

dem anfänglich begrüßten Alleinsein wird dort dann oft schmerzhaft Einsamkeit, die in der Gemeinschaftssuche der Befreiungskriege ein Ventil findet. Die Techniken der Agitation sind durch die Einfachheit der Sprache, die gängigen Reime und dem Liedcharakter vieler Texte gewissermaßen schon vorbereitet. Vgl. dazu auch einige von Eichendorffs Gedichten wie z. B. "Aufbruch" (HKA 1.1: 175), "Soldatenlied" (HKA 1.1: 179) oder "Kriegslied" (HKA 1.1: 120).

• WORKS CITED

- von Borman, Alexander. "'Tief Verlangen nach besserer Lust'. Zu Eichendorffs Gedicht 'Die Heimat. An meinen Bruder'". *Gedichte und Interpretationen. Bd. 3. Klassik und Romantik*. Hg. v. Wulf Segebrecht. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1984. 451-462.
- von Eichendorff, Joseph Freiherr. *Sämtliche Werke*. Bd. 1.1. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe. Hg. v. Wilhelm Kosch. Regensburg: Habel, 1921. Frühwald, Wolfgang. *Eichendorff Chronik: Daten zu Leben und Werk*. München: Hanser, 1977.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode. Gesammelte Werke*. Bd. 1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.
- Kunisch, Hermann. "Freiheit und Bann - Heimat und Freude." *Eichendorff Heute*. Hg. v. Paul Stöcklein. München: Bayerischer-Schulbuch Verlag, 1960. 131-164.
- Lämmert, Eberhard. "Eichendorffs Wandel unter den Deutschen: Überlegungen zur Wirkungsgeschichte seiner Dichtung." Sonderdruck aus: *Die Deutsche Romantik: Poetik, Formen und Motive*. Hg. v. Hans Steffen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967. 219-252.
- Offermanns, Ernst. "Eichendorffs Roman *Dichter und ihre Gesellen*." *Literaturwissenschaft und Geschichtsphilosophie*. Hg. v. Helmut Arntzen, et al. Berlin: Gruyter, 1975. 373-387.
- Schulz, Gerhard. "'Mit den Menschen ändert die Welt sich'. Zu Friedrich von Hardenbergs '5. Hymne an die Nacht.'" *Gedichte und Interpretationen. Bd. 3. Klassik und Romantik*. Hg. v. Wulf Segebrecht. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1984. 202-215.
- Schwarz, Egon. *Joseph von Eichendorff*. New York: Twayne, 1972.
- Schwarz, Peter Paul. *Aurora: Zur romantischen Zeitstruktur bei Eichendorff*. Bad Homburg: Gehlen, 1970.
- Seidlin, Oskar. *Versuche über Eichendorff*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- . "Eichendorffs symbolische Landschaft." *Eichendorff Heute. Stimmen der Forschung mit einer Bibliographie*. Hg. v. Paul Stöcklein. München: Bayerischer-Schulbuch Verlag, 1960. 218-241.
- Stöcklein, Paul. *Joseph von Eichendorff in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1963.

Goethe's *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten*: A Serialized Reading

Siegfried Weing,
Virginia Military Institute

After observing that older studies of Goethe's *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten* treat sources,¹ novella theory, or the relationship between the frame and the tales, Theodore Ziolkowski expands the scope of the critical investigation by emphasizing the aesthetic dimensions of the work. Studies that deal with theory reveal conflicting conclusions. Hellmuth Himmel notes: "die Rahmengespräche [bieten] so gut wie nichts was ernsthaft als Beitrag zu einer Theorie der Novelle zu werten wäre" (29). Johannes Klein, however, believes: "die Gespräche führen zu den *ersten theoretischen Erörterungen über das Wesen der Novelle*" (63).² When it comes to determining which tales are novellas, opinion again is divided: Oskar Walzel finds no novellas (169); McBurney Mitchell considers "Der Prokurator" and "Ferdinand" to be examples of the genre (221); whereas Josef Kunz believes all the narratives, excepting "Das Märchen," are novellas (41).

A review of critics who assess from other viewpoints also reveals opposed opinions. One group of critics holds the work in low esteem. Erich Trunz considers *Unterhaltungen* "ein Nebenwerk" because Goethe intended it only for entertainment (599). Katharina Mommsen states that Goethe views a novella collection as "ein lockeres Gefüge" and, in such narrative ventures, "verzichtet Goethe mit Absicht auf Einheit . . . (63)." Ziolkowski, likewise, sees no unity because "the work is a fragment" (65). Hans Popper, however, finds a palpably organic unity (214).

August Raabe believes that Goethe and the chaplain (the principal narrator) use the stories to educate their respective audiences—German readers and the young people in the frame. They attain their goal by telling tales that become progressively better in aesthetic quality and increasingly more edifying in moral content (30-34). Bernhard von Arx, Ilse Jürgens, Joachim Müller, Gerhard Fricke, Jane Brown, Rolf Geißler, and Sigrid Bauschinger arrive, with exceptions and qualifications, at the same conclusion. Brown notes, for example, that "the narratives are subordinated as a pedagogical response to the problem posed by the frame" (8). Bauschinger first defines the educational program ("nur Bildung rettet die

Menschen vom Untergang") and then observes that didactic aims, in the form of "Entsagung" and "Aufopferung," manifest themselves in all the narratives. These virtues find their best expression in the last tale, "Das Märchen," with the self-sacrifice of the serpent (140).

Bernd Bräutigam, Ulrich Gaier, and Bernd Witte also interpret in pedagogical terms, but draw sharply different conclusions than do the above critics. Bräutigam believes that Goethe used this "Nebenwerk" to rebut Schiller's idealistic "Programm" of aesthetic education as stated in *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*. Gaier and Witte express the same view: Gaier confines his interpretations to the first nine *Briefe* as they pertain to the frame of *Unterhaltungen*, whereas Witte concentrates upon all the letters as they apply to "Das Märchen." Bräutigam expresses a collective view when he observes that the plan to initiate "Bildungsprozesse" through "das Erzählen von Geschichten" fails (533).

Bernhard Gajek, Peter Morgan, Gerhard Neumann, Christine Träger, and Jürgen Söring stress that *Unterhaltungen* represents Goethe's literary reaction to the French Revolution. Gajek notes, as do many critics, that Goethe was no supporter of the Revolution. Since all narratives have moral themes and emphasize "Entsagung," Goethe is advocating that moral restraint and education do more to improve society than does revolution. Morgan points out that Goethe, upon visiting friends in Mainz in 1792, reported: "Von politischen Dingen war die Rede nicht, man fühlte, daß man sich wechselseitig zu schonen habe . . ." (299). The failure of the frame characters to exercise similar consideration in *Unterhaltungen* leads to an explosive political argument. In order to restore social harmony, the refugees ban all controversial topics and attempt to amuse themselves by telling stories. The Revolution not only disrupts normal social intercourse, it also adversely affects the creative impulse, for the stories "are hackneyed, trivial and verge on the pornographic" (305). Neumann, interpreting in Foucaultian terms, stresses that the Revolution led to new social and economic conditions and that Goethe, in his first six stories, emphasizes the conflicts that arise when ideals between the old and the new orders clash. Söring believes the first four tales, all ghost stories, represent ironic aftershocks of the Revolution and also serve as harbingers of the anti-rationalism that was to characterize the post-enlightened age (549). Träger notes that the Revolution engendered many unprecedented events. Goethe chose the novella to give artistic expression to such events because this Renaissance genre, which originally was conceived during a time of social upheaval, depicted the same type of "sonderbare Begebenheiten" as do the first six narratives of *Unterhaltungen* (78-91).

Since critical inquiries into the work have yielded both closely allied as well as widely divergent results, an examination from a hitherto neglected

viewpoint seems justified. Even though all the scholars mentioned above know that *Unterhaltungen* appeared in six separate installments of Schiller's journal *Die Horen*, they treat the work as if it had been conceived and executed as a unity—no critic has paid other than cursory attention to the impact of serialization. In their interpretations, moreover, critics also tend to gloss over Goethe's stated intentions for the work. In view of these gaps, this study will attempt to illuminate the genesis of the individual installments.

On 24 June 1794 Schiller invites Goethe to contribute to *Die Horen*. Goethe accepts and on 1 October writes Schiller he intends to play a prank: "Für die Horen . . . sinne ich auf Vehikel und Masken, wodurch und unter welchem wir dem Publico manches zuschieben können" (*Briefwechsel* 19). On 26 October Goethe writes that he soon will forward his first contribution, an "Epistel," and asks whether Schiller needs additional works. Schiller reminds Goethe of his earlier plan to adapt "die Geschichte des Ehrlichen Prokurators aus dem Boccaz" and even schedules this work for the third volume of the journal (25). Goethe replies: "Die Erzählung soll zu Ende des Jahrs bereit sein" (26).³ Shortly thereafter Goethe decides to expand from this one tale to a story cycle patterned on *The Decameron*.

This project so piques Goethe's interest that he completes the opening framework in the next few days and takes it with him when he visits Schiller in Jena on 2 November. This framework describes how the French Revolution forces a German family, led by a widowed baroness, to flee from its home on the west bank of the Rhine. Once settled on the east bank, the political argument erupts and the baroness attempts to restore social harmony by banning all controversial topics. The frame ends with the family chaplain's offer to provide entertainment ("Unterhaltung") by telling stories.

Schiller apparently finds a problem in this installment that Goethe consents to correct. Both authors agree that this frame would appear in the first volume of the journal. Goethe resubmits the manuscript on 27 November and expresses the hope "daß ich das rechte Maß und den gehörigen Ton möchte getroffen haben." He also tells Schiller: "Zu den kleinen Erzählungen habe ich grosse Lust . . ." Schiller replies: "Nach meinem Urtheile ist das Ganze sehr zweckmäßig eingeleitet, und besonders finde ich den strittigen Punkt sehr glücklich ins Reine gebracht" (26-27).⁴ Despite this positive evaluation, Schiller continues to harbor reservations, for he comments on the lack of a story to accompany the framework. But, fearing Goethe may come to regard his work for the journal an "Onus," he withdraws this objection. He next expresses concern over the abrasiveness of three frame characters⁵ and concludes his letter by exhorting Goethe to begin his prank: "Da Sie im Verlauf der Erzählungen . . . oft ihr Spiel treiben

werden, so wäre es wenigstens nicht übel, gleich damit anzufangen . . ." (27-28).⁶ Goethe replies: "Mir ist sehr erfreulich, daß Sie mit meinem Prologus . . . nicht unzufrieden sind." He also shows sensitivity to Schiller's comments: although unable to send a story, he agrees to the other suggestion—"Ich will . . . dem geheimen Rat und Louisen Sordinen auflegen und Karlen vielleicht noch eine Forte geben." He then gives Schiller an insight into his narrative technique: "[ich] gedenke . . . wie die Erzählerin in der Tausend und einen Nacht zu verfahren" (29).

Despite Goethe's changes, Schiller continues to be disappointed, for he writes Theodor Körner: "Von [Goethe] findest Du . . . den Anfang von einer Reihe von Erzählungen; aber dieser Anfang . . . hat meine Erwartung keineswegs befriedigt. Leider trifft dieses Unglück schon das erste Stück; aber es war nicht mehr zu ändern" (*Schillers Briefe* 76). After sending all manuscripts of the first volume of *Die Horen* to Cotta, the publisher, Schiller complains to Körner that Goethe does not send him "die exquisitesten Sachen"⁷ for his journal. He also repeats his earlier assessment: "Göthens Erzählungen . . . sind nicht von dem Werth, wie seine übrigen Arbeiten" (*Schillers Briefe* 90). Upon reading the first volume, Körner agrees with Schiller's evaluation: "den '[Wilhelm] Meister' darf man nicht daneben stellen" (Gräf 328).

After sending the final draft of the framework to Schiller, Goethe inquired whether a ghost story involving Hippolyte Clairon has ever been published. If not, "so lieferte ich sie noch, und wir fingen so recht vom *Unglaublichen* an . . ." (30). Upon receiving a negative reply, Goethe asks Schiller to keep this matter confidential (33). Later, while in Jena, Goethe discusses with Schiller several tales he is considering for *Unterhaltungen* and, shortly after returning to Weimar, writes that he is about to begin working on "die Gespenster-Geschichten" (34). On 10 January 1795 he forwards these tales to Schiller and suggests that they are part of his prank: "Es sollte mir lieb sein, wenn Ihnen meine Bemühungen mit dem grossen Hennings zu wetteifern nicht missfiele" (Gräf 325).⁸

In this installment the chaplain begins the evening's entertainment by telling the story "Antonelli." After he finishes, the refugees speculate about the mysterious sounds described in this tale. Fritz, the baroness's son, claims to have a solution. When urged to reveal it, he side-steps by telling "Der Klopffeist," a story that also involves a mysterious sound. When Fritz finishes, the frame characters puzzle over "das Klopfen" described in this tale. Their pondering is interrupted by a loud crack, which an investigation reveals to have come from a splitting desk top. The refugees lose interest in Fritz's story and now devote their attention to this mystery. After they fail to arrive at a solution, Karl tells the story "Die schöne Krämerin." The "Ausgewanderten" now speculate over the fate of the

shopkeeper and fail, again, to come up with an explanation. Karl then tells "Der Schleier," a story Luise dismisses as a "Märchen." Her brother Fritz will not allow for such an interpretation, for he insists that a tradition similar to that of the talismans described in the story exists in their family. Luise requests more information, but Fritz replies that it is a secret that may be passed on only from father to eldest son. When the other refugees demand an explanation, Fritz proclaims: "ich habe wohl schon zuviel gesagt" (166) and leaves the room. His departure signals the end of the installment.

In these tales Goethe adopts a narrative technique based on Scheherezade's. This technique, as he told F. W. Riemer, involves narrating "[so] dass eine Erzählung durch die andere hervorgerufen [wird]" (Gräf 352). Goethe utilizes this technique by first narrating and then by attempting to explain mysterious events. He curtails all speculation either by having one of the refugees tell another, unrelated story or by inserting a mysterious event into the frame itself. Goethe does not allow for a satisfactory explanation for any of the stories or frame incidents, thereby leaving the frame characters and the readers dangling.

Since Goethe visited Jena one day after submitting these tales, Schiller's reaction remains unrecorded. After publication in February, Schiller receives a sampling of public opinion. Charlotte von Stein, in a letter to Schiller's wife, takes Goethe to task for debasing the contents of *Die Horen*:

Dem Goethe scheint's gar nicht mehr Ernst um's Schreiben zu sein, dass er die bekannte Geschichte der Mademoiselle Clairon, die er nach Italien transportirt, die vom Klopfen, welche mir vor drei Jahren Herr von Pannwitz erzählte . . . und die aus des Bassompierre sehr bekannten mémoires . . . gut genug zum Inhalt eines so respectablen Journals wie die 'Horen' hält. (Gräf 328)

Stein faults these tales over the dual circumstance that they are borrowed and of poor quality.

On 22 February Schiller asks Goethe about the possibility of including "Der Prokurator" in the third volume of *Die Horen*. Occupied with other matters, Goethe offers, instead, to send this story for the fourth volume. In this (the third) installment, submitted on 19 March, the chaplain again offers to tell a story. The baroness welcomes this offer, but forewarns the chaplain:

Jene Erzählungen machen mir keine Freude, bei welchen nach

Weise der 'Tausendundeine Nacht' eine Begebenheit in die andere eingeschachtelt, ein Interesse durch das andere verdrängt wird, wo sich der Erzähler genötigt sieht, die Neugierde, die er auf eine leichtsinnige Weise erregt hat, durch Unterbrechung zu reizen und die Aufmerksamkeit, anstatt sie durch eine vernünftige Folge zu befriedigen, nur durch seltsame und keineswegs lobenswürdige Kunstgriffe aufzuspannen. Ich tadle das Bestreben, aus Geschichten, die sich der Einheit des Gedichts nähern sollen, rhapsodische Rätsel zu machen und den Geschmack immer tiefer zu verderben. (166)

This passage amounts not only to a repudiation of the narrative technique of the first four stories ("wie die Erzählerin in der Tausend und eine Nacht zu verfahren"), but also to an apology for the poor quality of the stories and the "keineswegs lobenswürdige Kunstgriffe" of the second installment. With the phrase "leichtsinnige Weise," Goethe also seems to distance himself from his earlier intentions of playing a practical joke.

It remains unclear whether Goethe realized that his prank had misfired,⁹ or whether he had gained new aesthetic insights into short narratives during the interval between installments. In either case—and both reasons may apply with equal force—Goethe also has the baroness urge the chaplain to incorporate into his story characteristics she deems desirable. His story should thus involve "wenig Personen und Begebenheiten" and be "wahr, natürlich und nicht gemein." It should advance at an appropriate pace and, upon completion, be "befriedigend" and leave "einen stillen Reiz, weiter nachzudenken" (167). Briefly stated, the baroness's criteria involve characteristics that the previous stories lacked. The chaplain at first complains about these strictures, but then recounts "Der Prokurator."¹⁰ This story, unlike the previous four, has a satisfactory ending—an ending, it should be noted, that coincides with the conclusion of the third installment.

On 20 March, Schiller writes Goethe: "Die Erzählung liest sich mit gemeinem Interesse . . ." (45-46). On 8 May an exasperated Körner offers a less generous evaluation:

was meint denn Goethe eigentlich mit seinen 'Unterhaltungen'? Das erste Stück war mir begreiflich . . . Auch im zweiten interessirte mich die Darstellung bei der ersten Erzählung. Aber für das dritte weiss ich nichts zu sagen. Und was soll daraus werden, wenn es noch immer decrescendo geht?

Körner also reports on the reaction of Dresden: "Von allen Seiten hör' ich Klagen über diese Aufsätze . . ." (Gräf 328).

Körner's letter may have alarmed Schiller, for on 15 May he writes Goethe: "viele sind . . . an Ihren Unterhaltungen irre, weil sie, wie sie sich ausdrücken, noch nicht absehen können, was damit werden soll" (49). Goethe responds: "Lassen Sie uns nur unsern Gang unverrückt fortgehen . . . Es muß nur fortgespielt werden, weiter ist dabei nichts zu sagen" (50). Yet the negative reaction to *Unterhaltungen*, as Wilhelm von Humboldt's letter of 17 July to Schiller indicates, not only persists, but also extends to Berlin: "Die 'Unterhaltungen' missfallen durchaus und total, auch der 'Prokurator' . . ." (Gräf 328).

The fourth installment, which Goethe submits on 27 June, begins with the baroness lauding "Der Prokurator" as a "moralische Erzählung." Pleased that the chaplain has met her aesthetic demands, she asks for a "Parallelgeschichte" (187). The chaplain responds by recounting "Ferdinand." This installment—and presumably the story—ends at the point where Ferdinand has restored the stolen money and family harmony has been restored. The circumstance that the chaplain tells this tale as a parallel to "Der Prokurator" suggests that Goethe is still adhering to the serious literary course he set in the third installment.

Shortly after sending this installment to Schiller, Goethe goes to Karlsbad and conceives the idea for a fairy tale. Upon returning to Weimar, he apprises Schiller on 17 August of his planned contributions for *Die Horen*: "Schluß der letzten Geschichte" in August, the first half of "Das Märchen" in September, and the second half in October. This last work, he notes, will serve as a conclusion: "Ich würde die Unterhaltungen damit schließen" (61). Four days later Goethe submits the fifth installment. In the beginning Luise tells the chaplain that she likes his story and, having heard the "Entwicklung," she also would like to hear the ending. The chaplain at first insists that the story is "wirklich aus," but then goes on to tell how Ferdinand broke his engagement, moved to the provinces for business reasons, and married his uncle's niece. After the chaplain finishes, the refugees tire of moral tales and request a "Märchen." The installment ends with the chaplain's promise to tell such a tale that evening.

The dual ending of "Ferdinand" has attracted much critical attention. Raabe views the break as an essential step in Luise's education. Earlier she had been rude. But, after hearing the story of Ferdinand, she is capable of more factual observations: "Um wie vieles sachlicher sind doch die Einwendungen des jungen Mädchens, verglichen mit den schnippischen Bemerkungen des vorher gehenden Tages!" (33). Jessen states that "die eigentliche Geschichte . . . ist schon zu Ende" and that the

second ending is merely "ein stilistisches Abflauen" (449). Ziolkowski notes that "the reader's attention is constantly enticed into side alleys." The second ending is thus only one of many indicators of a "sorely lacking" unity (70). Brown sees the two endings as necessary steps in Ferdinand's moral development: the first step involves repayment of the money; "the second step is the decision to renounce Ottilie . . ." (19). Bräutigam reverses Raabe's interpretation: Luise, by calling for a second ending, reveals she has learned nothing and fails to recognize "[daß] die Novelle . . . ihren künstlerischen Abschluß erreicht hat." The chaplain thus responds to Luise's ignorance with irony: he destroys the unity of the narrative by providing a conclusion that, with its "karikaturhafte Züge," is purposefully "überpointiert" (534). And, to cite a last critic, Bauschinger agrees with Bräutigam's assessment concerning caricature, but interprets the overemphasis on "Entsagung" to be the bridge which Goethe uses to cross over into "Das Märchen." Karl requests a fairy tale "[um] nichts mehr von Entsagung hören zu müssen" (156).

An examination based on serialization suggests another, albeit radical interpretation. As noted, Goethe initially enjoyed working on *Unterhaltungen* ("zu den kleinen Erzählungen habe ich grosse Lust"). The baroness's criticism and the fulfillment of her demands in the form of "Der Prokurator" suggest that Goethe knew he had made a false start with the first four "kleinen Geschichten" and that he determined to change narrative directions. Yet, even after "Der Prokurator" appeared, readers continued to complain because they were unable to see, as Schiller wrote, "was damit werden soll." On 27 June Goethe submitted "Ferdinand" and went to Karlsbad. This story appeared in July and, since *Unterhaltungen* was published anonymously,¹¹ Goethe may have heard similar complaints first-hand at the spa (the letters from Stein, Körner, and Humboldt suggest the work met with wide-spread disapprobation). Upon returning to Weimar, Goethe's joy seems to have vaporized. Four days after announcing his plans to conclude the work, Goethe submits the second ending of "Ferdinand" and informs Schiller: "Mehr ein Übersprung als ein Übergang . . . zum Märchen ist mein diesmaliger Beitrag geworden. Nehmen Sie damit vorlieb" (64). This casual attitude suggests, as Schiller had feared earlier, that the work has become an "Onus" and that Goethe wishes to unburden himself of *Unterhaltungen* as quickly as possible. Thus he changes his plans about "Das Märchen" and, instead of waiting for September as he originally intended, submits this narrative to Schiller only three days after forwarding the second "Ferdinand" installment.

Although Goethe chafes to be liberated from his story cycle, he may also have wanted to send his critics a parting shot.¹² Since readers groused because they could not see the direction in which the work was

heading, Goethe may have determined to exacerbate their vexation by providing even more fragmentary installments than earlier. Thus, although "Ferdinand" for all practical purposes was completed at the end of the fourth installment, Goethe in the fifth installment tacks on an ending that is so overtly moralistic as to be banal. With such banality, Goethe not only imitated the worst features of the then popular, but hackneyed "moralische Erzählungen,"¹³ he also destroyed what little unity the first portion of the story originally may have had. Such an interpretation is supported by Goethe's intentions for "Das Märchen," which, as he informed Schiller, he wished to have published in two installments, with the first half to appear in the same volume as the second ending of "Ferdinand." Such separation would have resulted in the following segmentation: the penultimate installment of *Unterhaltungen* would have consisted of two narrative fragments joined, to use Goethe's own words, more by an "Übersprung" than by an "Übergang." The last installment would have consisted of the second half of "Das Märchen."

Schiller, more heedful of practical matters than Goethe, suggests that "Das Märchen" be published whole: "Das Publikum ist immer mit dem Abbrechen unzufrieden . . ." (66). Goethe, however, insists on separation: "Das Märchen wünscht ich getrennt, weil eben bei so einer Produktion eine Hauptabsicht ist, die Neugierde zu erregen" (67).¹⁴ Goethe's reply arrives too late and Schiller, in his need to meet publication deadlines, forwards the manuscripts of the ninth volume without including the first half of "Das Märchen." Upon informing Goethe of this development, Schiller again urges: "Ich bin aber nie für das Trennen . . . weil man das Publikum nicht dazu anhalten kann, das Ganze an einer Sache zu übersehen und darnach zu urteilen" (68). The passage of time may have eroded Goethe's pique, for he acceded to Schiller's judgment and "Das Märchen" appeared, unseparated, in the tenth volume of *Die Horen*. Goethe apparently is so anxious to shed himself of *Unterhaltungen* that he fails to provide a concluding framework. The full measure of his discontent is provided by Riemer: "Goethe wollte . . . wie er mir sagte, eine Art von 'Tausend und einer Nacht' liefern . . . dankte aber zuletzt Gott, dass er bis an das 'Märchen' kam" (Gräf 352).

As noted in the earlier review of literature, the dominant critical view postulates that Goethe, from the very outset, intended to narrate a series of progressively better stories in order to educate his readership and frame characters. Such an interpretation does not comport with the correspondence, which makes it clear that Goethe originally intended, with his contributions to *Die Horen*, to play a practical joke on the reading public (Schiller himself referred to Goethe's first contributions as "Teufeleien"). A serialized reading of *Unterhaltungen* suggests that

pedagogy, in the form of moralizing, evolved only after Goethe realized that his joke had misfired.

• NOTES

¹ The sources for the first five narratives have been well-documented: "Antonelli" is an adaptation of an episode from the life of the French actress Hyppolite Clairon, "Der Klopffeist" is Goethe's treatment of a story told in Weimar by a Herr von Pannwitz, "Die Krämerin" and "Der Schleier" are borrowed from the memoirs of the French Marshal de Bassompierre, and "Der Prokurator" is an adaptation from the French novella collection, *Les Cent nouvelles nouvelles*. The last two tales of *Unterhaltungen*, "Ferdinand" and "Das Märchen," are of Goethe's invention.

² Himmel and Klein do not represent isolated views—they reflect the two dominant schools of thought. Critics who hold the same view as Himmel include, to name only a handful, Oskar Walzel (167), Arnold Hirsch (40), Bernhard von Arx (20), and Karl Konrad Polheim (261-62). Proponents of the view held by Klein include, among others, Paul Arnold (1251-54), McBurney Mitchell (221), Josef Kunz (16), Henry Remak (133-38), and Roger Paulin (20-24).

³ Goethe apparently told Schiller about his plans to adapt this story during the course of Schiller's fourteen day visit to Weimar in September. The story does not come, as Schiller supposed, "aus dem Boccacaz," but from *Les Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, where it is the ninety-ninth narrative. Schiller's erroneous attribution led Max Herrmann, editor of the *Jubiläumsausgabe*, to opine as follows: "Schillers Irrtum führt Goethe auf den Gedanken für diese Erzählungen einen lockeren Rahmen zu zimmern, der sie alle umfaßt und der der Rahmenerzählung Boccaccios nachgebildet ist" (xiv). This opinion has found wide acceptance—see, to single out only a few critics, Mitchell (220-21), Mackensen (399), Ziolkowski (58), Brown (7), and Bauschinger (138).

Herrmann's analysis seems partially flawed. His reference to "diese Erzählungen" suggests that Goethe already had several stories either in mind or in hand. The correspondence makes it clear that both Goethe and Schiller at this point are considering "Der Prokurator" as an independent story. The question of other stories does not arise until later. Herrmann's statement also suggests that Goethe was unfamiliar with a framed story cycle and, on his own, would not have come up with such a structural device. Yet, as Trunz points out (604), Goethe was familiar with *The Decameron* from his student days. Upon considering this matter in a wider context, it seems more likely that it was Schiller's *reminder* rather than his "Irrtum" that inspired Goethe to write a narrative cycle patterned on Boccaccio's work.

⁴ The above interpretation and chronology, by stating that Goethe submitted the first installment on 2 November, differs from the universally accepted view that Goethe first sent the framework to Schiller on 27 November. Claimants of the later date include, to cite only a few representative critics, Gräf (319-20), Paul Raabe (40), Mommsen (57), Müller (154), Popper (229), Bauschinger (142), and Gaier (231). There seems to be something seriously amiss with this assumption: if 27 November were indeed the day of initial submission, there could hardly have been a disputed point for Goethe to have brought, to use Schiller's words, "sehr glücklich ins Reine."

The evidence available in corroboration of the earlier date, in addition to Schiller's letter that brings this disputed point to light, includes two other letters by Schiller. On 7 November, one day after Goethe left Jena to return to Weimar, Schiller informs Gottfried Körner: "Goethe ist jetzt beschäftigt eine zusammenhängende Suite von Erzählungen im Geschmack des Boccacaz auszuarbeiten, welche für die Horen bestimmt ist" (*Schillers Briefe* 54). Schiller not only confirms the interpretation concerning Goethe's change in plans from one story to a narrative cycle, but, by using the words "jetzt" and "auszuarbeiten," he suggests that Goethe already is well embarked on the project. On 14 November Schiller sends Cotta, his publisher, a progress report about the first volume of *Die Horen*: "Das noch restierende Manuscript zu diesem ersten Stück [der Horen] läßt Goethe wirklich in Ordnung bringen und ich sende es spätestens 10 Tage nach" (*Schillers Briefe* 59-60). Here Schiller refers directly to the existence of a manuscript which Goethe, thirteen days before the commonly assumed date of submission, is not in the process of writing, but of revising.

Most critics fail to comment on the disputed point. Gräf takes notice, but is unable to offer an explanation: "Was unter dem 'Hauptpunkt' . . . zu verstehen sei ist zweifelhaft; jedenfalls ist es dasselbe, was Schiller . . . den strittigen Punkt genannt hatte" (319-20). Müller, the only other critic to comment on this matter, ventures the following interpretation: "Bei dem strittigen Punkt kann es sich doch ganz wörtlich um den Streitpunkt der Rahmenhandlung, das Für und Wider im Hinblick auf die französische Revolution handeln" (155). This interpretation is problematic. Schiller states his views concerning the correction of the disputed point in the first paragraph of his letter. His comments on political matters come in the second paragraph. Since these two paragraphs are thematically unrelated, it seems unlikely that Schiller would have returned to the political topic. The exact nature of this disputed point remains a mystery. Since Goethe wrote Schiller "ich . . . wünsche, daß ich das rechte Maß und den gehörigen Ton möchte getroffen haben," the disputed point may have involved matters pertaining to tone and proportions.

I devote so much space to the questions of initial submission and the disputed point for two reasons: to establish a more accurate historical chronology and to show that Schiller, from the very beginning, found *Unterhaltungen* problematical.

⁵ Schiller calls Luise "unbarmherzig" and characterizes her behavior toward

the chaplain as "fast zu arg." In their political disagreement Karl and the "Geheimrat" go so far as to wish that the French guillotine and the German hangman's noose find much employment among the ranks of their respective opponents. The argument ends with the councillor leaving the estate in a rage. Schiller is basing part of his criticism on Goethe's violation of what will be one of the basic guidelines of the journal: "Keuschheit in politischen Urteilen." Upon publication of the first volume of *Die Horen*, Schiller states in the foreword that the journal is dedicated to "leidenschaftsfreyen Unterhaltung" and he explicitly excludes "alles . . . was mit einem unreinen Parteygeist gestempelt ist" (IV).

⁶ A week earlier, on 21 November, Schiller commented on this prank to his friend, Friedrich von Hoven: "[Goethe] hat sich seit einiger Zeit auf alle Teufeleien eingelassen, davon Du in den ersten Stücken des Journals Proben finden wirst" (*Schillers Briefe* 68).

⁷ Schiller uses the plural because Goethe contributed two works to the first volume of *Die Horen*: the earlier-mentioned "Epistel" and the framework to *Unterhaltungen*.

⁸ This manuscript contains four untitled stories, usually referred to as "Antonelli," "Der Klopfsgeist," "Die schöne Krämerin," and "Der Schleier." The ironic allusion to the "great" Hennings, a professor at Jena who published a series of works dealing with "Ahnungen, Visionen, Geister, Träume und Nachtwandlerei" (Gräf 325), suggests that Goethe, through imitation, is attempting to satirize such narratives.

⁹ Goethe's original expectation, as he wrote Schiller on 5 December, was that ghost stories would earn "ein unendliches Zutrauen" from the reading public. On 18 March, the day before submitting the third installment, Goethe wrote Schiller that *Die Horen* were receiving a great deal of attention, but that he was unable to determine whether they received "ein reines pro [oder] contra" (44). Goethe's letter suggests that he knew his expectation had not materialized and that the journal was the subject of a controversy that may have been caused by his contributions.

¹⁰ Many critics point out that even though the baroness had been absent when the first four stories were told, her remarks are singularly applicable to these tales. Critical opinion concerning the significance of the baroness's statement reflects a wide spectrum. Gräf (cited by Mommsen, 58), Fricke (282), and Müller (173-74) believe these remarks represent Goethe's own views on the nature of short prose fiction. Walzel (167) and Mommsen (59) suggest that the baroness is presenting her own opinions. Geißler (19) and Bauschinger (132) note that the statement foreshadows Goethe's later novella definition ("eine sich ereignete unerhörte Begebenheit"). Brown believes that the baroness's criticism of *Arabian Nights* "cannot be Goethe's" (15). Bräutigam opines that the baroness attempts to initiate "Bildungsprozesse" (533). Ziolkowski, to cite a last example, interprets the baroness's comments as a call for form and "classical unity and moderation" (64).

¹¹ On 6 December 1794 Schiller asked whether Goethe wished to be identified

as the author of *Unterhaltungen*, perhaps only "mit einem simplen G." (30). Goethe insisted upon anonymity: "dadurch wird mir ganz allein möglich, mit Freiheit und Laune . . . an Ihrem Journale teilnehmen zu können" (31). Goethe's refusal to be identified presumably was prompted by his plans to play a practical literary joke. This intention confirms Trunz' assessment that *Unterhaltungen* was a "Nebenwerk" (see also footnote # 6).

¹² According to Nicolai, Goethe is extremely disappointed in the public's reaction and first conceived the idea of writing a series of epigrams that lambasted contemporary critical and reading tastes on 3 May 1795. These epigrams materialized later in the form of the *Xenien* (63). Erich Trunz reinforces this view with his observation that Goethe expected approbation for his contributions to *Die Horen*: "Aber der Erfolg war ausgeblieben. Statt Anerkennung war fast überall nur Mißverständnis, scharfe Kritik und Spott zu bemerken . . ." (591).

¹³ Paulin cites the generally accepted opinion that during the end of the 18th Century Germany was afloat in a sea of short prose narratives, especially "moralische Erzählungen," written by such authors as Wezel, Spiess, Meissner, Eckartshausen, and Langbein. Wieland, Goethe, and Tieck considered the works of these authors "models of vulgar debasement" (18). Also see Jürgen Jacobs for a similar assessment.

¹⁴ At the beginning of the third installment, it should be noted, Goethe had the baroness specifically condemn a narrative technique that fostered "Neugierde."

• WORKS CITED

- Arnold, Paul. "Goethes Novellenbegriff." *Das literarische Echo* 14 (1912): 1251-54.
- Arx, Bernhard von. *Novellistisches Dasein: Spielraum einer Gattung in der Goethezeit*. Zurich: Atlantis, 1953.
- Bauschinger, Sigrid. "Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten." *Goethes Erzählwerk: Interpretationen*. Ed. Paul Michael Lützel and James McLeod. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1985. 134-65.
- Bräutigam, Bernd. "Die ästhetische Erziehung der deutschen Ausgewanderten." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 96 (1977): 508-39.
- Brown, Jane K. *Goethe's Cyclical Narratives: Die Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten and Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina, P, 1975.
- Fricke, Gerhart. "Zu Sinn und Form von Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.'" *Formenwandel: Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Paul Böckmann*. Ed. Walter Müller-Seidel and Wolfgang Preisendanz. Hamburg: Hoffman and Campe, 1964. 273-93.
- Gaier, Ulrich. "Soziale Bildung gegen ästhetische Erziehung: Goethes Rahmen der

- 'Unterhaltungen' als satirische Antithese zu Schillers 'Ästhetischen Briefen' I-IX." *Poetische Autonomie? Zur Wechselwirkung von Dichtung und Philosophie in der Epoche Goethes und Hölderlins*. Ed. Helmut Bachmaier and Thomas Rentsch. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1987. 207-72.
- Gajek, Bernhard. "Sittlichkeit statt Revolution. Die Versöhnung von Pflicht und Neigung als *Unerhörte Begebenheit*. Zu Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.'" *Vielfalt der Perspektiven: Wissenschaft und Kunst in der Auseinandersetzung mit Goethes Werk*. Ed. Hans-Werner Eroms and Hartmut Laufhütte. Passau: Passavia Universitätsverlag, 1982. 149-63.
- Geißler, Rolf. "Zur Einheit von Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.'" *Zeigen und Erkennen: Aufsätze zur Literatur von Goethe bis Jonke*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1979. 9-19.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten*. Vol. 6. *Werke*. Ed. Erich Trunz. Hamburg: Christian Wegner, 1968.
- Goethe-Schiller Briefwechsel*. Ed. Walter Killy. Frankfurt A.M. and Hamburg: Fischer, 1961.
- Gräf, Hans Gerhard. *Goethe über seine Dichtungen*. Frankfurt A.M.: Rütten & Loening, 1901.
- Herrmann, Max, ed. *Goethes Sämtliche Werke: Jubiläums-Ausgabe*. Vol. 16. Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Nachfolger, 1906.
- Himmel, Hellmuth. *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle*. Bern: Francke, 1963.
- Hirsch, Arnold. *Der Gattungsbegriff "Novelle"*. Berlin: Emil Ebering, 1928.
- Jacobs, Jürgen. "Die deutsche Erzählung im Zeitalter der Aufklärung." *Handbuch der deutscher Erzählung*. Ed. Karl Konrad Polheim. Düsseldorf: Bagel, 1981. 56-71.
- Jessen, Myra R. "Spannungsgefüge und Stilisierung in den Goetheschen Novellen." *PMLA* 55 (1940): 445-471.
- Jürgens, Ilse. "Die Stufen der sittlichen Entwicklung in Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.'" *Wirkendes Wort* 6 (1955-56): 336-40.
- Klein, Johannes. *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle von Goethe bis zur Gegenwart*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1954.
- Kunz, Josef. *Die deutsche Novelle zwischen Klassik und Romantik*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1966.
- Mackensen, Lutz. "Die Novelle." *Novelle*. Ed. Josef Kunz. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973. 391-410.
- Mitchell, McBurney. "Goethe's Theory of the *Novelle*: 1785-1827." *PMLA* 30 (1915): 215-36.
- Mommsen, Katharina. *Goethe und 1001 Nacht*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- Morgan, Peter. "Critical Enlightenment and the Intelligentsia after 1792: Die Horen, Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten and the 'Xenienstreit'." *Aufklärung* 1 (1987): 299-307.
- Müller, Joachim. "Zur Entstehung der deutschen Novelle: Die Rahmenhandlung in Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten' und die Thematik der

- französischen Revolution." *Gestaltungsgeschichte und Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. Ed. Helmut Kreuzer. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1969. 152-75.
- Neumann, Gerhard. "Die Anfänge deutscher Novellistik: Schillers 'Verbrecher aus verlorener Ehre'—Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.'" *Unser Commercium: Goethes und Schillers Literaturpolitik*. Ed. Wilfried Barner. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1984. 433-60.
- Nicolai, Heinz. *Zeittafel zu Goethes Leben und Werk*. Munich: Beck, 1977.
- Paulin, Roger. *The Brief Compass: The Nineteenth-Century German Novelle*. New York: Oxford, UP, 1985.
- Polheim, Karl Konrad. *Novellentheorie und Novellenforschung: Ein Forschungsbericht (1945-1964)*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1965.
- Popper, H[ans]. "Goethe's *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten*." *Affinities: Essays in German and English Literature*. Ed. R. W. Last. London: Wolff, 1971. 206-45.
- Raabe, August. "Der Begriff des Ungeheuren in den 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten.'" *Goethe: Viermonatsschrift der Goethe Gesellschaft* 4 (1939): 23-39.
- Raabe, Paul. *Die Horen: Einführung und Kommentar*. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1959.
- Remak, Henry. "Goethe and the Novella." *Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Continuing Vitality*. Ed. Ulrich Goebel and Wolodymyr T. Zyla. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech Press, 1984. 133-55.
- Schiller, Friedrich, ed. *Die Horen*. 1795-1798. Ed. Paul Raabe. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959.
- Schillers Briefe*. Ed. Fritz Jonas. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, [1892-96].
- Söring, Jürgen. "Die Verwirrung und das Wunderbare in Goethes *Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten*." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 100 (1981): 544-59.
- Steiger, Robert. *Goethes Leben von Tag zu Tag: Eine dokumentarische Chronik*. Zurich and Munich: Artemis, 1984.
- Träger, Christine. *Novellistisches Erzählen bei Goethe*. Berlin, Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1984.
- _____. "Goethes 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten' als Ausdruck eines novellistischen Zeitbewußtseins." *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 107 (1990): 144-57.
- Trunz, Erich, ed. *Werke*, Vol. I. Hamburg: Christian Wegener, 1969.
- Walzel, Oskar. "Die Kunstform der Novelle." *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* 24 (1915): 161-84.
- Witte, Bernd. "Das Opfer der Schlange: Zur Auseinandersetzung Goethes mit Schiller in den 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten' und im 'Märchen'." *Unser Commercium: Goethes und Schillers Literaturpolitik*. Ed. Wilfried Barner. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1984. 461-84.

Ziolkowski, Theodore. "Goethe's 'Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderter': A Reappraisal." *Monatshefte* 50 (1958): 56-74.

Autobiography in the *Libro de buen amor*: Was the Poet's Use of the *Pamphilus* Suggested by the *De vetula*?

Richard Burkard
Penn State At Berks

To what genre can one assign the *Libro* as a whole? Is there a preexisting type? Or is the poem perhaps *sui generis*? On the one hand we have episodes and themes which sometimes lack for mutual compatibility; in places one even notices the presence of contextual confusion. On the other hand we have an autobiographical pretense which runs the length of the work and provides—with varying degrees of success—a connecting link over most of the ensemble. General unity, in short, would seem both present and absent at the same time. The critical reader is therefore bound to wonder: was the formation of the *Libro* unique, or was there a precedent?

The first commentator to make a serious attempt to fix the *Libro* within a previously existing literary tradition was Américo Castro.¹ According to this former dean of Hispanists an adequate interpretation of the Archpriest's poem must proceed from the premise that the work is a compound of Western and Arabic elements, the creation of an artist who was familiar with both sides of the cultural divide. And doubtless to some extent the proposition is sound: for clear evidence of the presence of Islam in the *Libro* one need only consider the poet's use of the *zéjel* in sts 115-120 (and elsewhere), his use of Arabic expressions in 1509-1512, and his assessment of musical instruments in 1516-1517.

The proposals made by Castro concerning the role of Islamic philosophy and literature in the *Libro* are many and manifold. Of interest for us here, however, are his two contentions that 1) the autobiography in the *Libro* is of Arabic origin, and 2) Ibn Hazm's treatise on sexual love, *The Dove's Neck Ring* (11th century), served as a model for the Spanish poem.²

Just how strong are these views? Underlying the first contention is the notion that medieval Arabic literature contains a good deal of erotic autobiography while medieval Western literature does not. But the consensus among experts is otherwise: the Moslems were just as disinclined as the Christians to draw up a history of their sexual lives.³ Examples do exist,