stiefel.
>
> Scholz: Das nehme ich jeden Augenblick mit Freuden gegen mein Los in Tausch (IV, 24-25).

Keith and Scholz are both outsiders because one has the ruthless guts and the other has the money, and without both neither one is of much intrinsic value.

Unfortunately for Keith, however, Consul Casimir does have both, and he uses them to defeat Keith in his potential moment of glory. Casimir and Keith are in many

ways quite similar; both are ruthless, ambitious, intelligent and cunning. From his position as a moneyed insider, however, Casimir has the distinct advantage of security and established power, and from this aspect stands in contrast to Keith's wheeler-dealer recklessness. Keith, as was true of the children in Frühlings Erwachen, was not defeated as much by a person as by a system. Casimir does not contrive over a long period of time to bring about Keith's downfall; he merely steps in at the propitious moment when Keith has transgressed the rules of the game (he didn't keep any books and had no capital of his own) and crushes his now helpless foe with legalities.

The female counterparts to the action, Molly Griesinger and Anna, Countess of Werdenfels, also exhibit a variety of contrasts to each other and to the remaining characters. Molly, first of all, is a simple girl from a very modest environment. She loves Keith for who he is and not what he might become, and has stood by his side as he went up and down the roller coaster of his life. Like the children of Frühlings Erwachen, however, her simplicity belies a power of common sense wisdom which contains far more insight than Keith's grandiose "Wunschträume." She realizes the futility of Keith's struggle and sees in advance that he is not fighting in his own class. As she says: "Wir beide sind eben nun einmal zu einfältig für die große Welt!" (IV, 19); and

earlier in the same conversation she diagnoses his full sickness with the simple words: "Du leidest eben einfach an Größenwahn" (IV, 18). All such warnings, however, go totally unheeded. Keith is so wrapped up in his plans that he is not even concerned with the necessities of everyday existence, and Molly's imploring statement: "Wir haben morgen kein Brot auf dem Tisch" is answered in typical Keith nonchalance with the solution: "Dann speisen wir im Hotel Continental" (IV, 15). Molly's suicide at the end of the drama does not result from her concern for the basic needs; it is caused in fact by Keith's having come too close to being able to eat in the Hotel Continental, at which point she saw her usefulness in life extinguished.

Anna, in distinct contrast, is best characterized by the German term "Machtweib." She knows what she is after, and she goes out to get it with all the powers at her disposal, which consist primarily of her inherited wealth (through divorce) and her body. She sides with Keith only as long as it is advantageous, and his fall brings with it her rise in the form of a proposal of marriage from Casimir. She cannot be condemned too harshly, however, since it can be presumed that Keith would have taken the same course had the situation been reversed.

While all of the above characters employ the same basic middle class idiom, Keith clearly stands out from the others not only in speech but also in his gestural

spontaneity. His terse, chopped sentences and his almost total inability to sit down and remain seated set the entire tone for the impatient dialogue. Throughout the entire drama Keith ranges over the stage, touching or grasping everything in his path. The following passages from the final scene, for example, clearly illustrate the combination of gesture and language to show Keith's disjointed state of mind:

> Keith (kriescht suchend umher): --Molly!--Molly!-- Es ist das erste Mal in meinem Leben, daß ich vor einem Wieb auf den Knien wimmere!--(Plötzlich nach dem Wohnzimmer aufhorchend): Da . . .! Da . . .! (Nachdem er die Wohnzimmer geöffnet): . . . Ach, das sind Sie? (IV, 96)
>
> Keith: Hören Sie . . . Der Lärm! Das Getöse!-- Das bedeutet nichts Gutes . . . (IV, 96)
>
> Keith: Ich kann es nicht!--Ich kann es nicht!-- Das ist sie . . .! (IV, 96)
>
> Keith: (sich wie ein Verzweifelter wehrend, ruft): Polizei!--Polizei! (Bemerkt Casimir und klammert sich an ihn an.) Retten Sie mich, um Gottes willen! Ich werde gelyncht! (IV, 97)
>
> Keith (immer noch den Revolver in der Linken haltend): Ich--ich habe dieses Unglück-- nicht zu verantworten . . . (IV, 98)
>
> Keith (in der Linken den Revolver, in der Rechten das Geld, tut einige Schritte nach dem Diwan, bebt aber entsetzt züruck. Darauf betrachtet er unschlüssig abwechselnd den Revolver und das Geld.--Indem er den Revolver grinsend hinter sich auf den Mitteltisch legt): Das Leben ist eine Rutschbahn . . .

His walk, complicated by a severe limp, is as jerky as his sentences, and at times it almost seems that his motion literally bounces out the words. He doesn't sit down,

he throws himself into a chair; almost immediately he stands up again. He accompanies almost every visitor in and out, like a dog sniffing out potential friends and enemies. Thus, in a Wedekind world which is out of joint, where man no longer knows where to turn, the protagonist's speech has become fragmentary and halting. As demonstrated above, on occasion it fails entirely and it then gives way to frustrated gestures and emotional outcry.

Keith's maturity and worldly experience frequently compensate for the fact that his mind clearly runs faster than either his words or his legs. He is always ready with a witty phrase or potent aphorism, whose number and general applicability not only could, but did fill an entire book, published under the title Also sprach der Marquis von Keith.[129] A few examples of these phrases of "gesunder Menschenverstand," any one of which could just as likely have been spoken by Courage or Azdak, will serve to show the Brechtian nature of their content and implications:

> Es gibt keine Ideen, seien sie sozialer, wissenschaftlicher oder künstlischer Art, die irgend etwas anderes als Hab und Gut zum Gegenstand hätten (IV, 8).
>
> Meine Begabung beschränkt sich auf die leidige Tatsache, daß ich in bürgerlicher Atmosphäre nicht atmen kann (IV, 10).
>
> Je höher ich gelange, desto vertrauensvoller kommt man mir entgegen. Ich warte auch tatsächlich nur noch auf diejenige Region, in der die Kreuzung von Philosoph und Pferdedieb ihrem vollen Wert entsprechend gewürdigt wird (IV, 11).

> Man kann weinen Mitmenschen nicht mehr in dieser Welt nützen, als wenn man in der umfassendsten Weise auf seinen eigenen Vorteil ausgeht (IV, 21).
>
> Was ist Sünde!! (IV, 29)
>
> Sünde ist eine mythologische Bezeichnung für schlechte Geschäfte. Gute Geschäfte lassen sich nun einmal nur innerhalb der bestehenden Gesellschaftsordnung machen (IV, 30).
>
> Die Wahrheit ist unser kostbarstes Lebensgut, und man kann nicht sparsam genug damit umgehen (IV, 31).
>
> Dem richtigen Komponisten ist sein Verstand nur ein Hindernis (IV, p. 32).
>
> Mit Feuerwerk blendet man keinen Hund, aber der vernünftigste Mensch fühlt sich beleidigt, wenn man ihm keines vormacht (IV, 32).

The frequency of such maxims is illustrated by the close or identical page numbers, and they continue right up to the final line of the drama, when Keith, with a sardonic grin, makes his all-encompassing pronouncement on existence: "Das Leben ist eine Rutschbahn . . ." (IV, 98).

Keith is surrounded by an entourage of purely Wedekindian types, whose clear delineation and atmospheric function totally separate them from the lesser importance of the minor characters of the Aristotelian drama. Hermann Casimir, whose effeminate nature is accentuated through the portrayal of the role by a girl, is a rich, rebellious brat who pumps money from Keith while the latter is attempting to use the prodigy as an inroad to the father. His desire to flee to Paris or London is hardly more than talk, since he is tied to the security of his father's

moneybelt, and Keith, his hero, constantly advises him to take advantage of his propitious situation and, of all things, to steer clear of confidence men. Hermann flits in and out of the drama like a pesky insect which is harmless, and yet irritable, and his sole redeeming quality is that he is pathetically comical.

Keith's potential "great" artists represent a collection of dilettantes who are as useless as their respective works. Saranieff paints forged pictures by the dozen which don't sell any better than did his originals, Zamrjaki composes something which is only remotely reminiscent of music, and Sommersberg's career as an author came to an unfortunate termination when he went without food for two days and had to go out and beg. Their parasitic, Bohemian existence is characterized by a corollary lack of true partisanship and, while idolizing Keith in his presence, they would probably be more than willing to stab him in the back if it meant continuing their life in this modern "Schlaraffenland." Keith even gives Sommersberg the opportunity to start a new career, as a forger, but as the outcome of the drama illustrates, his ability with simple handwriting was no better than with creative writing.

One of the most interesting characters in the drama is Raspe, the commissioner of detectives. His career as a student of theology resulted ("durch zu vieles

Studieren" [IV, 30]) in his total departure from religion, and a corresponding drop to the lowest depths of society, ending with two years in prison. His boyishly pretty features make him a real ladies' man, and temptation was his constant downfall. Following his prison stint, he reformed his nature and joined the side of his former foe. As a detective spy, however, he is not above using his information to his own advantage, including the betrayal of his apparent friend Keith. His profession is implicitly reflected in his speech, as he constantly uses conversation to questioningly seek out information.

Seppi and Kathi, expressively renamed Sascha and Simba by Keith, are the loyal servants who, at the first sign of danger, are the first to switch sides. Their lower class origins are illustrated in the use of the same Bavarian dialect as spoken by the group of Hofbräuhaus patrons who carry in Molly's body in the final scene. Further, Simba's name reflects her natural animalism, and her function as a carefree bedmate for everyone and anyone clearly relates her to Wedekind's line of "Freudenmädchen." Keith explains the significance of her mundane position in his household on the same basis as his own struggle for upward recognition: "Das Geschöpf rechnet das [ihre Stelle als Aufwärterin] zur Ehre an, weil es dabei Gelegenheit findet, die unbegrenzte Verachtung zu bekämpfen, mit der sie von der gesamten bürgerlichen

Gesellschaft behandelt wird" (IV, 29). Saranieff calls her "eine geborene Dirne" (IV, 55); Wedekind himself introduces her as "ein echtes Münchener Mädel, mit frischen Farben, leichtem Schritt, üppigem roten Haar . . . " (IV, 52). The full impact of her personality, however, comes out best when she characterizes herself in the befitting Bavarian dialect, as in the passage:

> Sozialdemokratin hätt i können werden. Weltverbesserung, Menschheitsbeglückung, das san so dem sein Spezialitäten. Noa, woaßt, ich bin fein net für die Sozialdemokraten. Die san mir z'moralisch! Wann die amal z'regieren anfangen, nachher da is aus mit die Champagnersoupers (IV, 54).

What good is there in saving the world if in doing so you eliminate all the fun?

The remaining characters can be considered in their group functions. The first is constituted of the "caryatids," the solid businessmen of Munich, and their wives. These three couples are sarcastically presented as successful, but somewhat meaningless puppets. The men are totally submerged under the power of Casimir and, despite their own influence and finances, they would not dare to do anything in which the man did not take part. The women are a "typical" group of upper class social climbers, and their primary concern in life at the present moment is whether or not Keith will be able to develop them into performers of one sort or another for his entertainment center. The group of tradesmen who enter with

Molly's body in the final scene stands in distinct contrast to these inconsequential busybodies. The righteous indignation, human compassion and violent demand for recourse expressed in the words of the butcher's apprentice, baker's wife and the porter show a feeling for human life which is totally divorced from the amoral atmosphere of the business world which reigns throughout the remainder of the drama. Keith's function as a non-hero is almost extended to that of an anti-hero, since his overriding concern for money and power not only drove Molly to her death, but also kept him so absorbed that he had not even taken the time to look for her. The body, it turned out, had been lying in the water for eight days.

Wedekind could easily have left a great number of these characters out of Der Marquis von Keith; the fact that he did not illustrates his principal basis of technique, that of demonstrative contrast. He illuminates his main character not only through self-characterization, but also through the reflections which come from a wide variety of surrounding characters. Keith's conflict with the basic questions of existence, especially that between the established member of society and the aspiring outsider, can be viably presented only if we are given a picture of the world from which these problems arise. The inherent relationship between problematics and their exemplification through visible and realistic contrasts literally forces,

even in a drama which adheres otherwise to the classical unities, a total departure from the Aristotelian approach to characters and language.

CONCLUSIONS

Frank Wedekind's consistent failures in life can be seen to a great extent as the ultimate source for his posthumous success and recognition. His literary career consisted primarily of a series of conflicts with the censor, with everyone involved in dramatic production, from the directors to the actors, and with his contemporaries, especially Hauptmann. His personal life revolved around his constant attempts to become accepted into the secure normalcy of bourgeois society, the same society which he so ardently despised and attacked. At the same time, however, there was always an obvious desire to retain the freedom of the Bohemian parasite, but he never really fit in this class either. Even his marriage, so vividly described by his wife Tilly in her aptly titled autobiography Lulu--die Rolle meines Lebens, contained far more conflict than actual love. Wedekind was, simply stated, an outsider. Throughout his life his undeserved reputation was one of infamy and not of fame.

As a result of these experiences, however, Wedekind certainly knew what life is all about. His dramas reflect a potent reality which can only come from having lived such situations himself. The stage was for Wedekind, as it was

for Brecht and all those related to the epic theater, an outlet for aggression and criticism. He chose as the basis of dramatic action in his dramas the type of irreconcilable conflicts which seemingly belie solution, and which can only be presented on the stage in the form of demonstration. This problematic basis, more than any other single factor, forces in turn a complete departure from the linear structure of the Aristotelian drama.

The preceding examination has clearly shown that, having chosen this existential basis of conflict, Wedekind works from the principle of demonstrative exemplification which serves as the structural groundwork of the epic theater. While the employment of epic techniques varies from work to work, there is not a single Wedekind drama which does not display epic treatment with respect to the elements of dramatic action and characters and language. This is true even of dramas such as Der Marquis von Keith and Der Schnellmaler oder Kunst und Mammon, both of which otherwise adhere quite closely to the characteristics of the Aristotelian drama. Frühlings Erwachen and the "Lulu Plays," on the other hand, exhibit a total correspondence to the characteristics of the epic drama, and deserve full recognition as examples of this particular literary phenomenon. It can be safely stated, in fact, that there is not a single technique employed by Brecht which is not found someplace in Wedekind's dramas.

The avenues of further and more intensified research which result from this examination are numerous. Each of the general topic areas represented in the chapter divisions deserves further expansion, a fact which has become more and more evident as this study progressed. Further, a number of the dramas not specifically discussed, such as So ist das Leben (König Nicolo) and Schloß Wetterstein, could and should be treated at length as individual studies in and of themselves. Finally, Wedekind's influence on other areas of modern drama, particularly the Theater of the Absurd and the drama of Luigi Pirandello, is worthy of specific examination.

The purpose of this dissertation, to illustrate Wedekind's positive relationship to the epic theater, has, however, been served. The following quote from Max Spalter will suffice as a last example of the inherent relationship between Wedekind and Brecht. It reads: " . . . cynical nihilism seems to be the message when it is bluntly stated that morality is only possible on a full belly and that one man's full belly means someone else has been fed on; that no matter what values men say they live by, they live hypocritically; that most men cannot possibly be cunning or evil enough to make a go of things; that even outstanding men are not immune to pure instinct; and, to top it all off, that the worst fools are those who sacrifice personal comfort to make a better world."[130] The tone and content

of these words sound like something from Keith, or Schon or any number of others through whom Wedekind speaks; the reference is in fact, however, to Brecht's Die Dreigroschenoper.

FOOTNOTES

1. From the commentary of Ferdinand Avenarius in the court case Dehmel versus Munchhausen, quoted by Artur Kutscher in Frank Wedekind: Sein Leben und seine Werke, III (Munich, 1931), p. 64. Kutscher cites as his sources Kunstwart 15. XI. 97 and H. H. Houben, Verbotene Literatur, 121 f. Underlining added.

2. e.g., the necessity of sex education for adolescents before or during the stage of puberty and corresponding clarification for adults to prepare them to give such training; the necessity to question the entire institution of censorship (especially in its vague position as guardian of middle class moral values); and his general opinions, similar to those of his contemporary Freud, of sex as a driving human instinct. Like Brecht, Wedekind also challenged the "culinary" theater of his own day and saw the need for revision in and of the theater if it was to accommodate the reality of modern society.

3. Frühlings Erwachen, for example, considered by many to be Wedekind's greatest contribution to German literature, was originally published at the author's own expense in 1891 (going almost totally unnoticed at that time) and was not performed until 1906.

4. After repeated attempts to free his drama Totentanz (later renamed Tod und Teufel) from a censorial production ban, Wedekind finally made a personal appeal to two of the board members, the literature professors Franz Mucker and Emil Sulger-Gebing, with the hope of receiving their educated backing. It was apparently Wedekind's opinion that these men of letters would be able to discern artistic from moral values. Much to his chagrin that is precisely what they did. As Kutscher relates: "Die Herren äußerten sich aber ganz anders als er [Wedekind] gehofft hatte, sie befürworteten die Aufführung, welcher keine sittlichen Bedenken im Wege stünden, verneinten aber den dramatischen Charakter, ja stellten überhaupt die Möglichkeit einer künstlerischen Wirkung in Abrede." See Kutscher, III (1931), p. 56.

5. Paul Fechter, Frank Wedekind: Der Mensch und das Werk (Jena, 1920), see esp. pp. 35, 42 and 168-169.

6. See Kutscher, I (1922), pp. 171, 177, 249-254 et passim; II (1927), pp. 33, 86, 96, 254, 261 et passim; III (1931), pp. 25, 278 et passim.

7. One notable exception is Max Spalter, who includes an entire chapter on Wedekind and discusses a number of his dramas in relation to epic aspects in Max Spalter, Brecht's Tradition (Baltimore, 1967), pp. 112-135.

8. Kutscher, III (1931), p. 64.

CHAPTER I

9. Bertolt Brecht, "Betrachtung über die Schwierigkeiten des epischen Theaters," in Bertolt Brecht, Gesammelte Werke in 20 Bänden [Werkausgabe Edition Suhrkamp] (Frankfurt a. M., 1967), XV ("Schriften zum Theater I"), p. 132--hereafter cited as Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, with the appropriate volume title and number.

10. The final collection of Brecht's theoretical writings, entitled "Die Dialektik auf dem Theater" (Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, XVI "Schriften zum Theater II," pp. 868-941) begins, "Die nachfolgenden Arbeiten . . . legen die Vermutung nahe, daß die Bezeichnung 'episches Theater' für das gemeinte (und zum Teil praktizierte) Theater zu formal ist. Episches Theater ist für diese Darbietungen wohl die Voraussetzung, jedoch erschließt es allein noch nicht die Produktivität und Änderbarkeit der Gesellschaft, aus welchen Quellen sie das Hauptvergnügen schöpfen müssen. Die Bezeichnung muß daher als unzureichend bezeichnet werden, ohne daß eine neue angeboten werden kann" (869). Brecht was thus careful not to outwardly suggest a replacement for his original term epic, but it had been clear for a number of years that the idea of a "dialectical theater" was utmost on his mind. See also the "Nachträge zum 'Kleinen Organon'" in Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, XVI "Schriften zum Theater II," p. 701, wherein Brecht clearly states that one reason for dropping the term epic is its static appearance as opposed to the word dramatic.

11. The German word "Dramaturg," used in connection with people such as Wedekind and Brecht, implies much more than its English counterpart, which means simply playwright or dramatist. The German "Dramaturg" may be a dramatist, director, critic, producer, etc., or any combination of these. For a brief but inclusive discussion of the German use of the words "Dramaturg" and "Dramaturgie" see Gero von Wilpert, Sachwörterbuch der Literatur (Stuttgart, 1964), pp. 145-147.

12. The narrative function of the chorus in the Greek drama is certainly epic in nature and serves, even if without the express purpose of doing so, to keep the

audience from total identification with the action, much like Brecht's concept of "Verfremdung," especially as seen in the person of the narrator. Brecht himself was quick to admit that "in stilistischer Hinsicht ist das epische Theater nichts besonders Neues. Mit seinem Ausstellungscharakter und seiner Betonung des Artistischen ist es dem uralten asiatischen Theater verwandt. Lehrhafte Tendenzen zeigte sowohl das mittelalterliche Mysterienspiel als auch das klassische spanische und das Jesuitentheater." Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, XV "Schriften zum Theater I," p. 272.

13. Maria Ley-Piscator, for example, prefaces her work The Piscator Experiment (New York, 1967), p. v, with the comment from Kenneth Tynan that "epic theater is a phrase which Brecht borrowed from Piscator in the twenties and went on defining until the end of his life." Whether or not this statement is accurate is merely a question of idle curiosity, but it is certain that Brecht learned and borrowed a great deal from Piscator in the early years of their association. Neither, however, was the first to use the phrase epic theater, nor will it ever be certain (or for that matter of great importance) who was.

14. Here again the question of who actually initiated the use of the term "Verfremdung" is of little importance other than to show that it was not totally novel with Brecht as some critics assert. Rheinhold Grimm has found a number of instances where Berthold Auerbach, a close friend of Spielhagen, used the concept of "Verfremdung," in a manner similar to the later ideas of Brecht, as early as 1875. See Rheinhold Grimm, "Naturalismus und episches Drama," in Episches Theater, ed. Rheinhold Grimm (Cologne and Berlin, 1966), pp. 27-28 and 34, n. 106. John Willet on the other hand, traces Brecht's specific use of the term to the Russian "Priem Ostrannenija" or "device for making strange," a phrase used frequently by the Russian critic Viktor Shklovskij. Willet's claim seems quite logical, since Brecht first began using the term after a visit to Moscow in the spring of 1935. See John Willet, The Theater of Bertolt Brecht: A Study from Eight Aspects (London, 1959), pp. 177-179 and 208-209; also Brecht on Theater, ed. and trans. John Willet (New York, 1964), p. 99.

15. See Willet, The Theater of Bertolt Brecht, pp. 190-212, esp. p. 209. Willet makes it clear that Brecht had at least three strikes against him before his dramas even came to bat in the Soviet Union and the other Eastern Block countries: his aversion to the accepted naturalistic style of Stanislavsky, his refusal to

sacrifice experimentation in favor of a standard (party designated) method of writing and production, and the very simple fact that his Marxism and communism were self-styled and, in the eyes of the party, somewhat unorthodox.

16. Klaus Ziegler, "Das deutsche Drama der Neuzeit," in Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, II (Berlin, Bielefeld, Munich, 1960), cols. 1997-2350.

17. Franz Hübert Crumbach, Die Struktur des Epischen Theaters: Dramaturgie der Kontraste (Braunschweig, 1960).

18. Volker Klotz, Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama (Munich, 1969).

19. e.g., the "theater of the scientific age" is one of the dominant themes in the "Kleines Organon fur das Theater." Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, XVI "Schriften zum Theater I," pp. 661-707.

20. Klotz, p. 29.

21. Ibid., p. 62.

22. Ibid., p. 90.

23. It is interesting to note, however, that this analogy applies not only to the Aristotelian and, as will be seen, epic theaters, but also to the so-called Theater of the Absurd. Estragon and Vladimir, central figures in Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot, represent the perfect example. In essence these two figures demonstrate the reduction of the drama (compared here to the atom) to a study of two isolated neutrons suspended in a vague world devoid of our normal conceptions of time and space. One could say that matter is reduced here to the immaterial in order that it may once again be recognized and understood as matter.

24. Brecht, "Über Stoffe und Form," in Gesammelte Werke, XV "Schriften zum Theater I," p. 196.

25. Ibid., p. 197.

26. Spalter, p. xii.

27. Brecht, "Kann die heutige Welt durch Theater wiedergegeben werden?", in Gesammelte Werke, XVI "Schriften zum Theater II," p. 931.

28. Willet, The Theater of Bertolt Brecht, pp. 76-77.

29. Brecht's theater is inclusive and can only be understood as theater; it begins with the first moment of conception of an idea in the mind of the dramatist and isn't completed until the eventual moment of cognition in the mind of the spectator following the performance. As he says in his "Betrachtung über die Schwierigkeiten des epischen Theaters" (see n. 5 above), it includes the "Darstellung durch den Schauspieler, Bühnentechnik, Dramaturgie, Theatermusik, Filmverwendung und so weiter." It is thus much more than the introduction of certain epic elements into the drama, as for instance is the case in Goethe's Götz von Berlichingen, which might be considered by some to fall into a limited category of epic drama, but which certainly could not be considered epic theater as conceived by Brecht.

30. Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, XVIII "Schriften zum Theater III," pp. 1009-1010.

31. See n. 9 above.

32. Since these terms are all quite flexible and somewhat confusing in both languages, an attempt was made to match the German terms as closely as possible to the English definitions given in A Dictionary of Literary Terms, ed. Sylvan Barnet, Morton Berman and William Burto (Boston and Toronto, 1960), pp. 67-68. While opinions may vary as to the validity of the correspondences, they will at least aid in clarifying the way the terms will be used in the present study and should be viewed as such.

33. See Klotz, pp. 25-38 and 99-112.

34. Two terms, however, deserve some attention. Klotz (p. 112) defines "Integrationspunkt" as ". . . der Fluchtpunkt, in dem die vielerlei Perspektiven des Dramas koordinieren. Integrationspunkt in den Soldaten [Lenz] ist die programmatische Schlußszene, im Woyzeck [Büchner] das Märchen der Großmutter, in Frühlings Erwachen [Wedekind] die Friedhofszene mit dem vermummten Herrn, im Baal [Brecht] der vorausgestellte 'Choral vom großen Baal'."

"Verfremdung" is a central concept (and possibly the single most important) in Brecht's theoretical writings and therefore, since Klotz (and also Crumbach) treats it only briefly, worthy of expansion in a rather lengthy but necessary footnote. "Verfremdung" is normally translated into English as alienation, estrangement, disillusion or distancing. While each of the words gives a general impression

of the idea of strangeness desired by Brecht, they also imply other factors which detract from their use as equivalents. Estrangement and alienation contain an element of hostility, disillusion normally has the side effect of sadness and distancing implies remoteness, none of which relates directly to the meaning and use of "Verfremdung." Perhaps the best suggestion so far is John Willet's choice of the word reorientation (Willet, The Theater of Bertolt Brecht, p. 179). Reorientation seems to be precisely what Brecht desired when saying that "der V-Effekt besteht darin, daß das Ding, das zum verständnis gebracht, auf welches das Augenmerk gelenkt werden soll, aus einem gewöhnlichen, bekannten, unmittelbar vorliegenden Ding zu einem besonderen, auffälligen, unerwarteten Ding gemacht wird. Das Selbstverständliche wird in gewisser Weise unverständlich gemacht, das geschieht aber nur, um es dann um so verständlicher zu machen. Damit aus dem Bekannten etwas erkanntes werden kann, muß es aus seiner Unauffälligkeit herauskommen, es muß mit der Gewohnheit gebrochen werden, das betreffende Ding bedürfe keiner Erläuterung." From Brecht, "Kurze Beschreibung einer neuen Technik der Schauspielkunst, die einen Verfremdungseffekt hervorbringt," in Gesammelte Werke, XV "Schriften zum Theater I," p. 355.

This same paragraph (p. 356) contains two excellent examples offered by Brecht to aid in the understanding of "Verfremdung" or reorientation. Brecht says: "Damit ein Mann seine Mutter als Weib eines Mannes sieht, ist ein V-Effekt nötig, er tritt zum Beispiel ein, wenn er einen Stiefvater bekommt. Wenn einer seinen Lehrer vom Gerichtsvollzieher bedrängt sieht, entsteht ein V-Effekt; aus einem Zusammenhang gerissen worden, wo der Lehrer groß erscheint, ist er in einem Zusammenhang gerissen worden, wo er klein erscheint." From these examples and the above definition, it is clear that strangeness or alienation is only the first step in a process of true (re)cognition. The spectator is forced to reorient his ideas in such a manner that meanings exceed words or perceived values, that reality ("Sein") breaks through the barrier of customary appearance ("Schein"). When looking in the mirror you see the image of what you have come to accept as yourself and nothing more; a blind man, given the same opportunity, would experience somewhat of a revelation, especially if the image didn't correspond to the previously projected features in his mind. Brecht wants us to look at everything as if for the first time because so much now passes blindly before our eyes and minds.

"Verfremdung" is normally used, as above, in combination with the word "Effekt." This combination can be misleading, however, if "Verfremdungseffekt" is taken to mean only the end result or effect produced in the

spectator. Crumbach states, for instance, that "die Form eines Werkes an sich keinen 'Effekt' enthalten kann. Indem der schaffende Künstler die Wirkung bestimmter Szenen seines Werkes auf das Publikum in Rechnung stellt, wird er folgerichtig bei diesem den gewünschten 'Effekt' verursachen. Uns obliegt es also, die Ursache selbst zu ergründen." Crumbach, pp. 105-106. As used by Brecht, however, this interpretation seems to be quite one-sided. "Verfremdungseffekt" in Brecht's dramas and theoretical writings implies not only the end effect, but also its inherent cause (in a sense similar to that of a stage effect). Thus the famous "Glotzt nicht so romantisch!" placard from Trommeln in der Nacht is the scenic stage effect which in turn produces a causal effect of reorientation in the mind of the spectator. Both come under the classification of "Verfremdungseffekt" as discussed and desired by Brecht himself. The former, the idea of effect as stage effect, also complies with Willet's theory that Brecht derived the term from the Russian "Priem Ostrannenija" or device for making strange (see n. 14 above).

For a more thorough and extensive discussion of Brecht's use of the term in the theater in general and the drama in particular, see Rheinhold Grimm, Bertolt Brecht: Die Struktur seines Werkes (Nürnberg, 1968). Grimm views the total concept of "Verfremdung" as the basis of all Brecht's writings and ideas on the drama, and deals with it in its various structural aspects.

35. The use of geometric terminology in the following discussion of structural elements in the Aristotelian and epic theaters is not intended as a "new" approach to this problem, nor should it be viewed as a theory in its own right. Its sole purpose is to relate the basic contrasts between the two types of theater in a manner which simplifies explanation and clarification for the average student or theater viewer who is not familiar with the normal terminology and/or theories involved in such a discussion.

The method has been tested on two unrelated groups, one consisting primarily of literature students and the other composed of a heterogeneous group from the general university community. The discussion was used as a basic introduction to a film version of Schiller's Wallenstein and a stage production of Brecht's Der kaukasische Kreidekreis. Following the presentations each group was able to point out, with an equally high degree of accuracy, the primary points of divergence in the productions, as well as being able to locate elements of the Aristotelian theater in the epic production and vice versa.

The original conception of this method, and further justification for its use, stems from the philosophically

problematic conflicts dealt with in the epic theater. The epic dramatist is concerned with the challenge of our basic existence and the inherent questions arising from this challenge. Such ontological problems find their original roots in the philosophy of Descartes, whose basic thesis "I think, therefore I am" (cogito ergo sum) leads automatically to the antithetical question "What am I?" Descartes, considered to be the father of both modern philosophy and modern math (based on the principles of geometry), attempted to find the synthesis in this dialectical problem in the same empirical manner as outlined above for Brecht, namely through observation and measurement of subjective values.

36. Quoted from Barnet, et al., A Dictionary of Literary Terms, p. 68.

37. Klotz, p. 216.

38. Emil Staiger, Grundbegriffe der Poetik (Zurich, 1963), p. 165.

39. Staiger, p. 165.

40. Ibid., p. 165.

41. C. G. Jung, "BewuBtes und Unbewußtes," in Beiträge zur Psychologie, ed. E. Böhler (Frankfurt a. M. and Hamburg, 1957), pp. 32, 33 and 30 (as listed), quoted in Crumbach, p. 222.

42. Staiger, p. 140.

43. Staiger defines problem in its original meaning as "das Vorgeworfene, das der Werfende in der Bewegung einholen muß" (p. 160), by geometric definition the moving point which must be limited by a beginning and end in the form of a line segment. The epic dramatist cannot limit the problem in the same fashion, cannot halt the moving point. Nor in fact does he want to, since it is precisely this "Bewegung" or in Brecht's terms the "Gang der Handlung" which he wishes to demonstrate and not its goal.

44. Klotz, pp. 101-104.

45. Crumbach, pp. 20-21, 33, et passim.

46. Klotz, pp. 67-71 and 149-156.

47. Staiger, pp. 117-118.

48. Ibid., p. 162.

49. Staiger, p. 139. Staiger remarks in another instance, however, "Ein solcher Organismus ist zweifellos Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea, die Odysee und die Ilias aber nicht. Aus einem Organismus kann man nicht große Stücke ausschneiden, ohne das Leben des Ganzen zu gefährden. Die Ilias aber könnte man auf die Hälfte, ja auf ein Drittel verkürzen, ohne daß jemand, der den Rest nicht kennte, etwas vermissen würde" (p. 116). Therefore while he is actually using this designation to prove the opposite point of that shown in the present text, this does not actually represent a distortion of usage when applied to the combined form of epic and dramatic found in the epic theater. Despite the opinion of many critics, there are actually very few scenes in the majority of the more well constructed dramas which could be cut without missing something. This is especially true of the relationship between the scene and the greater whole or circle; the scenes are independent in and of themselves, but they are neither random nor superfluous.

50. Klotz, p. 221.

51. Margret Dietrich, "Episches Theater?", in Grimm, Episches Theater, p. 108.

52. Klotz, pp. 38-45 and 113-120.

53. Ibid., pp. 45-59 and 120-136.

54. Staiger, p. 165.

55. The same methods used to unify the dramatic action in the Aristotelian theater (exposition, messenger reports, etc.) also serve to unify the elements of time and space. The messenger report, for example, avoids the necessity to shift locations in order to illustrate essential background material, and brings completed actions from the past and the potential results of future plans into the unified framework of the given forward motion of the action or line. This explicit deliniation of large time units gives us the illusion of different time phases or qualities, when in fact there is never a true deviation from the very abbreviated time segment presented on the stage.

56. Dietrich, "Episches Theater?", in Grimm, Episches Theater, p. 108.

57. Friedrich Dürrenmatt is a master in the use of stage effects (objects) as functional units with intrinsic value. The reader is therefore referred

especially to his Ein Engel kommt nach Babylon (Zurich, 1957), where a maximum of such objects is employed, and Play Strindberg (Zurich, 1969) where, in contrast, the utmost is achieved from the very minimum of well chosen effects.

58. Crumbach, p. 28.

59. Klotz, pp. 59-66 and 136-148.

60. Ibid., pp. 72-89 and 156-214.

61. Ibid., p. 77. Stressing the unity of speech as a reflection of the total unified world of the Aristotelian theater, Klotz goes on to say: "Die Partner schlagen nicht unbedacht und regellos aufeinander ein, sie verfügen sich über ein bestimmtes Reservoir an Figuren, die sie nicht selbst während des Kampfes erfinden, sondern allein höfischen und tragödienwürdigen Personen selbstverständlicher Besitz sind."

62. Brecht, "Die Straßenszene," in Gesammelte Werke, XVI "Schriften zum Theater II," pp. 546-558.

63. Fechter, Frank Wedekind, p. 27.

64. That this opinion is not purely personal is shown in the following quote from the eminent German professor Egon Schwarz, taken from his article "Hesse, the American Youth Movement, and Problems of Literary Evaluation," PMLA, 85 (1970), pp. 986-987: "I am tired of the abused word 'relevance' in inappropriate contexts; and I am deeply convinced that literature, be it contemporary or of the Spanish Golden Age or the Periclean period, is not irrelevant. What is irrelevant is a literary scholarship that artificially isolates its subject from the world and refuses to study its connections with the life around it; or in the case of a work of the past, a scholarship that ignores the conditions of life which produced it and to which it addressed itself; a scholarship that fails to relate to the milieu from which it is perceived and into which it is being absorbed by the very fact of dealing with it."

65. Contribution by Thomas Mann to Das Wedekindbuch, ed. Joachim Friedenthal (Munich and Leibzig, 1914), p. 224.

66. Brecht, Gesammelte Werke, XV "Schriften zum Theater I," pp. 337-388.

67. Frank Wedekind, Gesammelte Werke, ed. Artur Kutscher and Richard Friedenthal (Munich, 1924), VII,

pp. 299-324. Citations from Wedekind are all to this definitive nine-volume edition--hereafter cited as Werke. Wherever possible citations will be placed parenthetically in the text itself, with reference given to the appropriate volume and page.

68. Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz, Werke und Schriften, ed. Britta Titel and Helmut Haug (Stuttgart, 1966), I, p. 360.

69. Wedekind, Werke, VII, p. 317.

70. Kutscher, III (1931), p. 273.

71. Martin Esslin, Brecht: The Man and His Work, 2nd ed., rev. (New York, 1971), p. 120.

72. Kutscher, III (1931), pp. 236-238. Kutscher cites as the source for his quoted material Kurt Martens, II, 168 f., which apparently refers to the letter's (title?) Schonungslose Lebenschronik (Vienna, 1924), cited earlier in Kutscher, II (1927), p. 6.

CHAPTER II

73. Spoken by Fridolin Wald in the final scene of Wedekind's first complete drama, Der Schnellmaler oder Kunst und Mammon in Werke, VII, p. 77.

74. In "Was ich mir dabei dachte," a series of personal comments on his own works, Wedekind makes the following statement on Frühlings Erwachen: "Ich begann zu schreiben, ohne irgendeinen Plan, mit der Absicht zu schreiben, was mir Vergnügen macht. Der Plan entstand nach der dritten Szene und setzte sich aus persönlichen Erlebnissen oder Erlebnissen meiner Schulkameraden zusammen. Fast jede Szene entspricht einem wirklichen Vorgang. Sogar die Worte: 'Der Junge war nicht von mir,' die man mir als krasse Übertreibung vorgeworfen, fielen in Wirklichkeit" (Werke, IX, p. 424).

75. Spalter, p. 116.

76. Wedekind, like Brecht, found it extremely difficult to stimulate the proper reception of his humor, primarily because it frequently went unnoticed or was understressed in the various interpretations of the directors. Frühlings Erwachen, like Brecht's Mutter Courage and Der kaukasische Kreidekreis, cannot be produced

effectively unless the basic mood of tragedy is balanced with an equal accent on the humorous elements. The following excerpt from a letter to Fritz Basil dated 3. I. 1907 (Frank Wedekind, Gesammelte Briefe, ed. Fritz Strich [Munich, 1924], II, p. 170) openly vents Wedekind's frustration and desires on this subject: "Ich wurde hier in Berlin erst zur 10. Probe [of Frühlings Erwachen] zugelassen und fand da eine leibhaftige wirkliche Tragödie mit den höchsten dramatischen Tönen vor, in der Humor gänzlich fehlte. Ich tat mein möglichstes, um den Humor zur Geltung zu bringen, ganz besonders in der Figur der Wendla, in allen Szenen mit ihrer Mutter, auch in der letzten, das Intellektuelle, das Spielerische zu heben und das Leidenschaftliche zu dämpfen, auch in der Schlußszene auf dem Kirchhof. Ich glaube, daß das Stück um so ergreifender wirkt, je harmloser, je sonniger, je lachender es gespielt wird. So vor allem der Monolog von Moritz, Schluß vom 2. Akt, den ich bis auf den Schluß durchaus lustig sprechen ließ. Ich glaube, daß das Stück, wenn die Tragik und Leidenschaftlichkeit betont wird, leicht abstoßend wirken kann." Eric Bentley, in a public discussion following a performance of Brecht's Kreidekreis at Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois, March 16, 1972, mentioned that in a number of personal interviews Brecht had made similar demands for the production of his pieces, and particularly Kreidekreis.

77. Klotz, p. 112.

78. Spalter, p. 119.

79. Ibid., p. 119.

80. The fatalistic consequences of this alternative are clearly underscored in the final scene when The Masked Man tells Moritz: "Sie standen doch wahrlich im letzten Augenblick noch zwischen T o d und L e b e n" (II, p. 173).

81. Actually Lulu's heritage can be traced back yet another step to Ella, Wedekind's first portraiture of a "Freudenmädchen" in the dramatic fragment Elins Erweckung (1887). Also present in this piece, important because of its function as a place of infant experimentation with the artistic forms and thematic ideas which found their realization in Frühlings Erwachen, is Schigolch, the intentionally vague personage who constantly pops up out of nowhere in the "Lulu Plays," and is the reputed father of both Lulu and her counterpart Ella. His apparitional nature in both works combines with the fact that he first appears in Elins Erweckung in a graveyard scene similar to that in Frühlings Erwachen to link him also to the mysterious Masked Man.

82. Lulu's death is prefigured in Frühlings Erwachen, when Ilse relates her satanic episode with Heinrich, which she ends with his threatening prediction: "Wenn du schläfst, bist du zum Morden schön!" (II, 140).

83. Spalter, p. 124.

84. Wedekind's circus analogy immediately calls to mind Brecht's parallel desire to exchange the boring atmosphere of the theater with that of the active participation found in the common sports arena. See Brecht's "Mehr guten Sport" in Gesammelte Werke, XV "Schriften zum Theater I," pp. 81-84.

85. While Wedekind's use of anticipation ("Vorausdeutung") is not quite as obvious as that in the first scene of Courage, where each of her children draws the black cross of death far in advance of their separate tragedies, a careful reading of the "Lulu Plays" yields the finding that every death, including that of Lulu herself, is anticipated previous to the actual event, quite frequently by the victim himself.

86. Schön, the outgrowth of the supreme egoism and cold realism exhibited already in Melchior Gabor, is the direct descendant of a line of similar characters who find their culmination in the person of Keith, the epitomy of pure, selfish ego.

87. Sol Gittleman, Frank Wedekind (New York, 1969), p. 72.

88. Wilhelm Emrich, "Wedekind: Die Lulu-Tragödie," in Das deutsche Drama, ed. Benno von Wiese (Düsseldorf, 1964), II, pp. 209-210.

89. The original manuscript, of which only one copy dated 1895 has been retained, called for a five act drama entitled Die Büchse der Pandora: Eine Monstretragödie. According to Kutscher it was impossible to determine whether Wedekind divided his original drama for artistic or other personal reasons, or if it was merely a question of public reaction to the original content. Wedekind apparently went along with the changes quite willingly, because the first publication of Erdgeist in the same year already reflects the major changes, including the addition of an extra act between the original second and third. For more information see Kutscher, I (1922), pp. 338-356.

90. The prologue, a conversation in a bookstore among a "normaler Leser," a "rühriger Verleger," a

"verschamter Autor" and a "hoher Staatsanwalt" is nothing more than a weak reflection of the challenges which Wedekind had to face on the part of the general public, his publisher Albert Langen, and the board of censors following the publication of Erdgeist. It is worthy of mention only as an example of Wedekind's use of the prologue form, but its general lack of importance is underscored by the fact that critics such as Spalter, Emrich and Gittleman make no mention of it whatsoever.

91. The implausible phantasy of this escape is sufficiently illustrated in the following summary from Gittleman (p. 74): "[Geschwitz] volunteers as a nurse for cholera victims, steals their undergarments and, wearing the infected clothing, visits Lulu in prison. They exchange underwear, and when both become ill, they are placed together in the isolation ward of the hospital. There Geschwitz masterfully disguises herself as Lulu, thus enabling her friend to escape." The spectator is obviously not expected to question why neither was killed by the disease or to wonder how Geschwitz herself eventually got free. The intended seriousness of this plot becomes clear, however, when Hugenberg, who has himself just escaped from a reform school, comes up with an equally adventurous plan (in an apparent play on the figure of Mortimer in Schiller's Maria Stuart), but only gets laughed at or ignored.

92. Rodrigo, for example, is obviously speaking only to the audience when he makes the provocative statement: "Hier [in Germany] haben sie eine Angst vor der bloßen Haut wie im Auslande vor den Dynamitbomben. Vor zwei Jahren wurde ich im Alhambra-Theater zu fünfzig Mark Strafe verknallt, wie man sah, daß ich ein paar Haare auf der Brust habe, nicht so viel wie zu einer anständigen Zahnbürste nötig sind. Aber der Kulturminister meinte, die kleinen Schulmädchen könnten darüber die Freude am Strümpfstricken verlieren" (III, 125). Alwa, more than ever Wedekind's voice in the drama as the author of Erdgeist, has a purely Brechtian function in this act. The rather lengthy quote which follows is an example of his narrative commentary geared toward definite distancing between audience and actor and between role and reality:

> Das ist der Fluch, der auf unserer jungen Literatur lastet, daß wir viel zu literarisch sind. Wir kennen keine anderen Fragen und Probleme als solche, die unter Schriftstellern und Gelehrten auftauchen. Unser Gesichtskreis reicht über die Grenzen unserer Zunftinteressen nicht hinaus. Um wieder auf die Fährte einer großen gewaltigen Kunst zu gelangen,

> müßten wir uns möglichst viel unter Menschen bewegen, die in ihrem Leben nie ein Buch gelesen haben, denen die einfachsten animalischen Instinkte bei ihren Handlungen maßgebend sind. In meinem 'Erdgeist' habe ich schon aus voller Kraft nach diesen Prinzipien zu arbeiten gesucht. Das Weib, das mir zu der Hauptfigur des Stückes Modell stehen mußte, atmet heute seit einem Jahr hinter vergitterten Fenstern. Dafür wurde das Drama sonderbarerweise allerdings auch nur von der freien literarischen Gesellschaft zur Aufführung gebracht (III, 125-126).

Clearly Alwa has stepped out of his role at this point to express Wedekind's subjective view of the crisis in contemporary literature, and it would be all but impossible for the spectator to totally identify with Alwa as a dramatic personage without seeing the real person Wedekind at the same time.

93. Emrich (p. 225) states this situation quite clearly: "Die Vernichtung ist nicht mehr Erfüllung, ist kein Sieg mehr einer Idee oder wahren Natur wie im klassischen Drama. Lulu geht unter als 'Schlachtvieh', nicht mehr als tragisch sühnendes Opfer. Denn ihre Natur war schon geschlachtet ehe der Lustmörder Jack auftrat, war bereits 'verkauft' trotz Lulus verzweifeltem Sträuben." Lulu's actions have thus already perverted the principle which she was to represent, and her death is therefore merely a negation of the person and not of the principle itself.

94. This scene fully illustrates not only Lulu's total lack of comprehension of her situation, but for the first time we also realize that her actions are also ego based. Despite the fact that she had envisioned this entire scene while still in prison ("Mir träumte alle paar Nächte, ich sei einem Lustmörder unter die Hände geraten." [III, 142]), she cannot refuse Jack; she must have him to satisfy her own personal desires. She does not understand Jack's intentions because she has never understood her own nature. He is essentially a representation of her alter ego, and Lulu virtually becomes the helpless victim of her own self.

95. Emrich, p. 229.

96. Ibid., p. 226. Alwa is killed by Kungu Poti, Lulu's second of three "customers" who enter before Jack. Shortly before his death he himself realizes the futility of his own existence: "Ich suchte mit klarstem Zielbewußtsein den Verkehr mit Menschen, die nie in

ihrem Leben ein Buch gelesen haben. Ich klammerte mich mit aller Selbstverleugnung und Begeisterung an diese Elemente, um zu den höchsten Höhen dichterischen Ruhmes emporgetragen zu werden. Die Rechnung war falsch. Ich bin der Märtyrer meines Berufes" (III, 184).

97. In the foreword to Die Büchse der Pandora, which was usually printed in the theater program, Wedekind defends his drama on the basis of the fact that it is Geschwitz and not Lulu who is the tragic figure. Geschwitz suffers because she is different and cannot help it, and despite the fact that she knows she is nothing to Lulu, she continues to make superhuman sacrifices. While this argument has a great deal of validity, it does not alter the fact that Lulu is equally a figure of tragedy for essentially the same reason. In the "Scheinwelt" of bourgeois society her naturalness is more drastically unnatural than Geschwitz' abnormalcy. Geschwitz is in a number of ways more pathetic than tragic, as exhibited for example in her attempted suicide which pitifully fails when the ties break.

98. Wedekind was openly aware of the estranged situation which he presents in this act, and in the program he forewarns his audience: "Das Thema dieses zweiten Aktes ist die Ehe, speziell die Investition von Aufopferungen, durch die auch unter den ungünstigsten Verhältnissen zwei Menschen noch aneinander gefesselt werden. Um dies drastisch zu schildern, konstruierte ich eine so unglückliche Ehe, wie sie in Wirklichkeit gar nicht vorkommt, die Karikatur einer unglücklichen Ehe. Daher ersuche ich, das Stoffliche nicht allzu ernst zu nehmen, um so ernster die logischen Zusammenhänge achten zu wollen, auf deren Ergrüdung und Erörterung es mir in diesem Akte ankam" (VI, 135).

99. The obvious parallels between Wedekind and Pirandello are worthy of an individual study and can therefore not be dealt with at length in the present examination.

100. Kunz takes on the function of a Wedekind portrait in the last two acts of Franziska, and much of what he says is illustrative of Wedekind's constant self-criticism.

101. Spalter, p. 115.

102. For a discussion of this relationship see Klaus Wolfram Thomas, "Gerardo-Dühring: Ein Selbstgespräch Wedekinds," The German Quarterly, XLIV (1971), pp. 185-190.

103. Keith, like Brecht's Courage and Azdak, goes through life spouting words of sound wisdom, but is never able to follow his own advice in a constructive manner.

104. Despite the fact that the Scholz-Keith relationship is the central issue not only in the drama, but also in relation to its autobiographical basis, it has little to do with the purpose of this section. Therefore, while it is an extremely interesting topic which demands the majority of the space in most discussions of this drama, it need not and will not be treated here, except for what has already been said concerning its problem basis.

CHAPTER III

105. See n. 74 above.

106. Staiger, p. 161.

107. Klotz, p. 69.

108. Spalter, pp. 122-123.

109. Klotz, p. 151.

110. It is also interesting to point out that Wedekind ends his drama with a scene whose action is by no means expended. The Masked Man's invitiation to Melchior is merely the potential departure point for a new cycle of action, which is then taken up in the "Lulu Plays."

111. The remainder of the dramas treated in the first chapter also exhibits this inherent relationship between composition and dramatic action. The present discussion will therefore center on those elements of composition which do not result as a direct reflection of dramatic action, and on the basic differences in composition among the various dramas. The reader should therefore be referred in each instance back to the first chapter for additional information.

112. This same basic method of compositional division is also employed in Schloß Wetterstein. The first act is devoted to the seduction of Leonore von Gystrow by Rüdiger, Freiherr von Wetterstein, the murderer of her husband. The second then repeats this action, only this time it is Effie, Leonore's daughter, who conquers Rüdiger.

The third and final act then ends in a scene similar to the final act of Pandora, with Effie confronting a sadist who mentally destroys women by playing on their emotions until they kill themselves before his eyes. Each of these actions is basically autonomous, and the drama has very little in common with the traditional form of composition. That Wedekind operated purely from the principle of exemplary demonstration is obvious from the following quote which precedes the drama: "Das Schauspiel 'Schloß Wetterstein' enthält meine Anschauungen über die inneren Notwendigkeiten, auf denen Ehe und Familie beruhen. Das Stoffliche, die Geschehnisse, der Gang der Handlung sind dabei vollkommen Nebensache. In ihrer Abenteuerlichkeit waren sie durch die weiten Grenzen und die Bewegungsfreiheit bedingt, die ich nötig hatte, um meinen Anschauungen Platz zu machen. Wichtiger waren mir dramatische Steigerungen und Bühnenwirksamkeit" (VI, 5). Essentially Wedekind has defined here the basic problematic approach and consequent structure of the epic drama.

113. Not only Wedekind's use of songs is important, but also the type of song employed. They belong to the genre of the "Moritat," a form which has very little history previous to Wedekind, but employed frequently by Brecht, especially in his dramatic operas. Brecht had seen Wedekind perform in the cabarets of Munich, and it is not presumptuous to assume that Brecht learned the effective use of such songs directly from Wedekind.

114. Hidalla, oder Karl Hetmann, der Zwergriese and Oaha, Die Satire der Satire, two additional dramas which center on male portraits of Wedekind's own inner conflict are also, despite a number of modern elements which link them to the contemporary documentary theater, composed almost totally on the traditional principles of the Aristotelian drama.

115. The fact that the weakness of this drama stems from the premise on which it was written and not its composition is evident when it is compared with Tod und Teufel, which is composed in exactly the same fashion. The first scene and the third, discussions between the bordel owner Casti-Piani (who appeared in the same function in Pandora) and Elfriede von Malchus, a flag-waving fighter of decent causes, are once again set on either side of a central center scene, which depicts the prostitute Lisiska with her client Mr. König. There is once again no action as such in any of the first two scenes, and there is the same ending on a death note when Casti-Piani has a heart attack. This time, however, the discussion is motivated from within and Wedekind

sufficiently demonstrates his point. Briefly, Casti-Piani attempts to convince Elfriede of the beauty and freedom of pure "Sinnengenuß" and the ultimate freedom of the prostitute compared to the housewife, learns from Lisiska's conversation with König that these basic premises were in fact false and dies from the shock brought about by the realization of the fact that he has based his entire life on false principles. Elfriede, on the other hand, becomes convinced of Casti-Piani's sincerity and beliefs, sees in the sacrificial servitude of prostitution a meaningful and worthy service to mankind, and in the end wants to become a prostitute herself for the exact same reasons which drove Casti-Piani to a death of despair. The potent contrasts, wide implications, viable motivations, etc. of this drama are quite obviously absent in Die Zensur.

CHAPTER IV

116. Klotz (p. 247, n. 217) counts fifteen settings for the nineteen scenes. He must therefore consider certain locations to be essentially the same, but this seems to be in fact pure presumption. While there are similarities between some basic locations, Wedekind does not give enough positive information to make such a definite equation.

117. Ibid., p. 116.

118. Ibid., p. 115.

119. For the basic factors establishing the amount of time covered, see below in the text, p. 121.

120. Klotz, p. 130.

121. For a further discussion of the effect of space on the characters and action in this final scene see Klotz, pp. 132-133.

122. Klotz, for example, takes the majority of his examples illustrating the characteristics of time and space in the epic theater from Frühlings Erwachen and Büchner's Woyzeck.

123. Once again the reader should be reminded that Wedekind did in fact intend to write only one drama, and both of these settings would have been included in the original plan.

124. Emrich, p. 216.

CHAPTER V

125. This decision is stated verbally in "Was ich mir dabei dachte" (IX, 424): "Es widerstrebte mir, das Stück, ohne Ausblick auf das Leben der Erwachsenen zu schließen. Deshalb führte ich in der letzten Szene den Vermummten Herrn an."

126. Spalter, p. 122.

127. For more examples from and discussion of this and the previous scene see Gittleman, pp. 45-51.

128. Mrs. Gabor answers Moritz' plea for help with an understanding and clearly expressed letter, wherein she attempts, among other things, to convince the youth of the temporal nature of his present confusion. The letter itself constitutes the entire fifth scene of the second act (II, 132-134).

129. Published by Die Jugend, 1902.

CONCLUSIONS

130. Spalter, p. 175.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Wedekind, Frank. Ausgewählte Werke, ed. Fritz Strich. 5 vols. Munich, 1924.

Wedekind, Frank. Gesammelte Briefe, ed. Fritz Strich. 2 vols. Munich, 1924.

Wedekind, Frank. Gesammelte Werke in neun Bänden, ed. Artur Kutscher and Richard Friedenthal. Munich (17.-18. Tausend) 1924.

Wedekind, Frank. Prosa, Dramen, Verse. 2 vols. Munich, 1960-1964.

Wedekind, Frank. Werke in drei Bänden, ed. Manfred Hahn. Berlin and Weimar, 1969.

Secondary Sources

Barnet, Sylvan; Morton Berman; and William Burto. A Dictionary of Literary Terms. Boston and Toronto, 1960.

Brecht, Bertolt. Gesammelte Werke in 20 Bänden (Werkausgabe Edition Suhrkamp). Frankfurt a. M., 1967.

Brustein, Robert. The Theatre of Revolt. Boston and Toronto, 1964.

Corrigan, Robert W., ed. Theatre in the Twentieth Century. New York, 1963.

Crumbach, Franz Hubert. Die Struktur des Epischen Theaters: Dramaturgie der Kontraste. Braunschweig, 1960.

Dehnow, Fritz. Frank Wedekind. Leipzig, 1922.

Dietrich, Margret. Europäische Dramaturgie im 19. Jahrhundert. Graz and Cologne, 1961.

Emrich, Wilhelm. "Die Lulu-Tragödie" in Das deutsche Drama, ed. Benno von Wiese, Vol. II: Vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. Düsseldorf, 1964, pp. 209-230.

Esslin, Martin. Brecht. Frankfurt a. M. and Bonn, 1962.

Faesi, Robert. "Frank Wedekind" in Deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert (fifth, revised and expanded edition), ed. Otto Mann and Wolfgang Rothe, Vol. II: Gestalten. Bern and Munich, 1967, pp. 279-298.

Fechter, Paul. Das europäische Drama, Vol. II: vom Naturalismus zum Expressionismus. Mannheim, 1957.

Fechter, Paul. Frank Wedekind: Der Mensch und das Werk. Jena, 1920.

Friedenthal, Joachim, ed. Das Wedekindbuch. Munich and Leipzig, 1914.

Gassner, John. Directions in Modern Theatre and Drama. New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto, and London, 1965.

Gittleman, Sol. Frank Wedekind. New York, 1969.

Gittleman, Sol. "Frank Wedekind's Image of America," The German Quarterly, 39 (1966), 570-580.

Grimm, Reinhold. Bertolt Brecht: Die Struktur seines Werkes. (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach-und Kunstwissenschaft, Vol. V.) Nürnberg, 1959.

Gundolf, Friedrich. Frank Wedekind. Munich, 1954.

Hecht, Werner. Brechts Weg zum epischen Theater. Berlin, 1962.

Herbst, Kurt. Gedanken über Frank Wedekinds "Frühlings Erwachen," "Erdgeist" und "Die Büchse der Pandora." Leipzig, n.d.

Jendreiek, Helmut. Bertolt Brecht. Düsseldorf, 1969.

Kapp, Julius. Frank Wedekind: Seine Eigenart und seine Werke. Berlin, 1909.

Kayser, Wolfgang. Das Groteske. Oldenburg and Hamburg, 1957.

Kayser, Wolfgang. Das sprachliche Kunstwerk. Bern and Munich, 1965.

Kesting, Marianne. Das epische Theater. Stuttgart, 1969.

Klotz, Volker. Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama. Munich, 1969.

Kutscher, Artur. Frank Wedekind: Sein Leben und seine Werke. 3 vols. Munich, 1922-1931.

Kutscher, Artur. Wedekind: Leben und Werk, adapted and edited by Karl Ude, with a preface by Johannes Klein. Munich, 1964.

Lenz, Jakob Michael Reinhold. Werke und Schriften, ed. Britta Titel and Helmut Haug. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1966.

Ley-Piscator, Maria. The Piscator Experiment. New York, 1967.

Michelsen, Peter. "Frank Wedekind" in Deutsche Dichter der Moderne (second, revised and expanded edition), ed. Benno von Wiese. Berlin, 1969, pp. 51-69.

Neumann, Editha S. "Musik in Frank Wedekinds Buhnenwerken," The German Quarterly, 44 (1971), 35-47.

Pirandello, Luigi. Naked Masks, ed. Eric Bentley. New York, 1952.

Rasch, Wolfdietrich, ed. Der vermummte Herr: Briefe Frank Wedekinds aus den Jahren 1881-1917. Munich, 1967.

Redlich, H. F. Alban Berg. New York, 1957.

Rothe, Friedrich. Frank Wedekinds Dramen. Stuttgart, 1968.

Rülicke-Weiler, Käthe. Die Dramaturgie Brechts. Berlin, 1968.

Schwarz, Egon. "Hesse, the American Youth Movement, and Problems of Literary Evaluation," PMLA, 85 (1970), pp. 977-987.

Seehaus, Günter. Frank Wedekind und das Theater. Munich, 1964.

Soergel, Albert and Curt Hohoff. Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit, Vol. II. Düsseldorf, 1964.

Spalter, Max. Brecht's Tradition. Baltimore, 1967.

Staiger, Emil. Grundbegriffe der Poetik. Zurich and Freiburg i. Br., 1963.

Szondi, Peter. Theorie des modernen Dramas. Frankfurt a. M., 1969.

Thomas, Klaus Wolfram. "Gerardo-Dühring: Ein Selbstgespräch Wedekinds," The German Quarterly, 44 (1971), 185-190.

Völker, Klaus. Frank Wedekind. Velber bei Hannover, 1965.

Wedekind, Tilly. Lulu-die Rolle meines Lebens. Munich, Bern, and Vienna, 1969.

Willett, John, ed. Brecht on Theatre. New York, 1964.

Willett, John. The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht: A Study from Eight Aspects. London, 1959.

Wilpert, Gero von. Sachwörterbuch der Literatur. Stuttgart, 1964.

Woods, Barbara Allen. "A Man of Two Minds (Bert Brecht)," The German Quarterly, 42 (1969), 44-51.

Ziegler, Klaus. "Das deutsche Drama der Neuzeit," Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, II. Berlin, Bielefeld, Munich, 1960, cols. 1997-2350.