MHRA
Modern Humanities Research Association
Working Papers
in the Humanities

The *Wende* in the Light of Bert Papenfuß's Poem 'hunger, durst & sucht'

Karl Christoph Esser

St. Hugh's College, University of Oxford

Abstract

This working paper examines the poem 'hunger, durst & sucht' [hunger, thirst & drugs] written by Bert Papenfuß around 1995. My wider research project is the literary response to the Wende *(the collapse of the GDR and German reunification) in 1989–90 by the poets of Prenzlauer Berg in East Berlin, who were famous for their resistance to the literary and political establishment of the former German Democratic Republic (GDR). Papenfuß was one of their leading poets pre-*Wende *and became even more famous after reunification. The paper will ask how Papenfuß responds to German reunification in this poem. The argumentative model that I have chosen involves using an existing, but at best partial interpretation of the poem as both a springboard and a foil. In particular, I argue that Jörg Döring's interpretation can be considered a 'western' reading that fails to take account of the particular intellectual heritage and life experiences of East German subversive poets. I will argue that this poem shows that living conditions for the authors of Prenzlauer Berg in reunited democratic Germany are even worse than they were under the dictatorial GDR regime. It is worthwhile examining this poem in particular because it shows the* Wende *as a turning point from misery to even greater misery. For the poets of Prenzlauer Berg, the living conditions of a united Germany destroy their writing culture, exclude them from the variety and richness of cultural life and, above all, they take away their pride. This is a perspective which is hardly discussed in secondary literature. Scholars seem to take for granted that the change from a dictatorial regime to a democratic system would automatically improve working conditions for authors. However, my reading of the poem demonstrates that this is not true for the writers of Prenzlauer Berg.*

This working paper will examine Bert Papenfuß's poem 'hunger, durst & sucht', which he wrote around 1995.[1] Papenfuß was one of the leading poets of Prenzlauer Berg in East Berlin,

[1] Bert Papenfuß, 'hunger, durst & sucht' [*hunger, thirst and drugs*] in Bert Papenfuß, *Berliner Zapfenstreich: Schnelle Eingreifgesänge* (Berlin: Basisdruck, 1996), pp. 45–46. The poem is published at the end of the paper with an English translation. All translations in this paper marked by [*italics*] are by the author. For the translation of 'sucht', the monosyllabic word 'drugs' was used instead of the literal translation 'addiction' as it comes closer to the monosyllabic 'sucht' which, in context with the other monosyllables, should evoke and imitate the sound of a machine gun.

a group which fought against the literary establishment of the GDR.[2] He became even more famous after German reunification and was awarded the *Erich-Fried-Preis* in 1998. Jörg Döring has offered his reading of 'hunger, durst & sucht' and was able to draw on a meeting with the author to help him in his interpretation. However, Döring was, as he freely admitted, hampered by his 'westliches Vorurteil gegenüber der Prenzlauer-Berg-Lyrik' [*western prejudice towards the poetry of Prenzlauer Berg*].[3] For this reason, he limited his analysis to single aspects of the poem without, in my view, showing any understanding of its conclusion. My hypothesis is that Papenfuß wanted to express through this poem his view that for the writers of Prenzlauer Berg the bad cultural living conditions created by dictatorship and lack of liberty in the GDR deteriorated further in the united Germany through capitalism. This paper will examine whether such a hypothesis holds true. It will use Döring's reading of the poem, take it further by examining the individual lines in greater depth, and try to understand the poem as a whole. It will show that through the internal refrain, the poem establishes as its theme the 'reichtum der welt' [*richness of the world*]. This richness and variety of life found in the socialist GDR was, in Papenfuß's view, lost in reunited capitalist Germany. Furthermore, the first stanza describes how the *Wende* destroyed the culture of the East Germans. The following stanza shows life as it was before reunification for the writers of the Prenzlauer Berg. The next stanza explains their situation after the *Wende*. In the final one-line stanza the speaker asserts his decision to fight for improvement of this cultural situation. Lastly, the main refrain demonstrates the 'cultural war' by which the speaker hopes to effect this improvement. It is particularly important to look at this poem because, if the hypothesis is correct, it could mark a turning point in the reading of the literature of Prenzlauer Berg after the *Wende*. Until now, the *Wende* has been assumed to have brought about an improvement in the living conditions for the writers of Prenzlauer Berg, as censorship was abolished and the writers were liberated from a dictatorial regime. Nevertheless, this paper will come to the conclusion that this improvement is not the case automatically.

The poem has three ten-line stanzas and a final one-line stanza (l. 49). Each ten-line stanza ends with an internal refrain formed by the last two lines. Especially important is the first line of this refrain (line nine of each stanza), as it establishes the poem's theme as the richness and variety of the world inhabited by the people from Prenzlauer Berg in East Berlin.

---

[2] 'Prenzlauer Berg' functions as both the name of an area in East Berlin and as the name for this particular group of poets who lived there. It has to be stressed that the literary scene of Prenzlauer Berg changed so radically after the *Wende* that one has to speak of two totally different scenes.

[3] Jörg Döring, 'Großstadtlyrik nach 89: Durs Grünbeins "In Tunneln der U-Bahn" und Bert Papenfuß' "hunger, durst & sucht"' in *Text der Stadt—Reden von Berlin: Literatur und Metropole seit 1989*, ed. by Erhard Schütz and Jörg Döring (Berlin: Weidler, 1999), p. 111.

Strophe 1: denn der reichtum der welt gehört uns allen schon (l. 9)
Strophe 2: denn der reichtum der welt gehört uns allen: hassema' fluppe (l. 25)
Strophe 3: denn der reichtum der welt ist in festen händen schon (l. 41)

[*Stanza 1: for the richness of the world already belongs to us all* *(l. 9)*
Stanza 2: for the richness of the world belongs to us all: got a fag *(l. 25)*
Stanza 3: for the richness of the world has already been distributed] *(l. 41)*

Following a meeting with Papenfuß, Döring wrote:

> Zudem weiß ich jetzt, daß in dem Binnenrefrain 'denn der reichtum der welt' auch die Anspielung auf einen DDR-Schlager von Holger Biege verborgen ist.[4]
>
> [*In addition I know now that the internal refrain 'for the richness of the world' hints at a GDR-song by Holger Biege.*]

However, Döring arguably reads the refrain with Western blinkers and, for him, 'reichtum' means solely 'wealth' and not 'richness' (the German word has both these meanings). He therefore interprets the internal refrain with reference to capitalism:

> der Reichtum gehört eben doch nicht allen, und die Aufdringlichkeit des Schnorrers entlarvt die Wohlstandslüge, die der Binnenrefrain der ersten Strophe noch ungestraft aussprechen durfte.[5]
>
> [*the wealth, it turns out, does not belong to everyone after all, and the insistence of a cadger exposes the lie about prosperity, which the internal refrain of the first stanza was allowed to tell with impunity.*]

Döring analyses the poem solely in terms of materialism and concentrates on the meaning of 'reichtum' as wealth, ignoring the possibility that richness may refer to the diversity and

---

[4] Döring, p. 111.
[5] Döring, p. 109.

variety of life. This interpretation seems insufficient as Papenfuß specifically referred to the song ‘Reichtum der Welt’ [*Richness of the World*] by Holger Biege in his meeting with Döring.[6] This is confirmed by Papenfuß himself: ‘in allen drei strophen geht es um den “reichtum der welt”’ [*all three stanzas deal with the “richness of the world”*].[7] Whereas Briege’s concern had been with ecological issues, Papenfuß worries about the lack of richness and variety of life in reunited Germany for the poets of Prenzlauer Berg.

Having talked about the internal refrain I will now go on to treat the stanzas. The first stanza describes how the West Germans displaced East German culture during the *Wende*. This stanza is set in ‘mulackritze’ (l. 1), Berlin slang for the ‘Mulackstraße’, a street in Berlin-Mitte.[8] For Döring, ‘Mitte’ is a symbol for ‘zones of transition’ where East and West used to meet.[9] For Papenfuß, however, ‘“mitte” stand sehr schnell nach der wende für kommerzialisierung (treuhand, administration, ausverkauf [der ddr], kommerzkultur)’ [*very soon after the Wende “Mitte” became a symbol for commercialization: treuhand,*[10] *administration, liquidation [of the GDR], a culture of commerce*].[11] While Döring’s reading places greater emphasis on the fact of transition, then, Papenfuß is arguably more focused on the way in which it took place and its consequences. This is clearly indicated by his reference to ‘saumagen’ [*stuffed pig’s stomach*] (l. 8), the favourite dish of West German chancellor Helmut Kohl, the Chancellor of Reunification, and a word that, because not everybody can ‘stomach’ pig’s stomach, connotes a disgusting pleasure at consuming something. ‘Saumagen’ is therefore used in this stanza as a chiffre for the procedure of reunification, while establishing that the speaker in the poem will express his opinions about the way the reunification took place through the metaphor of food. Döring comments on this:

> Papenfuß beschreibt nun diese Szenerie der Vermischung, aber alles andere als lustvoll, sondern eher als Zumutung. Die Stimme des Gedichts […] findet Lust allenfalls daran, den hedonistischen Ankömmlingen (‘rehberger’, V. 4) ein möglichst unbekömmliches Gericht auf den Teller zu wünschen.[12]

---

[6] For the lyrics of the song, see, for instance, Peter Günther, *Mut zur Wahrheit: ostmusik.de*. Available at: http://www.ostmusik.de/reichtum_der_welt.htm (accessed 21 September 2006).
[7] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 15 June 2006.
[8] ‘Berlin-Mitte’ is the most central borough of Berlin and was part of the former GDR.
[9] Döring, p. 108.
[10] From 1990 to 1994 the Treuhand oversaw the privatization of formerly state-run East German companies.
[11] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 29 June 2006.
[12] Döring, p. 108.

> [*Papenfuß now describes this scenario of integration – not as pleasurable but more as a provocation. In fact, the speaker in the poem […] seems to wish the hedonistic incomers ('rehberger', l. 4) as indigestible a dish as possible.*]

Döring is right in thinking that the process of integration was not pleasurable for the East Germans at all. However, he does not analyse the dish. If one examines the individual ingredients of this meal, one finds that it is made up of 'bordsteinschwalben', 'langschweine', as well as 'bernhardiner & bernhardinerinnen' [*tarts, longpigs, monks & nuns*] (ll. 1–2).[13] Moreover, at first glance it contains animals like 'schwalben' (swallows), 'schweine' (pigs) and 'bernhardiner' (St. Bernard dogs). The use of dogs as an ingredient in a dish is sufficient to make one wonder whether Papenfuß is being literal or whether the animals refer to something else. Papenfuß has explained that '"bernhardinerinnen" sind nonnen (im gegensatz zu '"bordsteinschwalben" = nutten)' [*'"bernhardinerinnen" are nuns (as opposed to "pavement swallows" = tarts)*].[14] After this hint it is easy to find out that 'bernhardiner' is the Berlin slang word for monks. Furthermore, 'langschweine' [longpigs] is the name cannibals give their human food. It is notable that the whole dinner consists of human ingredients and is called 'westfraß' [*western grub*] (l. 6). West Germans could be seen as consuming East Germans, taking consumerism to the extreme. This reflects the speaker's view that West German culture has crossed the line that separates humans from animals and has therefore degenerated or evolved backwards. Through the line 'wir sind […] prall vom westfraß' [*we are […] plumb full of western grub*] (ll. 5–6) the author of the poem implies that the East Germans had to take over western culture in which, for him, everything seems to be about satisfying physical needs rather than intellectual or spiritual needs. The speaker ignores the fact that West Germany had thriving alternative scenes for decades before the GDR did, and that the new Germany still has them. However, it may well have felt like that to the Prenzlauer Berg poets in the years after 1989. To sum up, through the metaphor of food the speaker indicates that German reunification was not a cultural union, in which the best of each side's culture was adopted, but an imposition of West German culture, which displaced that of East Germany.

The second stanza is a retrospective view of East German culture as it was in Prenzlauer Berg before the *Wende* and describes how its writers enjoyed their life there. The place and

[13] The German words are Berlin slang. A literal translation would lose the meaning. For the sake of clarity, a translation closer to the meaning of the line was chosen even though the play on words was lost.

[14] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 27 June 2006.

even the season is indicated by the word ‘helmholtzhitze’ [*heat of helmholtz*] (l. 17): summer in Prenzlauer Berg (which has a square called ‘Helmholtzplatz’). Though it is clear that it is summer, the question is: pre- or post-reunification? Döring assumes that all stanzas take place at the same time and that the ‘Gedichtshandlung muss irgendwann in der Nachwendezeit spielen’ [*the poem must take place somewhere in the time after the Wende*], basing his assumption on the Berlin setting of the first stanza.[15] However, the second stanza must describe a time in the GDR long before German reunification as ‘soziologiestudenten glätten ihre enten’ [*students of sociology are smoothing their duck’s arses*] (ll. 20–21). The ‘duck’s arse’ was a fashionable way to style one’s hair in the late 1970s and early 1980s, in the manner of Elvis Presley. This time period in the GDR is characterized by the words ‘ich unterstell allen alles’ [*I impute anything to anybody*] (l. 24). With this statement the speaker refers to the collaboration of many GDR citizens with its secret service, the *Stasi*. They often spied on their friends, as Sascha Anderson did on his friend Bert Papenfuß. One was forced to ‘impute anything to anybody’, that is, that they might be a collaborator of the *Stasi*. This indicates that the speaker recognizes the more unpleasant aspects of the GDR and does not want to gloss over them. Döring sees the prevailing mood of this stanza as dark because of the presence of words relating to blackness, such as ‘substanzia nigra’[16] (l. 19) ‘schwarzer drachenfisch’ [*black weaver fish*] (l. 22) and ‘düsternis’ [*gloominess*] (l. 24).[17] Notwithstanding the gritty realism of this description of the GDR, there is a positive aspect as well which Döring does not comment upon. The gloominess is described as ‘frisch’ [*fresh*] (l. 24); this turns ‘gloominess’ into something positive, a salutary obscurity in which the poets of Prenzlauer Berg could easily hide their forbidden activities, for example, poetry readings which took place at church events or in private accommodation.[18] The poets could also disseminate their work by having it published in samizdats.[19] This means that even though the GDR was a totalitarian regime with one of the biggest secret services in the world, they could not control their citizens one hundred percent. This is especially true for the authors of

[15] Döring, p. 108.
[16] ‘Nigra’ is the Latin for ‘black’. A part of the brain, the ‘substantia nigra’ produces dopamine, a neurotransmitter involved in the prediction of and response to rewards; certain recreational drugs act on or mimic this response system.
[17] Döring, p. 109.
[18] Though Stasi observation was a constant possibility, a right of assembly was generally guaranteed in churches and in private homes in the GDR.
[19] ‘Samizdats’ were a type of publication which, banned by the government, would be produced in secret and distributed in limited quantities in the GDR. The receivers were expected to make additional copies and to distribute them to other people in the manner of a chain letter. This was normally done by typewriter. Samizdats were often used by the authors of Prenzlauer Berg in the 1980s and were a common way for them to distribute their work.

Prenzlauer Berg who were massively supported by the West. Line 18 makes reference to other groups of citizens in Western Europe and the United States that cannot be controlled by their governments: with 'die raute ist die farbe' [*the rhombus is the colour*], Papenfuß alludes to outlaw motorcycle gangs who can be recognized by the rhombus of a special colour that they display on the back of their leather jackets. These gangs are famous for their strong community spirit and for refusing to follow the law of the government. Very proud of their independent life-style, they fascinate many people. Through this allusion, the speaker compares the gangs' community to that of the artists of Prenzlauer Berg in the 1980s that were also proud of their work and their non-conformism. The food metaphor of the first stanza continues in the second one, where the speaker says that one can buy 'bleiche thüringer klöße' [*pale Thuringian dumplings*] (l. 19), a well-known GDR dish. That the meal is 'bleich' [*pale*] expresses the recognition that the culture of the GDR, and especially within Prenzlauer Berg, was far from perfect, with dictatorship, censorship and restricted possibilities of travel to the West. However, East Germans were able to eat their own foods instead of the 'westfraß' they would be forced to eat after the *Wende*. This implies that the culture of the GDR was a legitimate one, much better for East Germans than the one that the West would impose on them, and that East German culture should not have been simply cast aside but improved.

The third stanza describes the consequences for the poets from Prenzlauer Berg as they are forced to live in what they consider to be the culturally degenerate society of former West Germany. The stanza is set at a time long after German reunification; this is expressed by a reference to 'polnische suppe' [*polish soup*] (l. 37), a drug cocktail first found in Germany in 1991 and which became very famous in Berlin around 1995. The speaker continues to use the metaphor of food to describe the cultural situation for the poets from Prenzlauer Berg, now referring to a very special kind of 'food': drugs. According to Döring, this 'Strophe beschreibt nun ein völlig missglücktes Erlebnis mit harten Drogen' [*stanza describes an absolutely failed experience with hard drugs*].[20] I agree with Döring that the speaker's proximity to death is expressed through the word 'blutsturz' [*retching blood*] (l. 37). With this food metaphor of 'polnische suppe', which stands for drugs, the speaker suggests that the richness and variety of life that was present in the GDR has disappeared totally in the united Germany as the only things which are left to consume are drugs. The consequences of this disappearance are so bad, the poem suggests, that they lead to cultural and potentially even physical death. The severity

[20] Döring, p. 110.

of the cultural situation is underlined through the verse ‘ein trichterbechermann pißt in eine tulpenförmige urne’ [*a funnelbeakerman pisses into a funnel-shaped urn*] (l. 38).[21] Describing a funnelbeakerman urinating into the funnel-shaped urn that gave him his cultural name and symbolizes his art, the speaker evidently wants to express his sense of the former West Germans’ complete loss of respect for culture in general, even for their own. The speaker continues in a more constructive vein when he says that ‘der tiger ist gezähmt | vor mir liegt ein blatt papier’ [*the tiger is tamed | there is a sheet of paper in front of me*] (l. 39–40). Döring argues that the

> lyrische[s] Ich könnte jetzt zum Dichter werden, bezeichnenderweise erst, nachdem das Raubtier in ihm gezähmt ist […]. Bei Papenfuß ist der ‘drang & wucht’-Furor des Großstadttigers eine Rauschpose, die abgelegt werden muß, wenn das Schreiben beginnt.[22]
>
> [*the lyrical subject could now become a poet, significantly only after the beast in him has been tamed […]. For Papenfuß, the ‘stress & force’ phase of the urban tiger is a drug-pose, which has to be given up before one starts to write.*]

Döring takes the literary phrase ‘der tiger ist gezähmt’ at face value and argues that it has something to do with taking drugs, specifically giving up the habit before one can write. However I would argue that ‘der tiger ist gezähmt’ is a reference to Mao Zedong, who fought against the culture of the United States and called it a ‘paper tiger’. Indeed, Papenfuß confirmed this interpretation: ‘“der tiger ist gezähmt” bezieht sich auf maos “papiertiger”’ [*‘the tiger has been tamed’ refers to Mao’s ‘paper tiger’*].[23] Significantly, Mao’s fight against Western culture became known as his ‘cultural war’. In Papenfuß’s poem the expression ‘the tiger has been tamed’ is notably not in the future tense but in the present perfect, with the implication that Mao’s ‘cultural war’ has already been won. Therefore, it offers hope by example and implies that this cultural war against the West could be won a second time, in Germany. The weapons necessary to win this war are described in the next line ‘vor mir liegt ein blatt papier’ [*there is a sheet of paper in front of me*] (l. 40); this, according to Papenfuß,

[21] The Funnelbeaker culture existed from *c*. 4200 to 2800 BC, not only in the area that would become West Germany but throughout Central Europe. This culture got its name from the beakers with funnel shaped necks which the people called Funnelbeakermen produced at that time.
[22] Döring, p. 110
[23] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 15 August 2006.

is a reference to literature and to poetry in particular. To summarize, the third stanza expresses the view that the consequences of the former West Germans' imposition of their degenerated culture on the poets of Prenzlauer Berg could mean cultural death for these poets and former East Germans generally. However, the poets, through their work, have the ability to fight against this Western cultural takeover.

In the final one-line stanza (l. 49), the speaker is tempted to give up and asks himself whether he should really fight this 'cultural war'. Döring offers two possible interpretations for this line:

> Für ihn [den Salzhering] lassen sich zwei Deutungen denken, eine tragische und eine ironische: in der tragischen wird der 'salzhering' […] als Speisefisch verstanden, eine Art Katermahlzeit des Dichters […] man denkt an zerknüllte Gedichte im Straßengraben oder gar an den Tod des Autors. Die ironische Lesart versteht Salzhering […] als Lakritzsorte eines Bonner (damit westlichen) Süßwarenherstellers. […] Einen Salzhering (also Westfraß) als Belohnung fürs vollbrachte Gedicht.
>
> [*There are two possible meanings for it [the salt herring], a tragic and an ironic one: in the tragic one 'salt herring' is seen as food […], a kind of last meal for the poet […] one thinks of crumpled up poems in the ditch or even of the poet's death. The ironic reading interprets salt herring […] as liquorice from a (Western) manufacturer of confectionery in Bonn. […]. A salt herring (in other words, Western grub) as a reward for a finished poem.*]

I will return to Döring's notion of a western reward for a completed piece of work, but first it is worth considering the possibility that, in line with the earlier use of the food metaphor, salt herring stands for the culture of the coast, specifically, the culture of a sheltered childhood in a town like Greifswald on the Baltic Sea in East Germany where Holger Biege, the singer of the GDR song 'Reichtum der Welt' and Bert Papenfuß each spent their youth. This interpretation is confirmed by Papenfuß. For him, the movement of the poem goes 'richtung küste (salzhering) […] [und] das motiv des gedichtes ist (ambivalentes) heimweh' [*towards the coast (salt herring)*] […] [*and*] *the motif of the poem is (ambivalent) homesickness*].[24] One

[24] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 29 June 2006.

could argue, then, that 'salzhering' symbolizes the protective culture in which parents can solve nearly every problem for their children but only on the condition that the children behave as their parents expect them to, a relationship that can be compared to the one between the cultural rules of the united Germany and the authors of Prenzlauer Berg: as long as the authors write what their editors require, they will receive royalties. However, as soon as they write against the editors' opinions and wishes, their work will not be published and they will not receive any money to live on. In this case, they will be forced to rely on their partners or on social welfare, and neither of these situations will allow the writers their pride. The temptation for the speaker, then, is to collaborate with the editors of reunited Germany, write what they request and live a comfortable life on royalties, rather than staying true to the speaker's GDR identity and criticising German reunification, its consequences for the authors of Prenzlauer Berg, and their current living conditions. This temptation is answered by the speaker with 'krepppapier' [literally 'crêpe paper' but containing a play on the verb 'krepieren', 'to die'] (l. 49). Papenfuß confirms that it is related to death.[25] One could argue that his fight against the cultural establishment with his poems (the 'papier' of 'krepppapier') has to die; however, the real answer must be that the temptation has to die, as his fight against the cultural establishment is described in the main refrain and 'papier' is the speaker's weapon in this fight. In summary, the final one-line stanza shows that the speaker is tempted to give in and collaborate with the literary establishment in reunited Germany; nevertheless, he does not give in to this temptation but is ready for his 'cultural war'.

The main refrain describes the speaker's fight against the cultural consequences for East Germans in reunited Germany. Gerrit-Jan Berendse points out that Papenfuß's short refrains have the characteristics of a battle song: 'In den kurzen Refrains erinnert die schnelle Abfolge […] an […] MG-Poetik' [*In the short refrains, the quick sequence is reminiscent of MG-poetics*].[26] This striking refrain consists of short lines of three or four words each, and these words are mainly short nouns. The only two verbs, 'saufen' and 'fressen', reinforce the themes of consumption and animal behaviour, and they stand in sharp contrast to the key nouns 'Hunger' and 'Durst'. One could argue that Papenfuß uses his refrain as a machine gun and the words as ammunition. The first line of the refrain 'köter fressen katzen' [*mutts gobble cats*] (ll. 11, 27, 43) is a summary of the poem. Papenfuß has disclosed that these mutts are a

[25] Ibid., dated 26 June 2006.
[26] Gerrit-Jan Berendse, 'Der neue Papenfuß oder HipHop am Prenzlauer Berg', *literatur für leser,* 22 (1999), 199–208 (p. 208); 'MG poetics' is short for 'machine gun poetics'.

metaphor for the masses, while ‘katzen’ signify individuals.[27] The speaker might be saying that these masses consumed the culture of the GDR, an act which could itself be perceived as cannibalistic. According to Döring, this describes ‘drastisch die Folgen der [kulturellen] Verdrängung’ [*the consequences of the* [*cultural*] *suppression drastically*].[28] The weapon in this fight is ‘sturm, drang’ [*storm, stress*] (ll. 14, 30, 46) a reference to the 18th century literary period which is associated with the aestheticization of revolutionary spirit and the self-apotheosis of the poetic genius as *poeta alter deus*. One can therefore interpret this line as emphasizing the role of the writers of literature and poetry in the fight to overthrow the cultural devil of German reunification and win the cultural war. The first line is inverted in the last line of the main refrain ‘wie katzen köter’ [*like cats mutts*] (ll. 16, 32, 48). Döring does not know how to read this, and therefore asks, ‘ist die Inversion nur eine Artikulationsstörung einer [durch Alkohol] schwerer gewordenen Zunge’ [*is the inversion only a sign of a tongue made heavy by alcohol that is having difficulty articulating*]?[29] By no means is this the case; rather, it seems the outcome of the cultural war: now cats gobble mutts. Such an inversion expresses the speaker’s opinion that the former East German culture will survive and triumph over the former West German one. This belief is also underlined by Papenfuß’s statement that ‘“sturm, drang & wucht” drive “sucht in die flucht | wie katzen köter”’ [*“storm, stress & force” put “drugs to flight* | *like cats mutts”*].[30] In summary, in the main refrain, the speaker says that literature is so powerful that it could reverse the cultural consequences of the *Wende* and could even make the former East German culture the dominant one which will survive.

To sum up, in ‘hunger, durst & sucht’ the speaker asserts that, for the writers of Prenzlauer Berg, cultural living conditions were better in the GDR than in a reunited Germany. This comes as quite a surprise, since the GDR was a dictatorship and well known for its censorship, while reunited Germany is a democratic country with a free press. Most scholars take it for granted, therefore, that living conditions in reunited Germany must be better. However, cultural living conditions mean, first of all, the possibility of living life with pride. If one considers the reunification and its effect on the poets of Prenzlauer Berg with respect to pride, one will get a different view. The speaker highlights what he sees as the degenerated capitalistic culture of the West Germans and suggests that during the *Wende* they even behaved like cannibals and consumed East German culture. Therefore, West German

---

[27] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 29 June 2006.
[28] Döring, pp. 108–09.
[29] Ibid., p. 109.
[30] Email correspondence between Papenfuß and the author of this paper, dated 26 June 2006.

culture survived while that of East Germany declined. The authors of Prenzlauer Berg under the GDR were proud of their life in spite of censorship, dictatorship and the shortage of freedom. In the GDR they did not need to care about earning a living and could concentrate on their writing totally, even when their work was not published, as accommodation and basic food were practically free. If somebody ran out of money, there was always a writer who had sold a book to the West and who would be more than happy to share the royalties. The speaker refers to this spirit of generosity: 'hassema' fluppe' [*got a fag*] (l. 25). Döring argues that the person who says this is a 'Schnorrer' [*scrounger*].[31] However, there are many examples to be found in novels, short stories and films where sharing a cigarette is a symbol of deep friendship between proud men.[32] In addition, it shows that on the one hand, during the time of the GDR, the writers of Prenzlauer Berg found that money was similarly easy to share, and on the other hand that they were very pleased to help each other in this way. In the united Germany, however, they have to follow the rules of a capitalistic publishing market which takes away their pride. Furthermore, living conditions for the writers are totally different, as the costs of accommodation and basic food are comparatively high. If the poets want to concentrate solely on their writing and earn their living through publication of their work, they have to follow the rules of a capitalistic publishing market: providing whatever the market demands, which means, at least to a degree, writing what readers will want to read. If they fail to do this, they fear, editors will not choose their books to be published, and the authors will be unable to cover their living expenses. The writers feel that they are faced, then, with unpleasant alternatives: catering only to the desires of editors and potential readers in order to be published and receive royalties, or else working as an independent but unpublished author, forced to rely on their partner's earnings or on social welfare. Nevertheless, the speaker will not abandon his fight for a culture in which the writers of Prenzlauer Berg can be proud again, a determination articulated in the final stanza. At first the speaker is tempted to give in and live a life with a nine-to-five job or to write in a way that will ensure publication and enough money to live on; this would not make his life happier, however. He therefore resists this temptation and decides to fight for his right to write what he likes without being controlled by a capitalistic publication market. Finally, the main refrain articulates the speaker's cultural war against this capitalistic culture that will only publish poems for which there is a market demand. The speaker knows that the possibilities for poets

[31] Döring, p. 109.
[32] Cf. Günther Weisenborn, 'Zwei Männer', in *Lebensgut*, ed. by Erich Kirch et al. (Frankfurt/Main: Diesterweg, 1968), p. 193.

are very limited. Nevertheless, he believes in the power of words and will go on writing poems in which he criticizes the cultural situation that the writers of Prenzlauer Berg have had to endure since German reunification. In summary, the socialist living conditions of the GDR gave the writers of Prenzlauer Berg the possibility to concentrate solely on their independent writing, whether or not their work was published. The capitalist living conditions in reunited Germany have taken away this possibility. The poor living conditions for the writers of Prenzlauer Berg in the GDR have thus, Papenfuß argues in his poem, become worse in reunited Germany.

hunger, durst & sucht[33]

1[34] in der mulackritze haut man bordsteinschwalben
2 zusammen mit langschweinen, frischer berberitze
3 bernhardinern & bernhardinerinnen in mehlschwitze
4 hedonistische rehberger nuckeln an ihrer lakritze
5 wir sind feuer & fett, wir machen schlappen wett
6 die wampe prall vom westfraß & angestautem durchfall
7 mit nix als russinnen im kopf, korinthen in den topf
8 die galle tropft; saumagen & keine weiteren fragen
9 denn der reichtum der welt gehört uns allen schon
10 hunger, durst & sucht sind die früchtchen der furcht

11 köter fressen katzen
12 votzen klöten, & schnaps
13 seele auf: sauf

14 sturm, drang & wucht
15 sucht in die flucht
16 wie katzen köter

17 in der helmholtzhitze erst die kante, dann die blöße
18 die raute ist die farbe, anarchie auch dekomposition
19 die substanzia nigra zickt, bleiche thüringer klöße
20 gleich um die ecke, schummerige soziologiestudenten
21 glätten ihre enten & warten auf dem wolkenstillstand
22 aufm stammtisch aalt sich ein schwarzer drachenfisch
23 ausm wald der lauten bäume flattern feile schnepfen
24 hinein in frische düsternis; ich unterstell allen alles
25 denn der reichtum der welt gehört uns: hassema'fluppe
26 hunger, durst & sucht sind die früchtchen der furcht

27 köter fressen katzen
28 votzen klöten, & schnaps
29 seele auf: sauf

30 sturm, drang & wucht
31 sucht in die flucht
32 wie katzen köter

33 am verkehrsknotenpunkt spitze sitze ich voll zugeotzt
34 in meinem schweiß & prosperiere abgeklärt vor mich hin
35 meine augen bluten, die löffel dröhnen von dem gedöns
36 das auf mich einsabbert, langweile steht aus, unerhört
37 spuckt aus, & zwar polnische suppe, blutsturz & maulfurz
38 ein trichterbechermann pißt in die tulpenförmige urne

[33] The poem has appeared in Papenfuß's collections, *Schnelle Eingreifgesänge*, pp. 45–46, and *SBZ-Land und Leute* (1998), pp.25–26. It has been reproduced and translated with the kind permission of Druckhaus Galrev, www.galrev.com, BasisDruck Verlag GmbH and Bert Papenfuß.
[34] The line numbers have been inserted by the author of this paper.

39	die neurotransmitter sind knapp, der tiger ist gezähmt
40	vor mir liegt ein blatt papier; wir haben wohl ausgeault
41	denn der reichtum der welt ist in festen händen schon
42	hunger, durst & sucht sind die früchtchen der furcht

43		köter fressen katzen
44		votzen klöten, & schnaps
45		seele auf: sauf

46		sturm, drang & wucht
47		sucht in die flucht
48		wie katzen köter

49	ein salzhering winkt mir; krepppapier

hunger, thirst & drugs[35]

1	in mulack street they cook tarts
2	together with longpigs, fresh barberry
3	monks & nuns in roux
4	hedonistic rehbergers[36] suck at their liquorice
5	we are fire & fat, we make up for the setbacks
6	the potbelly plumb full of western grub & bottled-up diarrhoea
7	with nothing but Russian girls in mind and currants in the pot
8	the bile drips; stuffed pig's stomach & no more questions
9	for the richness of the world already belongs to us all
10	hunger, thirst & drugs are the fruits of anxiety

11		mutts gobble cats
12		cunts balls, & schnapps
13		open soul: drink
14		storm, stress & force
15		drugs to flight
16		like cats mutts

17	in the heat of helmholtz first rat-arsed, then the bareness

---

[35] Bert Papenfuß plays with words and uses neologisms as well as Berlin slang, making this poem very difficult to understand even for native speakers of German if they are not from Berlin. Therefore, the translation places most emphasis on understanding the poem while it also preserves as far as possible the sound and feeling of the German version. The monosyllabic word 'drugs' was used instead of the literal transition 'addiction' as it comes closer to the monosyllabic word 'sucht' which should suggest the sound of a machine gun.

[36] The 'Rehberger' were a group of revolutionary labourers in the 19th century who worked in a place called Rehberge in the western part of Berlin.

18 the rhombus is the colour, anarchy also decomposition
19 the substantia nigra is playing tricks, pale thuringian dumplings
20 just around the corner, dim students of sociology
21 are smoothing their duck's arses & waiting for the clouds to call a truce
22 a black weaver fish lounges on the regulars' table
23 birds going for a song flutter from the forest of noisy trees
24 into fresh gloominess; I impute anything to anybody
25 for the richness of the world belongs to us: got a fag
26 hunger, thirst & drugs are the fruits of anxiety

27 mutts gobble cats
28 cunts balls, & schnapps
29 open soul: drink

30 storm, stress & force
31 drugs to flight
32 like cats mutts

33 at the traffic junction called spitze i sit drugged up
34 in my sweat & prosper serenely to myself
35 my eyes bleed, my lugholes resound with the fuss
36 which keeps on slobbering at me, boredom bides its time, outrageously
37 spits out that polish soup, retching blood & belch
38 a funnelbeakerman pisses into a funnel-shaped urn
39 the neurotransmitters are in short supply, the tiger has been tamed
40 there is a sheet of paper in front of me; we must have fucked up
41 for the richness of the world has already been distributed
42 hunger, thirst & drugs are the fruits of anxiety

43 mutts gobble cats
44 cunts balls, & schnapps
45 open soul: drink

46 storm, stress & force
47 drugs to flight
48 like cats mutts

49 a salt herring is tempting me; black crepe paper

Translated by Karl Christoph Esser

MHRA
Modern Humanities Research Association
Working Papers
in the Humanities

Shakespeare’s Widows of a Certain Age: Celibacy and Economics

Dorothea Faith Kehler

San Diego State University

Abstract

Often more honoured in the breach than the observance, the prevailing discourse of early modern England encouraged widows to live as celibates, to epitomize piety, and to devote themselves to safeguarding their children’s interests. Of these injunctions, celibacy was crucial. Among Shakespeare’s elderly widows, all but Mistress Quickly remain single, a condition most vehemently prescribed by Catholic writers, who reluctantly exempted only the youngest widows—prejudged as concupiscent by virtue of their nubility and gender. In print, if not practice, Catholics and Protestants alike appeared to regard celibacy as the only suitable state for older widows. My paper briefly considers five widows of a certain age: Mistress Quickly, who violates the injunction when, between Henry IV, Part 2 *and* Henry V*, she weds Ancient Pistol; Paulina of* The Winter’s Tale *who, by the end of Act V, has not formally accepted Camillo as a substitute for Antigonus; and the celibate, child-focused widows of* Coriolanus *and* All’s Well That Ends Well*, ‘widows indeed’. Whether these characters remarry or remain celibate depends, to a significant extent, on their financial situations, those with greater economic needs remarrying if they can.*

Although neglected as a category, widows are prominent in Shakespeare’s plays, appearing in every genre. Including ‘seeming widows’—wives uncertain of their marital status like Amelia in *Comedy of Errors,* Thaisa in *Pericles*, and Paulina in *The Winter’s Tale,* or like Imogen in *Cymbeline*, who mistakenly believes herself widowed—I count thirty-one members of this character group.[1] The hefty number reflects early modern English demographics, the percentage

[1] Aemilia (*The Comedy of Errors*), Lady Grey (*Henry VI, Part 3, Richard III*), Queen Margaret, Duchess of York, Lady Anne (*Richard III*), Tamora , Lavinia (*Titus Andronicus*), Hortensio's wife (*The Taming of the Shrew*), Duchess of Gloucester (*Richard II*), Juliet, Nurse (*Romeo and Juliet*), Lady Faulconbridge, Constance, Elinor (*King John*),

of widows hovering around some fifteen percent.[2] Most historical widows, of course, were older women, as are only about a third of Shakespeare's. (Even though played by boys, younger women, presumably, would have more audience appeal.) But like their real-life counterparts, literary widows regardless of age are inherently embedded within a specific and individual set of political, social, and economic circumstances. Was it political power and safety that Gertrude sought between incestuous sheets? Having enjoyed the social status of a queen, did she choose to pre-empt a successor? Did she fear dwindling means? In contrast, ideological preceptors, whether in the name of morality or decorum, were prone to ignore the particular circumstances that each widow faced. Rather, they lay down rules and made value judgments as if widows were a monolithic abstraction.

Elderly widows were a favourite target. Despite basic contradictions between residual Catholic and dominant Protestant discourses of widowhood (celibacy versus remarriage), their expositors generally saw eye-to-eye concerning women past the age of childbearing. Celibacy was the approved behaviour. The purpose of marriage was, above all, procreation. Forestalling fornication and providing mutual comfort were secondary.[3] Body-curers supported soul-curers, the former opining that sexual intercourse between aging spouses was hazardous to their health.[4] Steven Mullaney provides insight into a more extreme view. Explaining Hamlet's response to Gertrude's remarriage, he writes: 'Gertrude's *aging* sexuality [is] conceived at times as a contradiction in terms, at times as a violation of [Gertrude's] own body akin in its unnaturalness to a rebellion in the body politic: hers is a passion that "canst mutine in a matron's bones"'.[5]

Lady Percy, Hostess Quickly (*Henry IV, Part 2, Henry V*), Gertrude (*Hamlet*), Countess of Rossillion, Widow Capilet (*All's Well That Ends Well*), Mistress Overdone (*Measure for Measure*), Regan (*King Lear*), Cleopatra, Octavia (*Antony and Cleopatra*), Volumnia (*Coriolanus*), Thaisa (*Pericles*), Cymbeline's Queen, Imogen (*Cymbeline*), Paulina (*The Winter's Tale*), and Three Queens (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*).

[2] Amy M. Froide, 'Marital Status as a Category of Difference: Singlewomen and Widows in Early Modern England', in *Singlewomen in the European Past 1250–1800*, ed. by Judith M. Bennett and Amy M. Froide (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1999), pp. 236–69 (pp. 236–37). Following Laslett (see note 31 below) but covering a more inclusive period and area, Rosemary O'Day finds twenty percent of households headed by widows; *The Family and Family Relationships, 1500–1900: England, France and the United States of America* (New York: St. Martin's, 1994), p. 94.

[3] Kathleen M. Davis cites Henry Smith, *A Preparative to Marriage* (1591) and Heinrich Bullinger, *The Golden Book of Christian Matrimony* (1543) to this effect ; 'Continuity and Change in Literary Advice on Marriage', in *Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage*, ed. by R. B. Outhwaite (London: Europa, 1981), pp. 58–80 (p. 62).

[4] Keith Thomas, 'Age and Authority in Early Modern England', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 62 (1976), 205–48 (p. 243).

[5] Steven Mullaney, 'Mourning and Misogyny: *Hamlet, The Revenger's Tragedy,* and the Final Progress of Elizabeth I, 1600–1607', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 45 (1994), 139–62 (p. 151).

Mullaney's reading points to a broader question engaging social historians and literary critics: did a significant part of the English populace share Hamlet's feeling about the unnaturalness of women's 'aging sexuality'? Was there, as received opinion would have it, a stigma against the older remarrying widow in Elizabethan England? Did her neighbours think her a 'lusty widow', comical, pitiable, or immoral, according to their lights?[6] Or was the widow's remarriage, as Jennifer Panek argues, approved of 'socially, economically, and morally'?[7] Whereas Panek excludes Shakespeare from her study, I focus on his contribution to the discussion, taking as my subjects a widow no longer young who weds again, a widow who *may* wed again, and two widows who elect celibacy. What does a study of these characters, in the context of each one's particular social and material circumstances, tell us about Shakespeare's attitude toward a single-minded ideology?

Whom one labels as no longer young is a subjective determination.[8] Generally, Renaissance women were thought to have become old between the ages of fifty and sixty, perhaps earlier if widowed.[9] Social historians distinguish between chronological, functional (decrepitude), and cultural old age, the last primarily dependent on appearance,[10] for like Nestor an older woman can be 'most reverend for [her] stretch'd-out life' (*Tr.*, I. 2. 61), yet healthy and energetic.[11] Maimonides asks, 'Who is an old woman?' and replies, 'One who is called old and does not protest'.[12] Being unable to chat with Shakespeare's widows, I fall back on the adjective 'old' prefaced to the widow's name in the text as a useful marker of age. Diana's mother, the

---

[6] Most social historians hold that vestiges of the condemnatory Catholic position lingered on; see, for example, Barbara J.Todd, 'The Virtuous Widow in Protestant England', pp. 66–83 (pp. 70–75), and Elizabeth Foyster, 'Marrying the Experienced Widow in Early Modern England: The Male Perspective', pp. 109–12, both in *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe,* ed. by Sandra Cavallo and Lyndan Warner (Harlow, Essex: Longman/Pearson Education, 1999).

[7] Jennifer Panek, *Widows and Suitors in Early Modern English Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 11. She argues that remarriage was never stigmatized in England, the lusty widow trope in comedies by Shakespeare's contemporaries and successors being an empowering fantasy for suitors of wealthy widows.

[8] Lynn Botelho, 'Old Age and Menopause in Rural Women of Early Modern Suffolk', in *Women and Ageing in British Society Since 1500*, ed. by Lynn Botelho and Pat Thane (Harlow, Essex: Longman/Pearson Education, 2001), pp. 43–65 (pp. 60–61). Also valuable is Lynn Botelho and Pat Thane, 'Bibliographical Essay: Older Women in Britain Since 1500', in Botelho and Thane, *Women and Ageing*, pp. 232–38.

[9] See Botelho, 'Old Age and Menopause', p. 43; and Amy M. Froide, 'Old Maids: The Lifecycle of Single Women in Early Modern England', in Botelho and Thane, *Women and Ageing*, pp. 89–110 (p. 91).

[10] Claire S. Schen, 'Strategies of Poor Aged Women and Widows in Sixteenth-Century London', in Botelho and Thane, *Women and Ageing,* pp. 13–30 (pp. 14–15).

[11] All Shakespeare references are taken from *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans, 2nd edn (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).

Widow Capilet in *All's Well That Ends Well* and Queen Margaret in *Richard III* are so described. Widow Capilet appears in the *Dramatis Personae* as 'An old Widow of Florence'; similarly, a stage direction states, '*Enter old Queen Margaret*' (*R3*, I. 3. 109). The descriptor 'old' may be part of the dialogue, as when Parolles inquires about *All's Well*'s Countess of Rossillion by asking the Clown, 'O, my knave, how does my old lady?' (II. 4. 19),[13] or when the page in *2 Henry IV* refers to 'old Mistress Quickly' (II. 2. 152). Mercutio mocks Juliet's nurse as 'an old hare hoar' (*Rom.*, II. 4. 134) and 'ancient lady' (II. 4. 143), and Juliet fidgets when the nurse is late: 'But old folks –many feign as they were dead' (II. 5. 16).[14] Paulina, whom Leontes in anger calls a 'crone' and 'hag' (II. 3. 77, 108), refers to herself as 'an old turtle' (*WT*, V. 3. 132), determined to mourn her husband Antigonus, lost to her sixteen years before when their oldest child was fourteen. We may question Paulina's notion of agedness, as we may doubt Mercutio's and Juliet's (to the young most adults are old), but by early modern demographic standards Paulina and the Nurse may indeed be elderly.

There are various less direct signals of age. *Errors's* Abbess Aemilia is not called old, but her husband Aegeon is (I. 1. 96).[15] Moreover, she believes her sons to be thirty-three and, despite some textual confusion about this matter, she should know. In *Richard III* the Duchess of York indicates that she is old when she promises that should Richard triumph in the ensuing battle, she will promptly die 'of grief and extreme age' (IV. 4. 186). Also in *Richard II* the Duchess of Gloucester, having just foretold her own death, reveals her age as she loses her train of thought and then contradicts herself:

> Lo this is all – nay, yet depart not so;
> Though this be all, do not so quickly go;
> I shall remember more. (I. 2. 63–65)[16]

---

[12] Quoted in Botelho, 'Old Age and Menopause', p. 43.
[13] Occasionally the Folio speech prefixes read 'Old Countess' or 'Old Lady'.
[14] On the other hand, since the nurse's daughter Susan, had she lived, would have been Juliet's age, the nurse may be younger than she appears to Mercutio and Juliet. Having lost most of her teeth—'I have but four' (*Rom.,* I. 3. 13) — the nurse would look older than her years, 'culturally old'.
[15] From what we know about age at marriage among the 'middling sort' in Shakespeare's England, we may assume that the difference in years between them is not great.
[16] She is played in David Giles's 1978 television production for the BBC series, *The Shakespeare Plays*, by the very elderly Mary Morris.

Yet another signifier of age is the widow's relationship to her fellow characters. Elinor in *King John,* convinced that the Bastard Faulconbridge is a Plantagenet, claims him as a grandson: 'I am thy grandame, Richard, call me so' (I.1.168). *Coriolanus*' Volumnia is also a grandmother. Though her grandson appears to be no more than seven or eight years of age, Coriolanus seems older than the Bastard, perhaps thirty, thus making Volumnia an incipient older woman. She appears no younger than Menenius, an elderly man, and behaves with the authority of age. All in all, we may count some eleven widows of a certain age.[17]

At least in theory, the authority of age was extended to men, who possessed the right to rule by virtue of their wisdom and experience, but no such claim was made on behalf of older women.[18] Status—i.e., wealth, rank, and what today we would call social class—would have largely accounted for their position in society.[19] Despite great differences in widows' status, for the most part conservative ideologues, the would-be makers of manners, assumed that widows were able to get along financially. But while polemicists continued to echo traditional views, encouraging widows to live as celibates, to epitomize piety, and to devote themselves to safeguarding their children's interests, and while playwrights successfully exploited the trope of the lusty widow, the English were remarrying with impunity. Remarriages are commonly estimated at about a third of all marriages, albeit most on the part of widowers, who were also apt to remarry sooner than widows.[20] In contrast to historical remarrying widows, Shakespeare's older widows are a particularly chaste lot, all but Mistress Quickly remaining single. In print if not practice, celibacy was crucial for elderly widows. Not only was sexuality, the presumptive driving force behind remarriage, considered unseemly in women past middle age but, at least according to George Minois, the appearance of the old was thought to be repulsive, in part because of the Renaissance privileging of youth and beauty. Also distasteful was female longevity; aristocratic women were beginning to outlive men, a phenomenon particularly evident

---

[17] I exclude Mistress Overdone from the category of elderly widows only because the text tells us nothing about her age. Of course, it must have taken some years for her to acquire and shed nine husbands. Also the profession of bawd or madam is associated with a woman older than her staff and, as Jeanne Addison Roberts notes, was frequently employed by Renaissance dramatists to sexualize a crone; 'Types of Crone: The Nurse and the Wise Woman in English Renaissance Drama', *Renaissance Papers* (2000), 71–86 (p. 74).

[18] Thomas, p. 207.

[19] Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, *Women in Early Modern England 1550–1720* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), p. 180 and p. 193.

[20] Demographic scholars state that 'it is *a fortiori* beyond reach to discover what proportion of those who were widowed later remarried'; E. A. Wrigley and others, *English Population History from Family Reconstitution 1580–1837* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 171 and p. 173.

from 1575 to 1600.[21] A consequence of these aesthetic and demographic factors was that in early modern English literature a widow of fifty or older with a predilection for the altar was on shaky *moral* ground, whatever her status.

The gap between precept and practice was a wide one. For example, Anne Locke, among the 'godliest' of women, being the friend of John Knox, was thrice married. Daughter of a widower who had himself remarried, Anne first wed Henry Locke, a mercer.[22] Two years after Locke's death in 1571, Anne married Edward Dering, a preacher ten years younger than she, who died within three years at the age of thirty-six. Anne remarried for the last time in her late forties or early fifties, this time to a draper three times mayor of Exeter, and remained a woman of the highest repute. Nonetheless, the literary widow who married a younger man was apt to be represented as a joke. Remarriage is hardly a joke in Shakespeare, though. More than half of the ten Shakespearean widows of all ages who remarry die, two—Anne Neville and Gertrude—killed by their second husbands.[23] The tacit assumption of writers' praises and canards is that every widow has a choice; she is the site of a *psychomachia* in which fidelity to her deceased husband opposes lechery.

Lechery wins the battle over Mistress Quickly. Should she be seen as a 'lusty widow', a stereotype so ancient as to disable a myth of origin? Does any man know where to have her? In *1 Henry IV* 'an honest man's wife' (III. 3. 119), she becomes 'a poor widow of Eastcheap' in *2 Henry IV* (II. 1. 70), betrothed, or so she thinks, to Falstaff. A tavern keeper who would have inherited her husband's privileges from the Vintners' Company, she is something of a financial prize. To the horror of moralists and the amusement of cynics, widows like Quickly often quickly remarried. Although Sir John falsely engages her affections, she soon has her choice of two ne'er-do-well untitled suitors, Nym and Pistol.[24] The tavern hostess never becomes a lady, a rank that might have lightened her labours, but Ancient Pistol, as Quickly's husband in *Henry V*, improves his economic standing significantly, though he perceives a decline in status:

---

[21] George Minois, *The History of Old Age: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, trans. by Sarah Hanbury Tenison (Oxford: Polity Press, 1989), p. 249 and pp. 292–93.

[22] Despite his protests, upon Knox's entreaty she left her husband for two years (1557–59) to live with the Protestant exiles in Geneva, where she translated works by Calvin. Patrick Collinson, biographer of Anne Locke, recommends Robert Louis Stevenson's 1875 essay, 'John Knox and His Relations to Women': Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: Hambledon Press, 1983), p. 279.

[23] Elizabeth Woodville, Hortensio's wife, Mistress Overdone, and Octavia survive. Anne Neville, Tamora, Hostess Quickly, Gertrude, Cleopatra, and Cymbeline's Queen die, as does Regan, who wished to remarry.

[24] Usually the fewer children, the sooner the early modern English widow would remarry (Wrigley, pp. 177–78).

> Base tike, call'st thou me host?
> Now by Gadslugs I swear I scorn the term;
> Nor shall my Nell keep lodgers. (*H5*, II. 1. 28–30)

Though now, it would appear, legal owner of the Boar's Head, Ancient Pistol immediately abandons the tavern to his wife's care. Eager for martial male camaraderie, he follows the wars. Why then did Pistol marry Nell?

A popular plot motif during the first two decades of the seventeenth century was the 'widow hunt', in which the widow was involved in predatory financial relationships. She might be presented as the object of a hunt motivated by her wealth, or the widow might be the wealthy (and lusty) hunter of a younger spouse. Among satirical widow-hunt plays are Chapman's *The Widow's Tears*; Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, *The Duchess of Milan*, and *The Widow*; Jonson's *The Alchemist* and *Bartholomew Fair*; and Fletcher's *Wit Without Money*. In tragedy the widow-hunt is often a corollary of the widow's first cuckolding, and then killing her husband, as in Webster's *The White Devil* and Middleton's *Women Beware Women*.[25] Shakespeare gives the widow hunt a political spin in *Richard III*, when Richard seduces the vulnerable Anne, not for her money but for her prestigious family status. (Although the histories generally occlude desire for material gain as a motive, we may assume that Shakespeare trusted his audience to understand the nexus of wealth, status, and power.) One could read Nym's and Pistol's rivalry for Nell Quickly as an aspect of a widow hunt, a parody of an inherently parodic courtship, mercenary at bottom.[26]

Overall, however, Shakespeare is wary of the 'lusty widow' trope. If Quickly is lusty, never came lust in such mundane attire. Among Shakespeare's widows, only the foreigners Tamora and Cleopatra—two out of thirty-one—have explicitly sexual lines, *prima facie* textual evidence of lust. Quickly's sexual malapropisms testify to her naivety in language as in life. Yet the textual confusion over whether it was Nell or the prostitute Doll who contracted 'a malady of France'

---

[25] See Katherine Harriett James, 'The Widow in Jacobean Drama' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1973), pp. iii–iv and p. vi. She notes, '[t]he early satiric treatment of the character is modified considerably as Jacobean satiric comedy changes to Jacobean romance in the second decade of the century' (p. iii).

[26] Aside from Quickly's and Anne's courtships—neither explicitly mercenary—I find no other widow hunts in Shakespeare.

(*H5*, V. 1. 81),[27]continues what may be a deliberate blurring and can be read as an attack on the entrepreneurial woman.[28] If Nell died, are we to believe that aside from her two husbands there were unsanctioned others who might have infected her? We *have* heard Falstaff swear cryptically, 'A pox of this gout! or a gout of this pox!' (*2H4,* I. 2. 243–44). In her most recent study of crones in Renaissance drama, Jeanne Addison Roberts observes that the crone, whom she defines as 'a mature woman not characterized primarily as virgin, wife, sex object, or potential mother' is frequently 'trivialized' and/or 'sexualized'.[29] Mistress Quickly, she notes, is trivialized as a stupid woman, 'easily duped and given to malapropisms';[30] to this we might add that the nature of her fatal illness sexualizes her as well.

But like real widows left with taverns, Quickly, no less than her suitors, would have had a financial motive for remarriage. Although Peter Laslett describes the owner of a commercial undertaking as head of an extended family,[31] which normally ensures a regressive social stability, such is not the case when a woman replaces the patriarch and the undertaking is both criminal and democratic. Quickly presides over the unruly society of a tavern where princes mingle with paupers, Lenten fasts are broken, and prostitutes are lodged. 'We cannot lodge and board a dozen or fourteen gentlewomen that live honestly by the prick of their needles but it will be thought we keep a bawdy-house straight' (*H5*, II. 1. 32–35), complains Hostess Quickly. In establishments such as hers, robberies were planned, and their perpetrators concealed. Alice Clark, drawing on the Hertford County Records for 1626, describes one woman innkeeper, 'who received stolen goods at the sign of the "Leabord's Head" in Ware, [and] had there a "priviye place" for hiding stolen goods and suspicious persons. Clark continues, 'at the press for soldiers she hid five men from the constables, and can convey any man from chamber to chamber into the backside'.[32] Paul Slack's comment on

[27] David Bevington, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, 5th edn (London: Pearson/Longman, 2004) and G. B. Evans have Ancient Pistol lamenting the death of Doll. See Evans's 'Note on the Text', pp. 1015–17 (p. 1016). But Stephen Greenblatt, *The Norton Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 1997), following the Oxford edition, changes 'Doll' to 'Nell'.
[28] See Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 176–85, especially p. 180.
[29] Jeanne Adison Roberts, 'The Crone in English Renaissance Drama', *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England,* 15 (2003), 116–37 (p. 116).
[30] Roberts, 'Crone in English Renaissance Drama', p. 123.
[31] Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost: England Before the Industrial Age*, 2nd edn (NewYork: Scribner's, 1973), p. 2.
[32] Alice Clark, *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (1919; repr. New York: Kelley, 1968), p. 233.

alehouses holds for Quickly's tavern as well; they were 'obvious centres of disorder, where stolen goods could be disposed of, whores picked up, money wasted and youth corrupted'.[33]

Running such an enterprise would pose a challenge. Some widows had to contend with guild restrictions on the widow's right to ply her husband's trade.[34] Even where there were no restrictions, hired help was an additional expense, whereas an improvident husband's labour was free and his self-interest might promise a great incentive to hard work. So for all her fear of swaggerers, Mistress Quickly remarries, perhaps to console herself for a lost mate—or the lost title she had dreamed of—perhaps for companionship, even desire, but surely for a helpmate to keep her demanding business solvent. That she is misguided in her choice of spouse is regrettable, but as her audience would have known, many a widow, caricatured as lusty, above all sought security through remarriage.[35] Shakespeare's plays reflect current findings that English widows at whatever class level who did not need a husband to conduct a business, provide legal protection, or help to raise children, were less likely to wed again.

Another widow of a certain age who *might* remarry—in an unwritten epilogue—is Paulina of *The Winter's Tale.* Finally assured of her widowhood, Paulina is offered a replacement by the king, guilt-ridden for effectively causing Antigonus's death:

LEONTES I'll not seek far
(For him, I partly know his mind) to find thee
An honorable husband. Come, Camillo,
And take her by the hand. (*WT*, V. 3. 141–44)

Setting aside the question of whether Camillo is truly inclined to wed (that is, does Leontes know anyone's mind?), will Paulina accept the king's offer? If Shakespeare took English matrimonial law

[33] Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Longman, 1988), p. 103. More than a third of the complaints listed in Norfolk petitions to justices of the peace between 1600 and 1669 have to do with alehouse offences; see S. D. Amussen, 'Gender, Family and the Social Order, 1560–1725', in *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*, ed. by Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 196–217 (p. 210).

[34] On widows' relation to the guilds throughout much of Europe, see Olwen Hufton, *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe, Vol.1: 1500–1800* (New York: Random/Vintage, 1998), pp. 243–49.

[35] Historians agree on the role material circumstances played in remarriage. See, for example, O'Day, p. 114; Mendelson and Crawford, p. 176 and pp. 182–83; and Margaret Pelling, 'Finding Widowers: Men Without Women in English Towns Before 1700', in Cavallo and Warner, pp. 37–54 (pp. 46–47).

for Sicilian, he might have been aware that an English Paulina determined to remarry would not necessarily have been barred from doing so. In Section 26 of *The Law's Resolutions of Women's Rights*, on 'Captivity or long absence of one which is married', the author explains:

> It falleth out not seldom, the one of them which are married to be taken captive or otherwise so detained that it is uncertain if he live or no. Therefore because it is in some sort dangerous to expect long the uncertain return of an absent yoke-fellow, here the civil law did ordain that after a husband had been gone five years and nothing known whether he lived or no, the wife might marry again and so might the husband that had expected his wife, etc. But the common law commandeth simply to forbear marriage till the death of him or her that is missing be certainly known.[36]

Indentured servants and apprentices would have been constrained by the common law; a woman of means, however, could bring her case in the appropriate court with a reasonable chance of success. Presumably a great lady and close companion of the king would have won such a case. Paulina, however, could not have remarried until Perdita was found, for Paulina's self-imposed dual mission was to shelter the queen and to prevent the king from taking another wife. For Paulina, celibacy was a duty. But once she has restored Hermione to a nominally more reliable Leontes, Paulina is dramatically a loose end that can be tied up by a new husband *ex machina*. And tied up she must be, for ideologically she is an 'unheaded woman',[37] unruly and masterless. Her powers of resuscitation, however benignly used, could be read as validating Leontes's earlier characterization of her as 'a mankind witch' (*WT*, II. 3. 68), whom he appropriately threatens to burn. To once again invoke Roberts, demonization was yet another way to deal with the threat of the powerful crone. Supplying Paulina with a mate would not only salve Leontes's conscience—her old petticoat brings forth a new codpiece—but would disempower and subsume her under

[36] *The Law's Resolutions of Women's Rights*, ed. by T. E., 1632, in *Daughters, Wives, & Widows: Writings by Men about Women and Marriage in England, 1500–1640,* ed. by Joan Larsen Klein (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), p. 39. Klein observes that *The Law's Resolutions* was apparently written at the turn of the century, although printed later.

[37] T. E. describes the widow as one whose 'head is cut off, her intellectual part is gone' (in Klein, p. 50). The adjective 'unheaded' is used in the anonymous play *The Puritan: or, the Widow of Watling Street* (1607), once attributed to Shakespeare. The widow has almost wed the jailbird, Idle, unmasked in the nick of time by a nobleman, who concludes, 'such is the blind besotting in the state of an unheaded woman that's a widow' (V. 4); *Disputed Plays of William Shakespeare*, ed. by William Kozlenko (New York: Hawthorn, 1974), pp. 230–61 (p. 256).

Camillo's domestic authority and legal coverture. Perhaps Shakespeare's nod to the scepticism of the more judicious playgoers is Paulina's and Camillo's silence when confronted with the king's surprising offer.[38]

Contrary to the tropes of the lusty widow and the widow hunt, in early modern England wealthy widows were not apt to remarry. Amy Louise Erickson, an economic historian, interrogates the received notion of the 'wealthy widow' as a prize, wealth supposedly being a primary source of a widow's allure: 'Aside from the breathtaking arrogance of both the contemporary and the historical stereotype, it is wholly untenable in the light of demographic and economic facts'. As compared to poor and 'middling sort' widows, the well-to-do were least likely to remarry 'from medieval England to nineteenth-century Virginia'.[39] For a woman of property, remarriage could be a desperate gamble; unless she had legally sequestered some part of her possessions before marriage, all she had became her husband's to spend or bequeath at will; moreover, 'though he bequeath them not, yet are they the husband's executor's and not the wife's which brought them to her husband'.[40] Thus, despite the protection offered by prenuptial contracts, despite the wisdom of the era which taught that 'The rich Widow weeps with one eye and casts glances with the other',[41] over half the widows of London aldermen (a representative group of well-to-do women) remained single.[42]

There is, however, a downside to celibacy, not only for the elderly widow but also for the child who becomes the focus of her life. This is obvious in *Coriolanus*, as Volumnia, addressing her daughter-in-law, cheerfully imagines herself in Virgilia's stead and her son's bed: 'If my son were my husband, I should freelier rejoice in that absence wherein he won honour than in the embracements of his bed where he would show most love' (I. 3. 1–5). Having lived vicariously

---

[38] The text allows Leontes' final speech to be played accordingly. Leontes could pause at line 146, as if waiting for a physical or gestural reply from Paulina and Camillo. Embarrassed that it is not forthcoming, he quickly orders, 'Let's from this place', only to encounter more cause for discomfort as Hermione shrinks from Polixenes, 'What? look upon my brother' (V. 3. 146–47).

[39] Amy Louise Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 196.

[40] The Law's Resolutions in Klein, p. 47.

[41] Morris Palmer Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Collection of the Proverbs Found in English Literature and the Dictionaries of the Period* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950), p. 722a, entry W340.

[42] Vivien Brodsky, 'Widows in Late Elizabethan London: Remarriage, Economic Opportunity and Family Orientations,' in *The World We Have Gained: Histories of Population and Social Structure,* ed. Lloyd Bonfield, Richard M. Smith, and Keith Wrightson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 122–54 (p. 123). Also see Barbara Todd, 'The Remarrying Widow: A Stereotype Reconsidered', in *Women in English Society 1500–1800*, ed. by Mary Prior (London: Methuen, 1985), pp. 54–92 (p. 69).

through her son, dominated his life, fostered his prowess and fatal inflexibility, and gained esteem through him, she becomes Rome's saviour by delivering him to death (V. 3. 185–89). The downside is less obvious in *All's Well That Ends Well,* but, reading against the grain perhaps, I argue that the play's two well-intentioned widowed mothers do their children far more harm than good. Aside from the works of psychoanalytically oriented critics, little has been written about the Countess, Shakespeare's addition to his source, other than praise for her graciousness and gravity. The best known comment on the Countess is still Bernard Shaw's; hers is 'the most beautiful old woman's part ever written'.[43] Yet the play's very first line, revealing the peculiar nature of the Countess's fidelity to her dead husband, gives us pause: 'In delivering my son from me, I bury a second husband' (I. 1. 1). Blurring the separate identities of husband and son, she implies through the obvious reluctance with which she lets Bertram leave Rossillion that she is losing a husband surrogate.[44] At the same time, knowing herself old and wishing herself young—'To be young again, if we could' (II. 2. 37) —she blurs her identity with Helena's. Having raised Helena and formed her character far more successfully than she has Bertram's, the Countess unconsciously sees herself in the receptive child of her own sex. With Helena's father dead, the Countess's attachment grows more intense; she steps into the role of Helena's mother as if retreating into a Lacanian Imaginary in which distinctions between mother and child are erased. Taking Helena's part against Bertram, she becomes Helena;[45] in this sense, she herself may marry Bertram while fulfilling her chief family obligation: to ensure the continuance of the Rossillion line. A passive abettor of Helena's suit, the Countess nevertheless plays a part in Bertram's unwelcome marriage. Publicly disgraced by his own lies, Bertram is trapped by the fulfilment of the impossible conditions he set for Helena, trapped in his mother's dream. How he feels is indicated by his response to Helena's question: 'Will you be mine now you are doubly won?' He replies not to

[43] George Bernard Shaw, *Our Theatres in the Nineties* (London: Constable, 1932), I, 30.

[44] W. Speed Hill describes the Countess as 'one so close to him [Bertram] that he has supplied for her the place of her own absent husband'. He further suggests that because Helena is the Countess's adoptive daughter, Bertram 'wants—and fears—that transposed intimacy [with his mother] in equal measure'; 'Marriage as Destiny: An Essay on *All's Well That Ends Well', English Literary Renaissance*, 5 (1975), 344–59 (p.351, p. 355). Richard P. Wheeler speaks of Bertram's need to 'win a woman he can isolate from his unconscious dread of incest'; 'Marriage and Manhood in *All's Well That Ends Well'*, *Bucknell Review,* 21.1 (1973), 103–24 (p. 116).

[45] See Ruth Nevo, 'Motive and Meaning in *All's Well That Ends Well', 'Fanned and Winnowed Opinions': Shakespearean Essays Presented to Harold Jenkins*, ed. by John W. Mahon and Thomas A. Pendleton (London: Methuen, 1987), p. 33; she cites Otto Rank and Norman Holland as having earlier identified the countess's unconscious motives. The transference has also been enacted on stage. J. L. Styan writes, 'With "Why, Helen, thou shalt have my leave and love" the Countess gives her such a blessing and embrace as to suggest that she is actually reliving her own story'; *All's Well That Ends Well. Shakespeare in Performance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 48.

Helena but to the King, and he uses the conditional: 'If she, my liege, can make me know this clearly | I'll love her dearly, ever, ever dearly' (V. 3. 308–10, my emphasis). His squirming suggests that, despite the evidence of the rings and her belly, he still hopes that she will not be able to prove her assertions. Is Helena ever likely to seem loveable to a very young man of shallow affections and unresolved tensions over his mother/wife/sister?[46]

Though no countess, Widow Capilet is also gifted with an impressive lineage, being 'derived from the ancient Capilet' (V. 3. 158), one of the great families of Italy.[47] But since her 'estate be fall'n' (III. 7. 4), she needs a generous dowry for Diana if the girl is to make an advantageous marriage. This mother's motives are not buried within her unconscious but are blatantly pecuniary. Suspecting that Helena is Bertram's wife, Widow Capilet initiates the 'sale' of Diana: "This young maid might do her [Bertram's wife] a shrewd turn if she pleas'd' (III. 5. 67–68). Helena understands, and two scenes later offers three thousand crowns in addition to the gold she has already given the Widow, buying the Widow's consent to an encounter in which Diana is to 'buy' Bertram's ring by falsely promising to sleep with him; or conversely, Diana must promise to sell herself to Bertram. Within a hierarchical society in which beauty contributes to the vulnerability of the poor, to protect Diana from seduction the Widow must contribute to her daughter's psychological scarring: 'My mother told me just how he would woo | As if she sat in's heart. She says all men | Have the like oaths' (IV. 2. 69–71). The cautions of an elderly single parent burdened by economic responsibilities and by a minatory double standard of morality, have led Diana to universalize Bertram. Filled with mistrust of men, she decides, 'Marry that will, I live and die a maid' (IV. 2. 74). She is no more likely to change her mind than is Bertram, her experience of him in France having revealed an even darker vision of the prerogatives of male desire and disregard than she had seen in Italy. Even when the King offers to pay her dowry, Diana remains silent.[48] The bedtrick that assures the continuance of the Countess's line becomes all the more problematic by reason of its unexpected toll on the Capilet's.

---

[46] Ann Blake asserts that although *All's Well* is Shakespeare's 'only play concerned with actual discrepancies in rank in a serious affective relationship,' for all but Bertram, that discrepancy becomes irrelevant. By the end of the play, the discrepancy that destroys the possibility of romance is his lack of desire for her; 'Breaking Rank in Shakespearean Marriage Plots', in *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching Performance,* ed. by Lloyd Davis (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), 103–15 (p. 113).

[47] Bertram's companions in Florence, the two French lords, refer to Diana as 'a young gentlewoman' (IV. 3. 13), and apparently think his seduction of her all the more heinous because of her birth.

Would things have gone better for Bertram and Diana had the child-focused widows remarried? —a question not to be asked. Yet *All's Well* does allow spectators to reflect on whether celibacy is necessarily the ultimate good that ideologues and their literary advocates would have had widows believe. We may also observe that Paulina, Volumnia, and the Countess reflect how financial sufficiency enabled celibacy among wealthy English women, and that Mistress Quickly reflects how financial inadequacy deterred celibacy among entrepreneurs. (Granted old Widow Capilet remains celibate, but the financial considerations that lead her to put her desirable daughter's reputation at risk can be seen as a displacement.) Broad generalizations about Shakespeare reinforcing or undermining the celibate imperative admittedly risk warping individual plays; moreover, Shakespeare's conscious concern was ever with telling a story, not with critiquing a discourse of widowhood. Even so, the plays I have examined intimate that the exaltation of celibacy falls short. Unlike the ideologues who had wholly sexualized a behaviour to a considerable extent contingent on material factors, Shakespeare's elderly widows gently interrogate the paradigm of the faithful 'relic' of her deceased husband, who achieves happiness for herself and others as she freely chooses the single state in a social, political, and economic vacuum.

[48] In an insightful Lacanian reading, Susan Snyder doubts whether Helena's desire is ever fulfilled or whether Diana marries; '"The King's Not Here": Displacement and Deferral in *All's Well That Ends Well,' Shakespeare Quarterly* 43.1 (1992), 20–32 (pp. 29–30).

MHRA
Modern Humanities Research Association
Working Papers
in the Humanities

Arthur Schnitzler – 'Einer der Modernsten unter den Modernen':[1] The Significance of Schnitzler's Associations with *das Junge Wien* for his Critical Reception in Vienna 1890-1900 as Documented in his Press Cuttings Collection.

Holly Sayer
University of Exeter

Abstract

My paper looks at the critical reception of Schnitzler's works in Vienna from 1890 to 1931 as documented in his press cuttings collection. Although the focus of my doctoral study is the significance of the question of Jewish identity, Schnitzler's associations with the Jung Wien *literary group clearly played an important role in shaping the reception of his early works and this is the focus of my first chapter. By addressing the following questions, this paper will explore to what extent and in what ways the critical reception of Schnitzler's early works* Anatol *and* Liebelei *was affected by his associations with the* Jung Wien*, and what, if any, impact this had on his subsequent critical reception: firstly, it will assess the role that Schnitzler played in the* Jung Wien *and the relative importance of the group for Schnitzler's literary development; secondly, it will examine the significance of his being labelled a representative of both specifically modern and specifically Viennese literature; finally it will evaluate how, together with his identity as a Jewish writer, his links with the* Jung Wien *group were detrimental to the critical reception of his works in Vienna throughout his lifetime.*

This working paper will investigate how Schnitzler's associations with the *Jung-Wien* group and his reputation as a writer of modern drama affected his critical reception in Vienna at the end of the nineteenth century. It will focus on the critical reception of *Liebelei* and *Anatol* with a view to establishing whether Schnitzler's identity as a member of the *Wiener Moderne* had a detrimental effect on how his works were received in the press. It will also assess how, if at all, their reception was further influenced by his Jewish identity. To date there is no study

of Schnitzler's critical reception that focuses specifically on the significance of his associations with *das Junge Wien*. All of the newspaper articles cited are taken from Schnitzler's collection of press cuttings, which is housed at the University of Exeter. It is probably the most comprehensive collection of items regarding his critical reception in existence. Together with its breadth, its particular value lies in the fact that it allows us to see exactly what Schnitzler knew about his own critical reception. Despite its obvious worth, the collection remains underused by academics working in the field of Schnitzler studies.

For twenty-first century scholars, fin-de-siècle Vienna has become synonymous with cultural achievement, and not only in the field of literature: even the briefest appraisal of the arts, philosophy and social sciences during this period reveals a wealth of accomplishments that are unparalleled in any other period of the city's history. It was a time of rapid change and instability when previously held beliefs and convictions were dismissed and disproved, and the city's inhabitants were bombarded with challenging new ideas and theories. One only has to think of Ernst Mach's *Die Analyse der Empfindungen und das Verhältnis des Physischen zum Psychischen* (1885) or Freud's *Die Traumdeutung* (1899) to appreciate the extent to which conventional ideas were being challenged during this period.[2] The city's modern literary scene was dominated by writers such as Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Felix Salten, Richard Beer-Hofmann, and, of course, Arthur Schnitzler.[3] Often collectively referred to as *das Junge Wien*, they met at the Café Griensteidl. Writing about the importance of the *Kaffeehaus* to the *Jung-Wien* group, Gotthart Wunberg comments that 'man sollte die Rolle des Kaffeehauses nicht als anekdotische Zugabe werten. Ihr soziologischer Charakter hat viel mit dem der Gruppe zu tun, die sich dort zu treffen pflegte'.[4]

Throughout 1891 Schnitzler made repeated references to *das Junge Wien* and *Jung Österreich* in his diaries, including a list of all the people he considered to be a part of that

---

[1] 'One of the most modern of the modern'. All translations into English are by the current author. Arthur von Gschmeidler, *Allgemeine Kunst-Chronik*, 95.

[2] Mach's *Analyse der Empfindungen* was first published in 1886, although it went largely unnoticed until its 1900 German reprint, which followed the publication of the 1897 English translation, and attracted considerable attention. For a brief discussion of Mach's ideas and their impact in the broader context of fin-de-siècle Vienna see Ursula Baatz, 'Ernst Mach and the World of Sensations', in *Vienna: The World of Yesterday, 1889–1914*, ed. by Eric Bronner and F. Peter Wagner (New York: Humanity Books, 1999), pp. 82–92.

[3] In her work *Modern Austria: Empire and Republic 1815–1986* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), Barbara Jelavich comments that 'Arthur Schnitzler […] is perhaps the most representative writer for the period', p. 125.

[4] 'One should not judge the role of the coffee house to be an anecdotal extra. Its sociological character has a lot to do with that of the group that was in the habit of meeting there'. See Gotthart Wunberg and Johannes J. Braakenburg, 'Einleitung', in *Die Wiener Moderne: Literatur, Kunst und Musik zwischen 1890 und 1910*, ed. by Gotthart Wunberg and Johannes J. Braakenburg (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1981), pp. 11–79 (p. 19).

group.[5] However, Andrew C. Wisely comments that *das Junge Wien* was 'less a literary movement than an assembly of great minds', which 'in less than two years […] began to wear on Schnitzler's nerves'; a fact Wisely attributes to the polarization of the group into 'coolly distant friends and those whose reviews Schnitzler would find unfair and vindictive'.[6] Hermann Bahr was undoubtedly an important figure in the development of *das Junge Wien*. As owner of the *Deutsche Zeitung* since 1893 and co-founder of *Die Zeit*, he was well positioned to publicize and promote *die Wiener Moderne* in both Vienna and Berlin, and he undoubtedly deserves recognition for helping Austrian literary Modernism develop a distinct identity, as well as for ensuring that its writers' works received the profile and recognition they deserved. However, although the establishment of the *Jung-Wien* group owes much to Hermann Bahr, it is important to recognize that he was not the movement's founder. This is a common misapprehension that he himself encouraged during his lifetime and which has passed into subsequent scholarship, Peter Sprengel and Gregor Streim commenting that 'der von Bahr selbst geschaffene Mythos, er sei der Gründer des Jungen Wien und der modernen österreichischen Literatur gewesen, wurde von Literaturgeschichten oftmals übernommen und begegnet gelegentlich auch noch in neuesten Arbeiten'.[7]

It is clear that during this period Schnitzler was regarded as one (if not the) leader of the *Jung-Wien* group. Consequently, his contemporary critics labelled him as a representative of Viennese Modernism.[8] This was not a role that Schnitzler chose. At best *das Junge Wien* offered him a forum to read his works and exchange ideas with other writers. There is no evidence, however, to suggest that he wished to be regarded as their spokesperson.

In Vienna, many critics viewed Schnitzler's associations with Modernism and the *Jung-Wien* group in a wholly negative light. One critic, writing for the *Wiener Neueste Nachrichten*, labelled him disparagingly as one of Vienna's 'Stirnlocken- und Kaffeehaus-Literaten', a description that also displays blatantly anti-Semitic overtones.[9] It is clear that many Viennese critics did not welcome the presence of the *Wiener Moderne* in the city's

---

[5] This list is reproduced in Wunberg and Braakenburg, *Die Wiener Moderne*, p. 14. See also Arthur Schnitzler, *Tagebuch 1879–1892* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987), pp. 318–20.

[6] Andrew C. Wisely, *Arthur Schnitzler and Twentieth-Century Criticism* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2004), p. 8.

[7] 'Bahr's self-created myth' that 'he was the founder of the *Jung-Wien* group and of modern Austrian literature, was often accepted into histories of literature and one still occasionally encounters it in the most recent studies'. Peter Sprengel and Gregor Streim, *Berliner und Wiener Moderne: Vermittlungen und Abgrenzungen in Literatur, Theater, Publizistik* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1998), p. 82.

[8] W. E. Yates supports this claim, writing that 'it was in fact Schnitzler and Hofmannsthal who were generally recognized as the leading creative figures of the "Jung Wien" group'. See W. E. Yates, *Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and the Austrian Theater* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 3.

[9] 'One of Vienna's ringleted coffee-house literati'.

theatrical scene. The same critic writing for the *Wiener Neueste Nachrichten* accuses Vienna's Modernist writers of trying to emulate their German counterparts, criticising 'wie sie derzeit in Wien zu Dutzenden als "Deutsche Dichter" herumlaufen'. He also attempts to undermine any suggestion that Schnitzler might be a talented writer by asserting that 'es ist gegenwärtig nicht schwer ein "modernes" Schauspiel zu schreiben'.[10]

It was not only the critics, but at times also the audience that were reluctant to accept the new modernist drama that was being performed in their theatres. It is hard to overestimate the significance of the theatre to fin-de-siècle Vienna. Yates writes that 'in a city celebrated for its theatrical culture, it was natural that modernism ('die Moderne') was launched in the theatre'. He dates its beginnings as the 'Ibsen week' in April 1891.[11] However, in the decade that followed it seems that the audience was not yet ready—was not yet modern enough—for Schnitzler's plays. Interestingly, in his article for the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* on 2 December 1893, following the *Deutsches Volkstheater* première of Schnitzler's *Das Märchen*, the critic Richard Specht holds his fellow critics partially responsible for the negative reception of Schnitzler's early work, writing: 'Ein neuer Dichter sollte gegrüßt werden; würden sie ihn grüßen? Sie haben ihn nicht gegrüßt. Und sie waren von vornherein entschlossen dazu. Und daß die Kritik ihnen dabei half, ist das jämmerlichste daran.'[12] He believes that the critics had a responsibility to act as intermediaries between Schnitzler and his audience.

During this period Schnitzler published two of his most significant early works, his cycle of seven one-act scenes *Anatol*, and his play *Liebelei*. The latter sees Christine, a poor violin player's daughter from the *Vorstadt*, fall in love with Fritz, who is her social superior. The play ends in tragedy when Fritz is killed in a duel after his affair with a married woman is revealed. Having given his life for another woman, Fritz's relationship with Christine is cruelly exposed to her as little more than a flirtation. In *Anatol*, too, Schnitzler takes male-female relationships as his central theme. Each scene sees Anatol in conversation with a current or former lover, and in five of the seven scenes there is also dialogue between Anatol and his friend Max.

Liebelei was premièred on 9 October 1895 in Vienna's Burgtheater. The play's performance was a significant marker, both in the history of the Burgtheater and in Schnitzler's career, Yates referring to it as 'the production that signalled the breakthrough of

[10] 'How at present they are running around Vienna in their dozens as "German writers"'; 'Currently it is not difficult to write a "modern" play.'
[11] Ibid., pp. 1–2.

indigenous modern drama'.[13] Its arrival had been awaited with much interest, as the première of *Das Märchen* in the Deutsches Volkstheater in Vienna two years previously had met with considerable criticism in the press and the play was taken out of the theatre's repertoire after the second performance. Critics had commented on Schnitzler's relationship with Adele Sandrock, who at the time was a member of the Deutsches Volkstheater company. They alleged that it was only thanks to this relationship between playwright and actress that *Das Märchen* was performed at all.[14] Nonetheless, *Liebelei*'s première was a success and the applause was so great that Schnitzler had to appear on the stage after every act.

Max Burckhard agreed to stage *Liebelei* within two days of having been given it to read by Schnitzler, who at the time was living in the same building as the theatre director. Schnitzler had read *Liebelei* to Hofmannsthal and Salten on 14 October 1894, and they had advised him to offer the play to the Burgtheater: 'Nm. las ich Loris [Hofmannsthal] und Salten Liebelei, die zu meiner Ueberraschung [*sic*] sehr gefiel. Ich solle außer einigen Wendungen nichts ändern, Burgtheater einreichen'.[15] It was undoubtedly a risk for Burckhard to agree to the play's performance. Schnitzler's associations with the *Wiener Moderne* meant that the inclusion of *Liebelei* in the theatre's repertoire was seen as a break with tradition. Not only was this the first time that Schnitzler's work had been performed in the Burgtheater, but he was also the first of any of the *Jung-Wien* circle to have their work accepted there.[16] In his diary entry for 16 October 1894, Schnitzler notes with frustration that Hermann Bahr concluded that *Liebelei* was more suitable for the Raimundtheater than the Burgtheater, without having even read the play: 'Nm. Bahr bei mir, dem Hugo vom Stück gesprochen; er auch schon mit Burckhard. —Charakteristisch—ohne Stück gelesen zu haben, findet er es fürs Raimundth..'[17] In spite of Bahr's reservations and those of Adolf von Sonnenthal, who

---

[12] 'A new author ought to be welcomed: would they welcome him? They did not welcome him, and were determined not to do so from the start. That the critics helped them in this process is the most deplorable thing about it'.

[13] W. E. Yates, *Theatre in Vienna: A Critical History, 1776-1995* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 180. For an interesting, if necessarily brief, overview of the significance of *Liebelei*'s Burgtheater première and its critical reception as documented in Schnitzler's Collection of Press Cuttings, see W. E. Yates, 'Schnitzler und die Sprachkrise: Wort, Wahrheit und "Liebelei"', in *Arthur Schnitzler im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert*, ed. by Konstanze Fliedl (Vienna: Picus, 2003), pp. 212–26.

[14] Ellen Butzko, *Arthur Schnitzler und die zeitgenössische Theaterkritik* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1991), p. 37.

[15] 'This afternoon I read *Liebelei* to Loris and Salten, which to my surprise they liked. They said apart from a few phrases I should change nothing and submit it to the Burgtheater'. All quotations from Schnitzler's diaries are referenced by the volume and date of entry. Arthur Schnitzler, *Tagebuch 1893–1902*, 14 October 1894.

[16] Renate Wagner and Brigitte Vacha, *Wiener Schnitzler-Aufführungen 1891–1970*, Studien zur Kunst des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 17 (Munich: Prestel, 1971), p. 25.

[17] 'This afternoon Bahr, who had talked to Hugo about the piece, visited me; he had already seen Burckhard—typical—he found the piece suitable for the Raimundtheater without having read it.' Arthur Schnitzler, *Tagebuch 1893-1902*, 16 October 1894.

had been the Burgtheater's temporary director for a brief period following the resignation of Adolf Wilbrandt in 1887, Burckhard resolved to stage the play at the Burgtheater.[18]

Despite *Liebelei*'s success, some critics still speculated as to the shock and indignation that the play might invoke amongst the more traditional members of the Burgtheater audience. In an article published in the *Montags Revue* on 14 October 1895, the critic Alfred Freiherr von Berger writes:

> Mancher alte Burgtheaterbesucher dürfte die Aufführung eines derartigen Stückes im Burgtheater geradezu als Scandal empfunden und sich entrüstet gefragt haben, durch welchen Zufall sich dieses Vorstadtstück auf die Bühne verirren konnte, auf der Schiller und Grillparzer heimisch sind.[19]

Berger's reference to Schiller and Grillparzer demonstrates the extent to which the Burgtheater was still associated with traditional drama. It is therefore unsurprising that *Liebelei*, the first play in Viennese dialect to be performed in the Burgtheater, created a few waves amongst audience and critics alike. Yates refers to 'the tension between innovation and conservatism' that he describes as characteristic of the 'artistic ambience of Vienna' throughout Burckhard's time as director of the Burgtheater.[20] Consequently, Burckhard's decision to champion modern and realist drama meant that he met with considerable opposition throughout his tenure.[21] During this period, Schnitzler was also vulnerable to those same tensions, and Yates claims that this in part explains why *Liebelei*'s 'daring modernity met with a predictably mixed reception'.[22]

Many of Schnitzler's contemporary critics saw *Liebelei* as confirmation that his main topic was the plight of the *süßes Mädel*. In her biography of Schnitzler, Wagner presents Christine as the very epitome of the various fictional embodiments of the *süßes Mädel*:

---

[18] Adolf von Sonnenthal had been concerned about the nature of the play's contents, convinced that Christine and Mizi's unaccompanied visit to Fritz would lead to a scandal. See Vacha and Wagner, p. 25.

[19] 'Many old Burgtheater visitors may have felt the performance of such a piece at the Burgtheater to be an absolute scandal, and have wondered in outrage through what accident this *Vorstadt* piece could have strayed onto the stage that is home to Schiller and Grillparzer.'

[20] Yates, *Theatre in Vienna*, p. 181.

[21] A number of critics writing for the Viennese right-wing press objected to the inclusion of works by Modernist writers in the *Burgtheater* repertoire. In an article published in the nationalistic paper *Vaterland* on 11 October 1895 the critic writes: 'Es läge also wieder einmal die Frage nahe, ob und wieweit das Burgtheater die Moderne Production—das heißt diejenige, die sich selbst so nennt und ihre Ausschreitungen als ein Postulat des Zeitgeistes hinstellt – berücksichtigen soll.' 'So we arrive again at the question of whether, and to what extent, the Burgtheater should consider the modern production—that is to say those which call themselves modern and make their excesses a prerequisite of the Zeitgeist.'

[22] Yates, *Theatre in Vienna*, p. 180.

'Dieses "süße Mädel" stammt aus der Vorstadt und ist eigentlich schon von Nestroy in die Wiener Literatur eingebracht worden, es kulminiert in der Christine der "Liebelei".'[23] Ellen Butzko suggests that this reputation remained with Schnitzler throughout his career and that subsequently critics were often reluctant to see his works as anything other than variations on this theme. She cites Felix Salten's article, written to mark Schnitzler's fiftieth birthday and published in the *Neue Rundschau* in 1912, which certainly seems to support this claim: 'Von der Liebe sprechen alle seine Bücher.'[24]

Schnitzler started writing *Anatol* in June 1888 and finally finished it in November 1891. Five of the acts were published prior to the 1893 publication of the *Anatol*-cycle. Despite the intervention of Hermann Bahr on Schnitzler's behalf, *Anatol* was rejected by Fischer on several occasions before eventually being published in 1893 by the Bibliographisches Bureau in Berlin.[25] Even this was only made possible thanks to Wilhelm König lending Schnitzler the five hundred marks that were necessary to secure the publication.[26]

Writing in 1929, Otto Schinnerer emphasized the considerable critical attention the work attracted, highlighting the positive reviews that it received in papers such as Vienna's *Fremdenblatt* and *Die Gegenwart*.[27] In fact, there are a total of twenty-five articles in Schnitzler's press cuttings collection regarding the Bibliographisches Bureau publication of the *Anatol*-cycle. Amongst the most positive is that written by Karl Kraus for *Die Gesellschaft*, in which Kraus claims that Schnitzler 'gehört zu den bedeutendsten Talenten Jungösterreichs'.[28] Part of this article is reproduced in Offermanns's notes for the 1964 edition of the play, and he comments on the favourable nature of the article in comparison with some of Kraus's later remarks regarding Schnitzler, especially in his 1897 essay 'Die demolierte Literatur'.[29] This reflects Kraus's change in attitude towards *Jung-Wien* writers during the 1890s. The cycle was not performed as a whole until eighteen years after its 1893 publication, although four of the seven individual acts were performed in the 1890s.

---

[23] 'This "süßes Mädel" comes from the suburbs and has actually already been introduced into Viennese literature by Nestroy. This figure reaches its peak in *Liebelei*'s Christine.' Renate Wagner, *Arthur Schnitzler: Eine Biographie* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1984), p. 55.
[24] 'All of his books talk about love.' Felix Salten, *Neue Rundschau*, 23 (1912), p. 636, cited in Butzko, p. 40.
[25] For publication details see Reinhard Urbach, *Schnitzler-Kommentar zu den Erzählenden Schriften und Dramatischen Werken* (Munich: Winkler, 1974), pp. 139-41.
[26] See Wagner, p. 53.
[27] Otto Schinnerer 'The Early Works of Arthur Schnitzler', *Germanic Review*, 4 (1929), 153–97 (p. 153).
[28] 'He is one of *Jungösterreich*'s most eminent talents.' The article is published in *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Literatur, Kunst und Sozialpolitik*, 1893.
[29] Arthur Schnitzler, *Anatol: Text und Materialen zur Interpretation*, ed. by Ernst. L. Offermanns, Komedia 6 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1964), pp. 180–81.

It is interesting to note that even as early as 1896 Schnitzler was seen as representative of a specifically Viennese literature, as is clearly suggested by the reference to him as an *Urwiener* by the critic writing for the *Literarische Gesellschaft* in Leipzig following the 1896 première of the first scene in the *Anatol* cycle, *Die Frage an das Schicksal*. Similarly, two years later following the November 1898 *Raimundtheater* performance of the fifth *Anatol* scene, *Abschiedssouper*, the critic writing for the *Wiener Zeitung* clearly identifies the play as having specifically Viennese qualities:

> Wie anders wirkt dieser Wiener Poet! Schnitzler ist eine eigenartige Schriftstellergestalt. Er hat Wiener Menschen in die Welt gesetzt, ihnen Esprit und Laune, tiefe Schmerzeslaute und jauchzende Lustworte gegeben. […] Diese Art modernes Wiener Stück gehört Schnitzler als Begründer.[30]

In fact, the reviews of the *Anatol* scenes that were performed in the 1890s and early 1900s demonstrate an acute awareness of Schnitzler as a specifically Viennese writer and of his works as possessing specifically modern characteristics. For example, in a review of the January 1900 performance of *Die Frage an das Schicksal* in Vienna's Josefstädter Theater, published in the city's *Arbeiter Zeitung*, the critic comments with reference to the seven *Anatol* scenes: 'In allen weht eine ermüdende Dekadenzluft […] In ihnen ist ein merkwürdiges Gemisch vom Vergangenen und Zukünftigen, aber freilich dabei mehr erschlaffender Zweifel als vertrauende Hoffnung. Echtes fin de Siècle! Sie sind prickelnd interessant, sie gehen auf die Nerven.'[31] The necessarily limited scope of this working paper means that there is not room for a full discussion of the significance of Schnitzler's identity as a specifically Viennese writer. Suffice it to say that it caused considerable controversy throughout his lifetime, especially from right-wing critics who objected to a Jewish writer representing Austrian literature.

In conclusion, it seems that Schnitzler's reputation as a writer of modern drama had a detrimental effect on the critical reception of his early works in Vienna. At times this was compounded both by his associations with the *Jung-Wien* group, and his Jewish identity, leading him to claim in 1917 that he was 'der am meisten beschimpfte Dichter deutscher

[30] 'What a different impression is made by this Viennese poet! Schnitzler is a peculiar sort of literary figure. He has brought Viennese people into the world, has given them wit and temperament, deep cries of pain and gleeful shouts of pleasure […] This sort of modern Viennese play belongs to Schnitzler as its founder.'

Sprache'—a claim that is certainly supported by the mass of virulently anti-Semitic cuttings contained in Schnitzler's press cuttings collection.[32]

---

[31] 'An air of tiring decadence blows through all of them [the seven *Anatol* scenes]. There is a strange mixture of the past and the future in them, but there is certainly more weary doubt than confident hope with it. Typical fin-de-siècle! They are tingling with interest, they work on the nerves.'

[32] 'The most slandered writer of the German language.' Arthur Schnitzler, *Tagebuch 1917–1919*, 13 December 1917.