

Book Reviews

Informationshandbuch Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft.

Von Hansjürgen Blinn. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001. 4. Auflage. 554 Seiten. €14,90.

It is not as though Hansjürgen Blinn does not have other titles to his credit. In the academy, the Saarland professor made a name for himself as the author of a seminal, two-volume anthology on Shakespeare reception in Germany, later complemented by a well-organized annotated bibliography. To the recreational reader he is perhaps best known as the editor of several popular volumes on erotic poetry and women's literature. Yet when Germans speak of "der Blinn," they refer exclusively, and rather reverently, to the *Informationshandbuch Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft*. Now in its fourth edition, the *Informationshandbuch* continues to be a standard work in the discipline. Omnipresent in introductory seminars all over Germany, it is not only a detailed student guide to research in German literature but arguably the most thorough research tool available in print. It deserves to find a larger audience this side of the Atlantic as well.

The current edition of the *Informationshandbuch* retains the organization and content of previous editions. Aside from some updated information, the most noticeable and welcome change is the inclusion of electronic sources. Those sources have greatly proliferated since the third edition was published in 1994, and Blinn now provides hundreds of URLs and email addresses to go along with postal addresses and telephone numbers for libraries, archives, etc. Though at times he seems to confuse the Internet with the World Wide Web (which is but one service of the Internet), Blinn's listing of digital resources covers a wide range. If it is true, as he says, that the "www" is still far from becoming a "wunderbare Welt der Wissenschaft" (19), then perhaps the Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag could do its share to change that and invest in an online edition of the *Informationshandbuch*.

Even in the digital age, though, Blinn's book serves a very useful purpose. In the introduction he underlines the importance of a comprehensive bibliography for scholarly work and provides step-by-step instructions on how to gather sources—primary and secondary texts as well as unpublished manuscripts, even film adaptations (though the latter section is less exhaustive). While these general search strategies are meant for the beginning *Germanistikstudent(in)*, the rest of the book is eminently useful to anyone in the profession. It is divided into three main areas: books, institutions, and societies. The first and largest section covers introductions, handbooks, dictionaries, reference works, major bibliographies, dissertation indexes, and address books, as well as periodical bibliographies, journals, and newspapers with relevant literary supplements. Many of the roughly 1,600 entries are annotated and many reach beyond Ger-

man into related fields such as comparative literature, pedagogy, theater, film, media studies, and cultural studies. The second section is concerned with institutions and lists literary archives and writer museums, libraries and electronic databases, as well as 320 (!) research institutions and academies. Also included here are special collections of libraries and archives in German-speaking countries (where the George Circle finds itself next to *Gefangenenliteratur*). The third section lists professional organizations, some 140 literary societies with annotations, and an almost equal number of literary and cultural prizes along with their past winners. The compendium concludes with an index of authors and titles that is generally useful but unfortunately not always accurate. Some entries are erroneously referenced, e.g., Dieter Borchmeyer's *Weimarer Klassik*, or the entry "German Departments (USA)," while others are missed completely, e.g., Barbara Becker-Cantarino's *Schriftstellerinnen der Romantik*, or Peter-Uwe Hohendahl's *Geschichte der deutschen Literaturkritik (1730–1980)*.

It is not difficult to find some fault with the book in other ways, too. The extended scope is welcome but the sections on film and media studies, for example, are rather slim and were not up-to-date even at the time of the editorial deadline in spring 2001. Partly to blame is Blinn's disinclination to cover works that are not published in German, even when they have proven to be influential (on the literary side, authors such as Wellek/Warren, Eagleton, and Jonathan Culler are listed in translation). Among the few works in English that are included is Eric Rentschler's volume on *German Film and Literature*, which appears in the broadly defined, yet very brief section on "Medienkunde und Massenkommunikationsforschung." The fact that Rentschler's name is misspelled as "Reutschler" is less significant than the fact that foreign scholarship as a whole remains too often unconsidered. Notable exceptions are professional journals—*Monatshefte*, *JEGP*, *Seminar*, *Études Germaniques*, *German Quarterly*, *German Review*, *PMLA* are all included—and yearbooks, though it is unclear why Blinn decided to list *The Women in German Yearbook* and *The Lessing Yearbook* but not, for example, the *Publications of the English Goethe Society (PEGS)* or the *Goethe Yearbook* published by the Goethe Society of North America. One would hope that, with greater attention to scholarship outside German-speaking countries, the next edition of the *Informationshandbuch* will include such important titles.

In conclusion, Blinn's book is the product of an enormous amount of work undertaken with great knowledge and care. It is comprehensive, easy to use, and generally very reliable. The lacunae mentioned above should not detract from the fact that the *Informationshandbuch* continues to be an indispensable reference and resource guide that cannot be recommended highly enough.

Davidson College

—Burkhard Henke

Handbuch der Mediengeschichte.

Herausgegeben von Helmut Schanze. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2001.

xvi + 575 Seiten. €24,60.

It is often assumed that the history of media would be most accurately represented in and by those same media. Yet this assumption, which supports the practice of many academics in the various fields concerned with media studies, runs one risk above all: that history as self-representation will necessarily leave out those errors and break-

downs of a given medium that shape its historicity. After all, many of the pivotal moments in the genealogy of media technology, as well as in the understanding of what media can do, are owed to such interruptions and disturbances. This may only show itself by implication, or it may be indicated, at the most, by way of limitation.

The book, of course, is itself a venerable medium; many systematic and accidental shortcomings of books have been represented in books, but arguably, the book that knew everything about books—and about all that is not a book—would no longer be a book. This goes even for encyclopedic projects, such as Helmut Schanze's splendid volume, *Handbuch der Mediengeschichte*. The age of the book synthesized multiplicity in the alphabetic, serial mode of the dictionary. It was the declared aim of Diderot's *Encyclopédie* to work through the past as fast as possible, in order to set free a new future. The idea of a handbook presupposes that there is a reliable knowledge of a well-defined field—but media may not always provide such a clear-cut case; their high differentiation and the fast pace of technical innovation, as well as the rapid development of academic disciplines relating to individual media or to discourses on media, necessarily complicate the project of a media handbook. Schanze's strategy is therefore to organize the collection historically. Media history as an academic paradigm has all but eclipsed (or rather swallowed) the concepts of information and communication. The problem is that in harnessing repetition and the flow of time, media can easily produce anachronisms. As a consequence of the way media transform the experience and conceptualization of time and place, media history itself cannot remain unaffected. However, the collective effort in this volume to grasp the specificity of each medium succeeds in making broad research perspectives accessible, and providing directions for further efforts.

The handbook opens with a guided tour of media theory from its foundations in ontology and ideology to Critical Theory, from McLuhan to Eco, from Deleuze and Flusser to Luhmann and Virilio. An overview of the empirical and sociological analysis of print journalism as well as film and television is followed by an abstract of aesthetics from Baumgarten in the 18th century to video games in the 21st century. The discussion of perception and cognition gives hints about illusion, perspective, camera obscura, panorama, photography, film, video-clips, and computer games. The limitations of a handbook approach are evident in a chapter that compresses the psychology of media into a fast-forward trailer that cuts from Mesmerism to Charcot, from Freud to Benjamin, and from Lacan to Sherry Turkle. Two sociological schools represented in detail are Norbert Elias on civilization and symbolization, and Critical Theory up to and including Habermas's *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cultural studies and systems theory are offered as current alternatives in media sociology. An overview of media pedagogy focuses on the protection of minors, on censorship and self-censorship, and on studies regarding media effects; the chapter manages to distinguish ideological critique in social policy from the assumptions of constructivism, especially when it comes to audience participation.

Media history here does not mean chronology. Those who expect to look up the deForest vacuum tube (1906), the RCA superheterodyne Radiola (1922), or the first consumer video tape recorder (1966) will be disappointed. A plurality of media histories corresponds with the plurality of media in this volume, and of multimedia study as it is practiced in academia today. Systematic approaches make clear how a chronology of media technology is not already media history: the specific historicity of each

medium is not simply a product of material chronology. This handbook retains a systematic spirit that may counter the unfettered multiplicity of media and their industrial proliferation of coverage—of perspectives, takes, views, threads, and files. Schanze aims for an integrated media history, from the invention of writing and the history of illusion in theater and forum, to repositories such as the scriptorium and the library. The history of typography and reading is sketched out here, as are the developments leading to the telegraph, phonograph, cinema and television. The development of secular, then literary, and eventually professional and technical theater is told parallel to the study of musical notation, recording, and audiovisual capture. The history of visual arts moves from the magic lantern and the lithograph to a discussion of resolution, panorama, and cinematography, before turning to video art. The history of print comes into focus in the book trade and publishing empires, and in stories about censorship. The inventions adding up to television and cinema are not reduced, for once, to mere fallout of military technology; and radio history is told twice—once analog, and once digital, in the course of the history of computing (digital sound and image, storage solutions, networking). Here we find mention also of the audio CD, the digital phone, the video recorder, and the advent of software, the Web, and multimedia applications.

Bias towards German texts and contexts is notable only where it is inevitable, above all in the sections on media law and media economics. By the same token, they are perhaps the most important contributions to a book of this kind, since media studies often ignore these frames, codes, and practices that shape the object of their study. Freedom of the press is traced from Gutenberg to Bismarck; radio regulation comes into focus in the transition from the Empire to the Weimar Republic; and the chapter concludes with an account of the subsequent commandeering of radio and television by National Socialism, and the democratic reconstruction by the Allies after WWII. Media law as a product of allied occupation meets a challenge in the convergence of old and new media in the computer. The chapter does not offer details on core issues of intellectual property, the commons, and globalization in the legal field. The fascinating entry on media economics dates public radio in Germany to 1923, public TV to 1953, radio advertising to 1948, TV advertising to 1956, and sponsoring to the introduction of the “dual system” in the 1990s, which pits new private channels against state-run public ones.

Helmut Schanze, who puts his erudition in the history of rhetoric to use in media studies, is one of the pioneers in the relatively young academic field in Germany. Since the 1960s, he has made the University of Siegen a center for the study of screen media, and in this volume, he assembled a competent group of contributors. They confront the task of producing a handbook of media history mostly in modest gestures inherited from 19th-century historiography, hesitating to write of the recent past. Where this volume succeeds, it embeds the historicity of media technology in the aesthetics, sociology, psychology, law, or economics of each media practice. Where limitations are evident, they are mostly owed to the inherent difficulties of a handbook approach: the result is a great reference work for advanced students and researchers in media studies, and a very useful book for all those who approach this subject.

University of Minnesota

—Peter Krapp

Das Andere Essen. Kannibalismus als Motiv und Metapher in der Literatur.

Herausgegeben von Daniel Fulda und Walter Pape. Freiburg: Rombach, 2001.
548 Seiten. €50,20.

Kannibalismus, Anthropophagie gehört in den Kern menschlicher „Faszinationsgeschichte,“ ebenso wie das Geschlechterverhältnis oder der Wunsch, fliegen zu können. Während für die Realität des ersteren die Evidenz unbestreitbar ist, jedenfalls noch, hat es bei letzterem ziemlich lange gedauert, bis apparative Konstrukte das Phantasma zur Realität konvertiert haben. Beim Kannibalismus ist die Situation noch etwas komplizierter. Ob es—abgesehen von verirrten Einzelnen und gewissen Hungersnotfällen—Menschenfresserei als kollektive Praxis je gegeben hat, darüber wird trefflich gestritten. Neigte man nach dem Buch von William Arens (1979) dazu, Kannibalismus als Konstrukt pur anzunehmen, so haben zwischenzeitlich prähistorische Forschungen die Möglichkeit eines ehemals gewohnheitsmäßigen Kannibalismus wieder ins Spiel gebracht, vom britischen Neurogenetiker John Collin inzwischen gar als gewissermaßen Universalie unserer Vorfahren behauptet. Auch das ist natürlich nicht unwidersprochen geblieben. Und so bleiben neben dem Ruch, der den kolonialistischen Westeuropäern anhängt, ihre Opfer allüberall in herabwürdigender Absicht als Anthropophagen denunziert zu haben, die griechischen Mythen, von Kronos etwa, der aus Gründen des Machterhalts beliebte, seine Kinder zu fressen, oder von Polyphem, der Menschen verspeiste, ehe Odysseus ihn durch einen Namenstrick für immer davon abhielt. Es bleibt weiterhin die gern skandalisierte christliche Eucharistie, es bleiben die hirnrissigen Gerüchte über rituelle jüdische Kinderopfer, die jüngst offenbar wieder einmal, nun angeblich via syrische Video-Serien, verbreitet wurden. Und es bleibt der Streit bundesdeutscher Juristen, ob der jüngste Fall des „Kannibalen von Rotenburg,“ nämlich Verspeisung auf Wunsch des Opfers, als Mord zur Befriedigung des Geschlechtstriebes, Totschlag auf Verlangen oder bloß Störung der Totenruhe zu werten sei. Denn ein Tatbestand Kannibalismus ist im Gesetzbuch nicht vorgesehen. Ob es diesen Fall von Kannibalismus überhaupt ohne die einschlägigen deutschen Kindermärchen, Hollywood-Filme und das Internet gegeben hätte, darüber streiten Pädagogen und Psychologen. Jedenfalls ist—dank einschlägiger Foren—das Internet neben vielem, was es sonst noch ist, damit nun auch zu einer neuen Karibik geworden.

Anthropophagie gehört zu den Selbstobsessionen nicht nur unserer Zeit. Wenn denn schon ihre reale Vorhandenheit als gemeinschaftliche Praxis umstritten bleiben sollte, könnte man, angeregt durch die jüngsten Bücher von Dale Peterson (*Eating Apes*, 2003) und David Quammen (*Monster of God. The Man-Eating Predator in the Jungles of History and the Mind*, 2003), der Frage nach der möglichen Realität einen anderen Akzent geben: Wie kannibalistisch ist es, Affen zu essen? Und ist das Konstrukt Kannibalismus vielleicht ein Echo jener realen Angst aus der menschlichen Vergangenheit, Raubtieren zum Opfer zu fallen, zählte damit unter die *Blood Rites*, die Barbara Ehrenreich 1997 etwas einsinnig auf den Krieg bezogen hat? Vielleicht aber ist das auch schon eine zu literaturwissenschaftliche Sichtweise. Für eine bestimmte Literaturwissenschaft hingegen dürfte sie nicht literaturwissenschaftlich genug sein, jedenfalls für eine, die in der Lage ist, solche Sätze zu generieren: „Der kannibalistische Eß-Akt ist die extremste Metapher der dekonstruktiven Autopoiesis“ (M. G. Burkhardt, n. 16). Oder, um ein weiteres Beispiel verbaler Autophagie zu zitieren: „Der sich selbst zerstückelnde, fragmentierende und auffressende Text radikalisiert die Kritik an der Fragwürdigkeit kultureller Konstrukte“ (Anna Campanile, 481).

Daneben gibt es viele weitere Möglichkeiten. Und die hat der vorliegende Band in seinen Beiträgen beeindruckend breit aufgefächert. Das ausgemessene Spektrum ist schon darin erahnbar, daß der einleitende Aufsatz von Daniel Fulda von einer beträchtlichen Bibliographie zum Thema ergänzt wird (35–50), der dann die geradezu einschüchternde Filmographie (517–531) im letzten Beitrag korrespondiert, in dem Michaela Krützen die Karriere des Kannibalen im Kino skizziert.

An Gelegenheit scheint jedenfalls kein Mangel. Und auch wenn die Frage nach möglichen spezifisch textkonstituierenden Funktionen eher ungefragt bleibt, ergibt sich, zentriert um die deutsche Literatur, doch nicht auf sie beschränkt, ein breites Spektrum an Materialien ebenso wie an spezifischen Formen der Motivierung oder Metaphorisierung. Hier ist, einmal mehr ausgehend vom Skandalon der Eucharistie, der Aufsatz von Walter Pape zu Metaphorik und Realität der Anthropophagie tatsächlich pivotal. Man erfährt nicht nur Erhellendes zur Anthropophagie als 'kühne Metapher' im Sinne Weinrichs, sondern bekommt—aus souveräner Kenntnis der Metaphorologie gespeist—an Novalis, Hölderlin, Jean Paul etc. vorgeführt, wie der Kannibalismus-Diskurs sich aus den ständigen Interferenzen zwischen Zeichen, Bild und Realität (von Pape in Anführungsstriche gesetzt) speist: "Der bloße Zeichencharakter ist im Anthropophagiediskurs nicht zu haben" (308).

"Was kann es grauenvolleres geben als Menschenfresserei auf der Bühne?" (Anna Campanile, 445). Was für Artaud, Tabori, Schwab und Heiner Müller nicht mehr tabu war, für das Theater des Barock war es das, mit Ausnahmen, noch—freilich nicht aus moralischen Gründen, sondern eher aus technischen: die *dilacerationes*, die unbedingt zum kannibalischen Akt dazu gehörten, die Zerfleisungen, ließen sich so recht nicht darstellen. Darum griff man lieber zu Botenbericht oder Mauerschau. Während *Titus Andronicus* immerhin das Ergebnis in Pastetenform auf den Bühnenschauplatz brachte, hat sich der Autor einer deutschen *Tragoedia von einem ungeratenen Sohn* daran versucht, seinen Bösewicht schlachtend, bratend und verspeisend zu zeigen. Die Nachwelt hat es ihm nicht gedankt. Ausgerechnet Lohenstein, der sich den szenischen Rekurs auf die Menschenfresserei völlig versagte, sie dafür aber "als Metapher frei von konkret sinnlicher Füllung verfügbar" machte, "um extreme Situationen, Handlungen und Konflikte rhetorisch einzuholen," wie Arnd Beise schreibt (142), wurde von Eichendorff des "präventösen Kannibalismus" bezichtigt (116)—was zeigt, daß im Zweifelsfalle Metaphorisierung die nachhaltigere Wirkung hat. Extremisierung, folgt man Maximilian E. Novaks einläßlichen Darstellungen zu *Robinson Crusoe*, scheint auch Defoes Absicht gewesen zu sein, nämlich Charakter und Natur des Menschen unter schwierigsten Prüfungen zu exponieren. "Und er wollte wie Conrad, der ebenfalls mit dem Kannibalismus spielte, daß seine Leser bis ins Innerste spüren, was ein solches Experiment bedeutet" (216). Stefanie Arend zeigt, wie Johann Carl Wezel das in seinem *Belphegor* (1776) und *Robinson Crusoe* (1789/80) weiterentwickelt, als Extremtest auf die epikureische Forderung nach Unversehrtheit des Körpers. Für Belphegor und seine Begleiterin bleibt es gleich, ob die einen aus Wollust und "Kurzweil" oder die anderen zur höheren Ehre ihrer Gottheit an ihnen knabbern—die Integrität des Körpers ist so oder so dahin.

Mal subtiler und komplexer, wie im Falle Thomas Manns und der Literatur der Weimarer Republik (Daniel Fulda), von Botho Strauß (Diana Kurth), Marcel Beyer (Oliver Kohns), mal ideologisch einsinniger, wie im Falle deutscher Reiseliteratur aus dem Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts (Wolfgang Struck), mal bloß einsinniger gele-

sen, wie Märchen der Romantik durch Roswitha Burwick—stets handelt es sich um Proben der Extremisierung. Da ist es erstaunlich, daß man als Leser bei immerhin 16 Beiträgen nicht vorzeitig abstumpft. Vielleicht liegt das—neben der Qualität der meisten Beiträge—auch daran, daß am Anfang ein langer Aufsatz steht, der mit äußerster Geduld und Abwägung diskutiert, was Kolumbus denn nun auf seiner ersten Reise wirklich über die Kannibalen und Kariben geschrieben hat. Diese Ehrenrettung gegen pauschalisierende Insinuationen ist ein Beispiel bester philologischer Lektüre und Diskussion, die auch noch die möglichen Wechselbeziehungen von antiken und frühneuzeitlichen Lektüren prüft und so ein Kontinuum hoher gedanklicher Dichte entstehen läßt. “Vorgefaßte Meinungen,” so das Fazit, “würden sich nämlich nicht leicht durchsetzen können, wenn man sich dazu entschlösse, Schriftzeugnisse in ihrer eigenen gedanklichen Struktur und in ihrer Einbettung in die Textzusammenhänge zu bedenken” (112). Nun verführt ein so ‘starkes’ Thema sicherlich zur Herauspräparation von Stellen, so wie der phantasierte Kannibale angeblich gerne einen Happen aus dem Korpus seines Opfers nascht. Auf der Kehrseite stellt sich eine andere Verlockung ein, nämlich durch Systematisierung die Herausforderung des eklen Gegenstandes einzuhegen. Gerade bei einem derart aparten und idiosynkratisch besetzten Thema, und gerade, wenn es von so vielen Seiten beleuchtet wird, gerät man leicht in die Lage dessen, der sich nicht mehr über die Vernunft der Frage wundert, wieviel Engel auf eine Nadelspitze gehen mögen, sondern beflissen diese nach Größe und Farbe zu unterscheiden sucht. Das ist hier trefflich möglich—ob nun Männer-, Frauen- oder “Kindfresser” (128), roh oder gekocht, tot oder lebendig, ganz oder partiell, exo- oder endo-, aus Hunger oder Wollust, der Feinde oder der Götter wegen . . . Unübertroffen bleiben ohnehin die 10 Arten, die eine Jenaer Dissertation 1792 zu unterscheiden wußte—*Anthropophagia religiosa, popularis, augusta, militaris, furiosa, consuetudinaria, pia, necessaria, gentilitia* und *morbosa* (330). Um so bemerkenswerter, daß die meisten Beiträge dem widerstanden.

Am ehesten halte man sich an zwei Grundregeln: Wenn man Menschen ißt, sollte man das entweder nur im äußersten Notfall tun oder wenigstens nach sehr strengen und den Opfern zuvor bekannt gemachten Regeln—sonst kommt zuviel Unsicherheit in die Welt. Und wenn man darüber schreibt, möglicherweise ebenso.

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

—*Erhard Schütz*

The Historical Experience in German Drama: From Gryphius to Brecht.

By Alan Menhennet. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003. xi + 186 pages. \$65.00.

Menhennet’s study is a historical one in three different modes. First, the study investigates representations of history in drama. This is to say that the study is not trying to define historical dramas, but dramas that “to some degree” internalize history (1) and share three criteria: that of temporality or “pastness,” actuality, and of a continuum (2f.). Whereas the study purports not to be normative regarding what constitutes a historical drama, it in fact is. For instance, to transform Egmont into a young and energetic character—as Goethe did—is too much freedom from the facts, i.e. “actuality” (2). Second, the study is historical in that it follows a linear chronology without attempting to give the comprehensive overview the subtitle suggests. Instead, after a brief introduction, the author discusses in seven separate chapters works by Gryphius,

Schiller, Goethe, Grillparzer, Hebbel, Schnitzler (?), and finally, but quite cursorily, Brecht. Third, and above all, this new study appears historical by utilizing only scholarly work that has not been informed by any theoretical approach of the last three decades. The chapters gave this reader a truly historical experience, a feeling of being in a time machine: this is how it was when Friedrich Sengle's *Das deutsche Geschichtsdrama* (1952) and Wolfgang Kayser's *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk* (1952) provided the main reference points for analyzing a drama. Thus, the study is free of any concerns that scholars such as Hayden White have raised about history and its representation through language, or Stephen Greenblatt has articulated for literary representations as cultural poetics, or Erika Fischer-Lichte has introduced regarding theater semiotics or, more recently, theater as an anthropological practice. In other words, theoretical approaches that can be labeled as linguistic turn, new historicism, and cultural studies nowhere impinge on the discussion.

What then does a discussion of, let's say, Schiller read like when there is an absence of new or even respectably recent scholarship? One might perhaps expect that a book free of jargon and theoretical concerns offers by its way of historical dialectic insights that seem to be new and refreshing. Menhennet portrays the historian Schiller as someone who "carries the eighteenth century with him," (48) i.e., someone who is primarily involved in the project of modernity and to a lesser degree in the historicist individualism that Herder initiates and represents. He then quickly settles on the trilogy *Wallenstein*, though he remains oblivious of Dieter Borchmeyer's perspicacious, if somewhat older study (1988) or the special issue of *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* edited by Norbert Oellers (1990) or Rainer Gödel's "produktionstheoretische" analysis (1999). For Menhennet, "Schiller did not want to write an historical play in our sense of the word" (58) but having chosen the historical character of *Wallenstein*, Schiller could not avoid it altogether (ibid.). With this framework in mind, Menhennet tiptoes around the notion that the play is somewhat historical and yet not "really." Assuming that the "historical drama proper is a hybrid of dramatic and epic" (66), he highlights the unresolved tensions in the play and echoes the dichotomy of the idealist and realist within Schiller himself. This is neither wrong nor original. Similar conclusions could be made for the other chapters. The author points out at the end that "historical drama as we conceived it, grew pale and spectre-thin" around the end of the nineteenth century (162)—for which Brecht's *Courage* serves as an example.

As much as the historical drama came to its own end as a genre, so much does this study reflect a type of scholarship that ran its course some time ago. This study neither provides new or innovative insights nor meets minimum standards of (current) scholarship. Furthermore, it does not provide an introductory and comprehensive overview of historical plays in German literature that would be of help to (graduate) students. However, what the study offers is indeed a historical experience, an experience of scholarship that has no need of revival.

University of Tennessee

—Peter Höyng

Die bürgerliche Mediengesellschaft (1700–1830).

Von Werner Faulstich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002. 295 Seiten. €46,00.

Over the past two decades Werner Faulstich has established himself as a leading authority in media studies. This current work, volume four in his *Die Geschichte der Medien*, advances and solidifies that reputation. The current volume draws the consequences from volume 3 and lays the groundwork for volume 5. Its focus is on the long eighteenth century (1700–1830) and is most concerned with the public sphere of the middle classes. Why? Because the bourgeois public sphere evolved as the dominant arena of public discourse by the beginning of the nineteenth century. Faulstich's thesis is that *Zeitschriften*, broadly defined, played the key role in constituting that new public sphere. He pursues his objective in twelve chapters. Beginning with a tell-tale transformation of the politically secretive world of absolutism (“das Geheime”) into the “privately public” (“das Private”) realm of the rapidly developing civil society, he traces the radiation of that change in mentality to its ultimate dominance around 1830 and provides the reader with a summary of the essential changes in group and personal identification (252–58). In between he examines newspapers (e.g., *Intelligenzblätter*, *Wochenblätter*), forms of political and commercial communication (e.g., *Plakate*), the bourgeois transformation of performance roles (so-called “Menschmedien”: herold, preacher, singer, teacher, etc.), letters and their distribution, changes in court and town theater, the decline of the *Volkskalender* and rise of the almanac, forms of *Flugblatt* and *Flugschrift*, the literary marketplace (authors, publishers, censors, librarians, readers), and the periodical (from the moral weekly to the “Fach- und Unterhaltungsschrift”). This journey through 130 years is accompanied by 56 illustrations and 25 pages of closely printed bibliography. The organization is clear, if not always compelling.

In order for the reader to better understand the transformations in eighteenth-century communication media, Faulstich first defines the nature of the public sphere as it evolved in his timeframe. Quite rightly he points out that one cannot speak of a uniform public sphere (*Öffentlichkeit*) in this—or any—era. Several caveats are advisable. Moreover, the concept of the public sphere has all too frequently been identified exclusively with the literary marketplace (19). Faulstich is at pains to avoid that facile identification and devotes much of his study to non-print media (e.g., dance, public festival, murals, placards, facial profiles, *laterna magica*, poster-man, *Guckkasten*, narrator, *Vorleserin*). He identifies at least five different traditional forms of the public sphere which ranged from the court culture of representation in absolutism, to liturgical celebratory practices in the village, to public life in the towns and cities, guild traditions, and forms of social interaction in the countryside (11). Their thematic foci were also diverse: state politics, mercantile interests, religious beliefs, agricultural innovation, social reform, community identification, domestic organization, entertainment, and public education debates.

Nonetheless, he is clearly interested first and foremost in the rise of the bourgeois public sphere. And here he foregrounds the expansion of the public sphere into the other forms of publicness. “Private Sphäre,” he later notes, “hie prinzipiell: frei gestaltbare Sphäre—freie Sphäre” (66). The bourgeois public sphere, then, is a metaphorical phenomenon that came to exist not simply alongside other forms of public discourse

and representation but also infiltrated their communication media. The “bürgerliche Medien,” Faulstich tells us, are distinguished by three dominant functions: (1) as the dissemination of information; (2) as fora for commercial advertisements but with an increasingly social message; and (3) as an instrument for the intentional shaping of public opinion (37). He can claim that the periodical emerged as the core of bourgeois media culture at the time precisely because the underlying mentality was partially present in various media and in various disciplines. Faulstich summarizes his essential thesis and project as follows: “Dass Zeitschriften bislang in die Gegenstandsbereiche völlig unterschiedlicher Einzeldisziplinen verteilt wurden und ihre Wirkung jeweils nur partiell in den Blick kam, hatte zur Folge, dass man ihre übergreifende Rolle in der bürgerlichen Medienkultur bislang noch unterschätzte” (251). Paradoxically, this partial presence everywhere ensured the dominance of the periodical by the late eighteenth century. This volume seeks to demonstrate the overall process.

Critical for the transformation of the public spheres in the long eighteenth century was—not surprisingly—the rise of Enlightenment thought with its idealistic and practical sides. The idealist thrust is evident in the ideals of education and self-cultivation (*Bildung*), whereas the practical trend is manifest in the role played by merchants. Faulstich posits bridges between the two in two major ways. First is a redefinition of virtue as something that one acquires rather than simply has. This new view seems indebted to a mercantile attitude (18). If one recalls the Hamburg merchant and patrician J. A. Hoffmann (not mentioned by Faulstich), who penned a successful 1722 treatise on the art of contentment, we can see Faulstich’s point. If we recall the compassionate and wise merchant in Gellert’s *Das Leben der schwedischen Gräfin von G** (1747), Lessing’s *Die Juden* (1749) and *Nathan der Weise* (1779), the point is reinforced. If we reflect on the fact that Goethe’s Werther is traveling on family business when we first meet him and Albert is often away on business, we can be persuaded. These two thrusts impacted upon all kinds of public-sphere forums: travel, salon, private societies, lending libraries, reading societies, coffee houses, exhibitions. When Faulstich speaks of the secularization of the political with regard to political newspapers (31), he could apply the same designation to transformations in church celebrations (63) and advertisements for consumer products (45–51). That secularization is tied to the economic expansion of the marketplace to include ever more consumers (cf. 181). Even the family structure is reshaped by those economic pressures (105–118).

There are several things that I like about this book. It is readable, informative, and interdisciplinary. Extensively researched, the volume offers a full range of perspectives, useful not only to historians of print media, but to social, intellectual, and literary historians of the Enlightenment in general. In fact, the volume is an excellent example of what in North America counts as German studies, not only because of its primary focus on print media but because it includes performance arts, aesthetics, epistemology, and references to literary works. While Faulstich emphasizes the importance of “Horizontenerweiterung” for the media he examines, he contributes to the broadening of his own reader’s horizon. Hence, this study of civil-society media can serve as a wellspring for literary scholars too. There is much in Faulstich’s emphasis on communication, participation, and critical acumen (250 et passim) that one can immediately relate to social practices mirrored in the literature of the era. In Gellert’s *Die zärtlichen Schwestern* it is the rise of woman’s self-assuredness (“Selbstwertgefühl”);

in Wieland's *Agathon* woman's self-assuredness, expressive dance, and pantomime; in Lenz's *Der Hofmeister* the whole-house paradigm and marriage for love; in *Werther* the waltz as expressing an emancipatory view, bourgeois party, court soirée; in *Faust* the public role of festivals; in Moritz's *Anton Reiser* and Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* the theater. Numerous other examples come to mind. Faulstich's discussion of the significance of the waltz is especially illuminating, although he does not refer to any literary use of it (69–71). Of course, the centrality of experience (“Erfahrung”) as a key to enlightenment and on the new understanding of virtue as merit creates an easy bridge for moving back and forth between literary and media production of the long eighteenth century. Indeed, Faulstich's differentiated discussion of media culture justifies his repeated assertion that the bourgeois culture of the long eighteenth century is due in very large part to technological and especially thematic transformations in media culture. His approach, therefore, is broadly applicable despite being self-serving. *Die bürgerliche Mediengesellschaft* provides a more encompassing narrative of media culture in the era than E. Fischer/W. Haefs/Y.-G. Mix (eds.), *Von Almanach bis Zeitung. Ein Handbuch der Medien in Deutschland 1700–1800* (1999) or R. Wittmann's *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels* (1991), both of which are very successful in their own ways.

While there is much to like about this book, there are, inevitably, shortcomings. First is Faulstich's tendency to cite sources frequently, often lining long quotations up back to back (e.g., 93, 124). But that is minor. Because he views things so much through the lens of love as a corrective to “Geld” and “Macht” (132), his judgments about the role of the media often come across as being too homogeneous. That is more serious. The historian Isabel Hull could have helped him out here with her *Sexuality, State, and Civil Society in Germany, 1700–1815* (1996), for she repeatedly points out how diverse the German *Aufklärung* was. Depending upon whether one investigates belles lettres, philosophy, or political thought, the outcome changes. That perspective also changes with geography (east vs. west, north vs. south), religious landscapes (Protestant vs. Catholic), even regionally from town to town (Hull 200). Faulstich also takes too much liberty with the chronological and geographical parameters of his narration. He does not differentiate between early, middle, and late Enlightenment, pays no attention to the east-west divide, and only passingly acknowledges the north-south division. Nor does he distinguish sufficiently among the variations of affective individualism from Pietism to *Empfindsamkeit*, *Sturm und Drang*, and Romanticism. It all blurs together. That emphasis on *Liebe* and empathy also leads him to neglect the role of reason in the Age of Reason. Similarly, rhetoric—so central to the concept of *Bildung* in the era—is not recognized as a major factor in the rise of the new media in civil society (see McCarthy, *Crossing Boundaries* 1989). Useful in maintaining a balance between reason and empathy (the dual core of rhetoric) and in appreciating the porous borders separating the middle classes from both aristocracy and the lower social classes would have been Rudolf Vierhaus's (ed.) *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (1981). *Bürgerlichkeit* designated an attitude not necessarily identical with the actual *Bürger*. In discussing the role of libraries, Faulstich surprisingly ignores the oldest library with public access: the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbuettel. The lending records of the HAB as a barometer of social and attitudinal change have been examined by myself (“Leser und Lesertypologie,” *IASL* 8 [1983]: 35–82) and Mechthild Raabe, *Leser und Lektüre im 18. Jahrhundert* (1989).

Lest we forget, the bourgeois media were not merely an expression of an attitude but an instrument of change. Finally, Faulstich seemingly wants to position his study within the European context (38, 207, 213, 242 et passim). Yet he does not acknowledge that the German Enlightenment and its practical civil society, more so than in either England or France, were organized in institutions, as argued by Ulrich Im Hof, *Das gesellige Jahrhundert* (1982) and Richard van Dülmen, *Die Gesellschaft der Aufklärer* (1986). (None of the above works are cited by Faulstich.)

Nonetheless, to point out such absences in a study as broad as Faulstich's volume strikes me as being *kleinlich* and unappreciative. The best approach is to recommend *Die bürgerliche Mediengesellschaft* as a useful and valuable addition to our understanding of the long eighteenth century. It contains a great deal of information on topics of interest to a broad transdisciplinary audience of students and experts alike. It should become standard reading in courses on the epoch.

Vanderbilt University

—John A. McCarthy

Everyday Life in the German Book Trade: Friedrich Nicolai as Bookseller and Publisher in the Age of the Enlightenment 1750–1810.

By Pamela E. Selwyn. *University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.*
xvi + 419 pages. \$75.00.

This straightforward book about Friedrich Nicolai began as a 1992 dissertation. As the author tells us in the afterword, her book is neither a biography nor an intellectual history. She suggests instead that her work attempts a social history of German letters. Specifically, she has focused on Nicolai's business records and correspondence. That fifty-year exchange of letters with some of the greatest minds of the day reads like a Who's Who of the eighteenth century: Geßner, Zimmermann, Herder, Lessing, Meusel, Elisa von der Recke, Campe, Knigge, Wieland, Sophie von La Roche, Georg Forster, Lichtenberg, Ramler, Lavater, and Tieck, to name only a few. Selwyn uses those letters not so much to discover and illumine any personal or intellectual dimensions of eighteenth-century life as to trace Nicolai's business principles and practice.

Needless to say, it is difficult to make such a mundane subject as "Everyday Life" shimmer and shine. While Selwyn takes account of Nicolai's power and prestige in the literary marketplace, she devotes much of her narrative to the ordinary and routine aspects of the book trade. Long discussions of Nicolai's accounts, of his letters about what he will or won't pay an author, prove informative, but not particularly significant. Likewise, the discussions of litigation and court cases in which he was involved tend to be long and drawn-out, but not very conclusive or incisive. Selwyn incorporates so much detail at times that minutiae threaten to obscure more important matters. In the case of pirated publications, for instance, Selwyn carefully describes various lawsuits, but delves no deeper into the broader socio-cultural significance of literary piracy. Similarly, she presents a picture of a well-respected and influential businessman, but she does not question his motives nor evaluate the contradictions and complications that such self-interest produced for a man eager both to make a profit and to promote a German literary culture.

In a social history about a businessman and his business practices, some comment about money and its value is both welcome and essential. Selwyn accordingly provides the numbers for Nicolai's various expenditures and income. Also essential,

however, is a frame of reference, so that the reader might know what 1,000 to 1,200 Taler a year for postage actually means. An assistant in the firm received about 100 Taler a year, for instance, and the shop manager in Stettin 300 Taler, but what a Taler could purchase, she does not say. She documents a profit of 4,000 to 4,800 Taler in 1775, but what that actually amounts to remains a mystery. Is it a lot or a little? In 1787, we learn, Nicolai bought a house for 30,000 Taler *in cash*. It would be most useful to know whether that compares to \$30,000 or \$30,000,000 in 2005. I suspect that 30,000 Taler was an enormous sum which would mean that Nicolai was exceedingly rich, but Selwyn gives no indication whether this guess is right or wrong. Since this is a book about eighteenth-century business, such clarification is especially important. Without a knowledge of what a Taler or Carolin was worth, that kind of information is all but meaningless.

To be sure, Selwyn has accomplished a remarkable task. Nicolai's papers are voluminous (roughly 300 in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz). Selwyn has managed to navigate and find her way through the letters of some 2,500 correspondents. She has sifted through mountains of materials, especially primary, but also the extensive secondary literature. In a book otherwise so thorough and attentive to detail, it consequently surprised me to find some of the relevant scholarship neglected: a 1992 study in *Seminar* and the 1995 book edited by Rowland and Fink entitled *The German Book Review* in which Nicolai figures prominently and where one essay is devoted entirely to him. Hardly a glaring error, such an omission only deserves mention as the research in question bears directly on her own work.

At the end of his life, as Selwyn observes, Nicolai made his money chiefly through the publication of textbooks. She herself concludes that his publishing house did little for German literature: "Nicolai's firm left no lasting mark on poetry, fiction, or drama" (91). So why bother with Nicolai? According to her, he left "no legacy of sweeping reforms like [other publishers such as] Philipp Erasmus Reich in his own day or Friedrich Perthes in the next generation. He did not change the way booksellers did business with each other. His innovations were in the field of retail book sales, in the works he published, and in his particular combination of intellectual and business pursuits" (179). The innovations in retail sales of which she speaks were not extraordinary or particularly memorable, and the emphasis in her study is not so much on Nicolai's intellectual as commercial transactions. What is there then to recommend Nicolai and this book about him to an audience today?

According to Gordon Craig, whom Selwyn quotes, German intellectuals of the day referred as much to Friedrich Nicolai as to the famous Prussian monarch when they spoke of the "Frederician age." Nicolai and his publishing house had a profound effect on German literary life as writers no less than (and so very different as) Schiller and Heine realized. While the former called Nicolai "the sovereign of literature" (23), the latter said "Frederick the Great and the bookseller Nicolai reigned" in Berlin (24). Nicolai left his mark not least as the friend and collaborator of such luminaries as Lessing and Mendelssohn and as long-time arbiter of literary taste and judgement. Although the textbooks he published and his own literary efforts are forgettable, one of the titles he published stands out in particular and mattered very much indeed: the monumental *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*. That journal alone allowed Nicolai to keep his finger on the pulse of German literature and to chart its course as well.

Illinois State University

—James van der Laan

Literarische Unternehmungen der Spätaufklärung. Der Verleger Friedrich Nicolai, die *Straussfedern* und ihre Autoren.

Von Annette Antoine. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2001. Bd. 1: 259 Seiten, Bd. 2: 172 Seiten. Je €47,66.

Friedrich Nicolai (1733–1811) occupies a distinctive position in German letters for at least two reasons. Old enough to have first made his mark as a member of the Berlin circle that attacked the aesthetics of Johann Christoph Gottsched in the 1750s, Nicolai long outlived his compatriots Moses Mendelssohn and Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, becoming himself the target of attacks by the young literary lions of the 1790s and thereafter. This circumstance made Nicolai both witness and protagonist throughout a series of decisive turns in German cultural history. Second, Nicolai acted not merely from the perspective of a critic and novelist; he was also a bookseller and publisher. To an extent almost unique among his contemporaries in the book trade, Nicolai attempted to use his efforts as publisher (to call his a publishing “house” would be anachronistic) to promote the values that he saw as central to the Enlightenment. One such project was the *Straussfedern*, the topic of Annette Antoine’s study.

The *Straussfedern* was an eight-volume collection of stories, folk tales, and novellas published by Nicolai between 1787 and 1798. It emerged from the collaboration between Nicolai and Johann Karl August Musäus, a frequent contributor to Nicolai’s *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek (ADB)* and the author of a well-known collection of folk tales. Musäus was exactly the partner Nicolai was looking for to lead his project: through his reviews in the *ADB*, Musäus participated in Nicolai’s decades-long project of building readers’ taste for good literature, while at the same time his own success as an author had taught him how to combine instruction with entertainment. Unfortunately for Nicolai (and of course, for Musäus himself), Musäus died shortly after the publication of the first volume, forcing Nicolai to seek another collaborator on the project and fill a gaping hole in the ranks of reviewers for the *ADB*. His choice was the novelist Johann Gottwerth Müller, who enlisted as both reviewer and author of the *Straussfedern*. Yet Müller’s part in the project was not crowned with success. Over seven years between 1787 and 1794 he managed to produce only two volumes of the *Straussfedern* and by the end of that period he and Nicolai had become thoroughly fed up with one another.

In spite of the difficulties with Müller, Nicolai was not yet ready to give up on the *Straussfedern*, and to carry it forward he recruited a struggling young Berlin writer, Ludwig Tieck, as the next author. As improbable as any collaboration between Nicolai and Tieck may sound, in many respects Tieck’s work on the *Straussfedern* was the most successful stage in the project’s entire history. He produced five more volumes and some twenty-seven stories, nine of which were penned by his sister, Sophie, and one by her husband, August Ferdinand Bernhadi. But Tieck’s literary sensibilities, needless to say, were nothing like those of his elders Musäus and Müller, who had shared Nicolai’s conviction that good literature ought to advance the enlightenment of readers. Tieck, for his part, lampooned these pieties in the stories published by him in the *Straussfedern*, thereby contributing to an estrangement from Nicolai that later made them both party to some very bitter exchanges.

Antoine rightly points out that the two sides of Nicolai’s identity—as critic and *Aufklärer* and as publisher—have too often been interpreted independently of one another, and she mounts her study of the *Straussfedern* as a case study in how one

might stitch together both sides of Nicolai's historical identity. To a great extent she reaches this goal, although perhaps too often the analysis boils down to asking whether the stories published in the series actually conveyed any particular lessons that were consistent with Enlightenment programmatic. This forces Antoine into the position of accepting at face value Nicolai's and his authors' own claims concerning what they thought the *Straussfedern* attempted to do, instead of taking a more critical stance toward its ideology. This places Antoine's study in the same position as Ute Schneider's well-known study of the *ADB*, another of Nicolai's great projects for spreading Enlightenment.

In studies of Nicolai the publisher, one often misses a sufficient consideration for the business side of his life. Aside from its mission of bettering his readers' quantum of Enlightenment, what did Nicolai expect to *earn* from the *Straussfedern*? Here, Antoine has comparatively little to say, although one can scarcely blame her for that, because in his *Nachlaß* in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek there are virtually no business records. Despite this handicap, *Literarische Unternehmungen* offers a rich portrait of the compelling and fraught relationship between publisher and author in the later eighteenth century. Especially as revealed by correspondence from Müller to Nicolai, which is edited and annotated by Antoine in the second volume, the reader can see how complex this relationship had become toward the end of the eighteenth century. Müller depended on Nicolai for a not inconsiderable portion of his livelihood, and this gave Nicolai leverage over "his" author, a situation that became increasingly intolerable for Müller, who preferred to see himself as a new-style independent author (*freier Schriftsteller*). Simply by attending to the complexity of all that was exchanged between Müller and Nicolai, an exchange that included books, money, deadlines, and advice, one can learn a great deal about the evolving circumstances of literary production in this crucial transitional period.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

—Thomas Broman

Germans, Jews, and the Claims of Modernity.

By Jonathan M. Hess. *New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002. xiii + 258 pages. \$45.00*

Jonathan Hess's study, *Germans, Jews, and the Claims of Modernity*, is a meticulously written and copiously researched study that brings to the forefront little-known biographical facts about Christian Wilhelm von Dohm, author of the influential *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (1781) and the anti-Semitic writer Carl Wilhelm Friedrich Grattenauer, whose *Wider die Juden* (1803) reached bestseller status by selling 13,000 copies. Hess's study of 18th- and 19th-century debates on the "Jewish question" is an essential addition to the literature on this topic.

Arguments in favor of Jewish emancipation were based on the principle of "Judaism's essential compatibility with modernity" (17). This led to a necessity to redefine Judaism in terms of its relationship to its non-Jewish environment. Hess documents these attempts by thorough consideration of such Jewish authors as Moses Mendelssohn, Saul Ascher, and David Friedländer. But Hess begins his examination with Dohm, who was so influential that he defined the framework of the debate over Jewish emancipation for over 100 years.

Dohm refers to the Prussian state's policy to bring about prosperity by encouraging large numbers of colonists to settle in Prussia and points to the incompatibility of directives to limit both the Jewish population and the economic productivity of Jewish subjects. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Dohm "did not want to make emancipation contingent on religious reform" (35). He believed that Judaism was a fundamentally rationalistic religion and that emancipating the Jews would unleash influences that would make it even more rationalistic.

Mendelssohn was known "for his symbolic role as a temperate mediator between Judaism and the secular world of the European Enlightenment" (93). Hess views him as having been one of Europe's chief Jewish public intellectuals, an uncontroversial avatar of Jewish emancipation who came to personify the promises of Jewish emancipation for both Jews and gentiles.

Mendelssohn's moderation and wish to refrain from polemics were the product of a rigorous self-discipline and a desire not to provoke Christian public officials to take actions detrimental to Judaism. Mendelssohn's book, *Jerusalem* (1783), defines Judaism as a noncoercive system of revealed legislation devoid of religious and mystical dogmas. Judaism is therefore more rational than Christianity and totally compatible with the emerging secular political order. In an unpublished statement from 1770, Mendelssohn contends that Jesus did not wish to be the founder of a new religion but a defender and perpetuator of the existence of Jewish law. Christianity is a multi-layered house with Judaism as its foundation.

Friedländer's open letter to Wilhelm Abraham Teller "drew its motivation from despair over the fading possibilities of Jewish emancipation" (170) and "represented an effort of elite Jews to abandon solidarity with Jewry as a whole" (171).

Hess then proceeds to examine anti-Semitic literature from such writers as Grattenauer and Friedrich Buchholz. Grattenauer sought to convince his Christian compatriots that Jews were committed to world domination, a charge that seems laughable given that Jews were a minuscule minority who were rapidly shedding all signs of difference. Hess points out that Grattenauer's influence outlasted the early 19th century and that Nazi historians quoted Grattenauer during the Third Reich. Grattenauer did not believe in a possibility of Jewish assimilation or acculturation. Buchholz, on the other hand, extols the coercive nature of military service as a means of bringing about the assimilation of Jews into German society.

Hopefully these few examples will suffice to point out that this book is a welcome addition to the literature of Judeo-German studies. There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever that Hess's book deserves to be in all scholarly libraries.

Rochester Community and Technical College

—Peter R. Erspamer

Volksaufklärung. Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Popularisierung aufklärerischen Denkens im deutschen Sprachraum von den Anfängen bis 1850. Bd. 2 [in zwei Teilbänden]: Der Höhepunkt der Volksaufklärung 1781–1800 und die Zäsur durch die Französische Revolution.

Einführung von Reinhart Siegert. Introduction translated by David Paisey. Bibliographische Essays von Heinrich Scheel zur Mainzer Republik; Holger Böning zur Helvetischen Republik; Reinhart Siegert zur volksaufklärerischen Kolportage.

Von Holger Böning und Reinhart Siegert. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2001. Teilband 2.1: cxxv Seiten, Spalten 1–1268; Teilband 2.2: vi Seiten, Spalten 1269–2978. €693,00.

Versuch über die Aufklärung des Landmannes.

Von Rudolph Zacharias Becker.

Volksaufklärung.

Von Heinrich Gottlieb Zerrenner.

Neudruck der Erstausgaben Dessau und Leipzig 1785 bzw. Magdeburg 1786. Mit einem Nachwort von Reinhart Siegert. (Volksaufklärung. Ausgewählte Schriften. Hrsg. von Holger Böning und Reinhart Siegert. Bd. 8.) Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2001. 326 Seiten. €148,00.

Das rasonnirnde Dorfkonvent.

Von Johann Adam Christian Thon.

Neudruck der Teile 1–3, Erfurt 1786–1788, in Auswahl. Mit einem Nachwort von Holger Böning. (Volksaufklärung. Ausgewählte Schriften. Hrsg. von Holger Böning und Reinhart Siegert. Bd. 11.) Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2001. 380 Seiten. €158,50.

Theorie der Popularität.

Von Johann Christoph Greiling.

Neudruck der Erstausgabe Magdeburg 1805. Mit einem Nachwort von Holger Böning. (Volksaufklärung. Ausgewählte Schriften. Hrsg. von Holger Böning und Reinhart Siegert. Bd. 13.) Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2001. 201 Seiten. €140,61.

Die anzuzeigenden Bände dokumentieren ein ehrgeiziges Projekt mit voraussichtlich weitreichenden Folgen: Volksaufklärung. Lange von der Zunft der dix-huitièmistes in Deutschland und anderswo stiefmütterlich behandelt, fristete die Volksaufklärung ein Dasein am Rande der Aufmerksamkeit von Philosophie und Philosophiegeschichte, vergleichbar der 'Trivilliteratur' in den Literaturwissenschaften—eher eine Art volkskundliches Hobby. Volksaufklärung galt als bloßes Derivat der 'richtigen' Philosophie der Aufklärung, gewissermaßen die Distanz zwischen 'Eliten' und (deren) 'Massen' widerspiegelnd. Die bis heute gängige Geringschätzung der Volksaufklärung hat und hatte offenbar mit der Abwertung aufklärerischer Praxis zu tun, mit gerade dem also, was für die Volksaufklärung von zentraler Bedeutung war. Diese Haltung ist freilich befremdlich, denn: War nicht erklärtes Ziel *aller* Aufklärer, daß Praxis werde, was als vernünftig erkannt worden war? Es läßt sich, insbesondere in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts, beobachten, daß die Praxisorientierung aufklärerischen Denkens Probleme aufwarf, von denen die theoretische Aufklärung, wenn überhaupt, dann nur eine vage Ahnung hatte. Der Anspruch, daß die gesamte Menschheit aufgeklärt werden solle, war Gemeingut, konkrete Bemühungen um Aufklärung des Volkes weckten freilich Ängste, die, wenn nicht 1776 oder 1789, so doch spätestens 1792 sich als berechtigt zu erweisen schienen. Das Volk aufklären wollen, hieß, die Frage zu stellen: Wer soll aufgeklärt werden? Von der Antwort hing entscheidend ab, ob die theoretische Aufklärung der Volksaufklärung vorgearbeitet hatte oder ob die Praxis der Volksaufklärung die Theorie Lügen strafte und sie dann das Fürchten lehrte. Kurz: Es stellte sich die Frage, ob Aufklärung teilbar sei. Es ist kein Zufall,

daß mit der Preisaufgabe der Preußischen Akademie für 1780 die Schwelle zur praktischen Aufklärung in großem Maßstab überschritten wurde. Die Frage, von Friedrich II. seiner Akademie aufgezwungen, lautete, "Nützt es dem Volke, betrogen zu werden?" (Est-il utile au Peuple d'être trompé?) Die Mehrzahl der Beiträge ging auf die Frage ein, ob es tunlich sei, das Volk von Irrtum und Vorurteilen zu befreien, und nicht wenige der Bewerber um den begehrten Preis der Berliner Akademie zogen maßvolles Vorgehen vor, damit die Ordnung nicht erschüttert werde, genauer: damit der Status quo keinen Schaden nehme. Es hätte ja sein können, daß aufgeklärte Bauern keine Kartoffeln mehr anbauen wollten! Volksaufklärung war also durchaus ein 'heißes Eisen.'

I.

Die Herausgeber und Verfasser des bibliographischen Handbuchs zur Volksaufklärung, Holger Böning und Reinhart Siegert, fördern in den beiden Teilbänden des zweiten Bandes (der erste erschien 1990) wieder eine wahrhaft überwältigende Menge an vergessenen und verdrängten Texten ans Tageslicht und bereiten den Boden für einen neuen Blick auf die Aufklärung insgesamt. Reinhart Siegert trat schon 1978 mit seiner gründlichen Arbeit über Rudolf Zacharias Beckers *Noth- und Hülfsbüchlein* — die volksaufklärerische Schrift mit den höchsten Auflagenzahlen überhaupt — hervor. (Reinhart Siegert, *Aufklärung und Volkslektüre. Exemplarisch dargestellt an Rudolph Zacharias Becker und seinem "Noth- und Hülfsbüchlein"*. Mit einer Bibliographie zum Gesamtthema. Frankfurt am Main: Buchhändlervereinigung 1978 [Separatdruck des in Bd. 19 (1978) des *Archivs für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, Sp. 565–1344 erschienenen Beitrags]). Holger Böning veröffentlichte seine Studie zu Heinrich Zschokkes *Schweizerboten* 1983. (Holger Böning, *Heinrich Zschokke und sein "Aufrichtiger und wohlerfahrener Schweizerbote"*. *Die Volksaufklärung in der Schweiz*. Bern [u.a.]: Peter Lang 1983).

Die 1970er und 1980er Jahre waren in den Geschichts- und Literaturwissenschaften Jahre der Sozialgeschichte und, damit einhergehend, Jahre, in denen populäre Literatur ernsthaft gewürdigt werden konnte (Otto Burger, Jochen Schulte-Sasse, Helga de la Motte-Haber u.a.) Rudolf Schendas *Volk ohne Buch* erschien 1970, mit dem Untertitel *Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der populären Lesestoffe 1770–1910* (Erstausgabe bei Klostermann, 1977 als Taschenbuch bei dtv). 1973 folgte Rolf Engelsing *Analphabetentum und Lektüre. Zur Sozialgeschichte des Lesens in Deutschland zwischen feudaler und industrieller Gesellschaft*. 1976 kam das erste Heft des heute international etablierten *Internationalen Archivs für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Hrsg. von Wolfgang Frühwald, Georg Jäger, Alberto Martino [u.a.]. Tübingen: Niemeyer 1976ff.) heraus, in dessen Umfeld Alberto Martinos monumentale empirische Untersuchung zur deutschen Leihbibliothek entstand (Alberto Martino, *Die deutsche Leihbibliothek. Geschichte einer literarischen Institution [1756–1914]*. Mit einem zusammen mit Georg Jäger erstellten Verzeichnis der erhaltenen Leihbibliothekskataloge. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1990) — allesamt Arbeiten, die vorgegebene Wertungsmuster von 'hoher' und 'niederer' oder Trivial-Literatur in Frage stellten und in empirischer Kleinarbeit das Bild der Kulturgeschichte als Geschichte der 'hohen' Kultur kräftig korrigierten. Böning und Siegert stellen in dieser Tradition mit ihrer Bibliographie das Material für eine empirisch gründlich unterfütterte Korrektur im Bereich der Philosophie-, Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte bereit, und sie tun es reich-

lich und gut. Was hier in langen Jahren in- und extensiver Arbeit zusammengetragen und in kaum überbietbar benutzerfreundlicher Form aufgearbeitet wurde, eröffnet riesiges Neuland für die Forschung, deren Bild von 'der' Aufklärung sich deutlich ändern dürfte. Wahre Pionierarbeit, ein bewundernswert langer Atem, ein immenser Fundus an Wissen verleihen den Bibliographiebänden ihr klares Profil und sichern ihnen einen Spitzenplatz unter den kommentierten Bibliographien überhaupt.

Immanuel Kant, Moses Mendelssohn (der in seinem Beitrag in der *Berlinischen Monatsschrift* [IV, 1784, 197] einen der frühen Belege für den Begriff "Volksaufklärung" lieferte), Karl Philipp Moritz, Rudolf Zacharias Becker, Joachim Heinrich Campe, Heinrich Pestalozzi, Friedrich Eberhard von Rochow, Christian Gotthilf Salzmann, Georg Friedrich Seiler und Christian Friedrich Sintenis, das sind Namen aus dem Berichtszeitraum von 1781 bis 1800, die mehr oder weniger geläufig sind. Aber Heinrich Gottlob Zerrenner, Christian Ferdinand Touchy, Johann Moritz Schwager, Johann Heinrich Pratje, Sebastian Georg Friedrich Mund, Johann Friedrich Mayer, Christian Ludewig Hahnzog, Gotthold Nathanael Fischer und wie sie alle heißen—kaum jemand außer Böning und Siegert kennt sie, und sie alle haben sich um Volksaufklärung bemüht. Das sind aber nur acht Namen aus den 206 Spalten (!) der Namenregister der beiden Teilbände. Den heutigen Vertretern der Disziplinen Philosophie, Geschichte, Germanistik (in voller Breite von Philologie bis German Studies) kann—den Rezensenten eingeschlossen—auf den Kopf zugesagt werden, daß ihnen über 90 Prozent der in der Bibliographie erfaßten Schriften unbekannt sind. Daß dem so ist, provoziert natürlich die Frage, ob die Schriften zur Volksaufklärung relevant sind für die Diskussion der Frage "Was ist Aufklärung?" Unsere Frage heute ist: "Was war Aufklärung und welche Bedeutung hat sie für uns?" Sind diese Volksaufklärungsschriften nicht vielmehr das, wovor Generationen von dix-huitièmistes uns schon immer gewarnt haben: Strandgut der Aufklärung? Vor eine Antwort haben Böning und Siegert nun das historische Material und die Durcharbeitung eines neuen Textcorpus gesetzt. Ihre Bibliographie ist nicht nur Information sondern vor allem eine Aufgabe.

Der erste Teilband enthält neben den Benutzerhinweisen (ix–xxiii) eine Einführung von Reinhart Siegert zu den Jahren 1781 bis 1800 als dem Höhepunkt der Volksaufklärung (xxv–xliv). Daß dieser Beitrag auch in englischer Übersetzung wiedergegeben wird, ist wenig einsichtig, da die Bibliographie sich insgesamt ausschließlich an Benutzer wendet, die die deutsche Sprache beherrschen. Siegerts Beitrag gibt konzise Auskunft über den Begriff "Volksaufklärung" und seine Geschichte, um dann die Dimensionen juristische, politische, historische und religiöse Volksaufklärung sowie die damalige aufklärerische Attacke gegen das geozentrische Weltbild vorzustellen, die als Differenzierungen den Gesamtbegriff "Volksaufklärung" deutlich machen. Sein Versuch, eine "neue Qualität: Emanzipative Volksaufklärung" aufzuzeigen, indem er eine proto-demokratische Dimension der Volksaufklärung zwischen 1781 und 1800 ausmacht, scheint mir eher einem Wunschenken geschuldet zu sein. Die Zahl der Schriften, die "den 'gemeinen Mann' die ersten Schritte zum mündigen Staatsbürger und zum modernen Individuum tun lassen" (xxx) dürfte, wenn überhaupt solche da waren, gering gewesen sein. Wir geben in diesem Zusammenhang gern zu, daß unsere Vermutung wegen der erwähnten Unkenntnis der Texte auf schwachen Füßen steht, merken aber aus einem uns vertrauten Bereich an, daß die Schriften, die sich 1780 um den Preis der Akademie bewarben, nicht, wie Siegert unterstellt, 'demokratisch' orientiert waren, den Preisträger Rudolf Zacharias Becker eingeschlossen.

Zur Bildung einer Traditionslinie, die moderne repräsentative Demokratien heutigen Zuschnitts legitimierte, dienen die Schriften der Volksaufklärung wohl kaum. Interessant dagegen ist Siegerts Rehabilitation der katholischen Aufklärung, die im Anspruch der Priester auf die Rolle als Volkslehrer den Protestanten in nichts nachstand (xxxvii).

Drei "bibliographische Essays" schließen sich an Siegerts Einführung an: Heinrich Scheels Beitrag, "Die Volksaufklärung der Mainzer Republik (1792/1793) und ihr literarischer Niederschlag," Holger Böning, "'Die Unterrichtung des Volkes ist der Tod seiner Tyrannen'—Zur Volksaufklärung und zu ihrem literarischen Niederschlag in Helvetischer Revolution und Republik (1798–1803)" und Reinhart Siegert, "Volksaufklärung und Kolportage."

Es folgt dann auf 2692 Spalten die kommentierte Bibliographie. Die Einträge folgen dem Muster: Exakte Titelangabe mit Formatangabe und Illustrationsnachweis; Standortnachweis; Beschreibung, häufig mit Hilfe von zeitgenössischen Rezensionen; Nachweis von Rezensionen; gegebenenfalls Nachweis von Quellen. Alle Titel sind durchnummeriert. Beide Teilbände schließen ab mit Personen- und Titelregistern. Geplant sind für den Abschlußband zusätzlich noch Register zu Orten und Regionen und Textsorten. Ein Sachregister—ein Desiderat ersten Ranges—für das Gesamtprojekt scheint möglich, aber von dem Willen und den Möglichkeiten der finanziellen Förderung abhängig zu sein. Möge es gelingen! Die Forschung zur Aufklärung hat hier mit Bönings und Siegerts grundlegender Arbeit die Chance einer erschöpfenden Dokumentation einer Phase und Dimension der deutschen Aufklärung, die sich wohl kaum wieder ergeben dürfte. Zudem wäre der Dokumentation eine intelligente Digitalisierung zu wünschen, so daß sie online zugänglich wird.

II.

Die Reihe *Volksaufklärung. Ausgewählte Schriften*, von denen drei der bisher erschienenen Bändchen für diese Rezension berücksichtigt werden, hat sich als Aufgabe gestellt, vergessene Schriften zur Volksaufklärung in Nachdrucken mit erläuternden und kontextualisierenden Nachworten wieder zugänglich zu machen. Bei der Auswahl aus dem immensen Materialfundus spielt natürlich der editorische Takt eine erhebliche Rolle, und mir scheint, daß es daran mitunter ein wenig hapert. Daß die angezeigte Bibliographie als Forschungsinstrument in hervorragend solider und lesefreundlicher Aufmachung mit ihrem stolzen Preis von €693,00 Privatleser und Privatleserinnen in der Regel vom Käuferkreis ausschließen dürfte, ist klar. Die Bibliotheken als öffentliche Institutionen sind hier gefragt. Daß aber die drei Reprint-Bändchen zur Volksaufklärung im Kleinoktav mit beispielsweise 907 Seiten Hardcover mit Fadenheftung auf feinem Papier insgesamt €865,00 (!) kosten, scheint mir ein verlegerischer Overkill. Zudem: Ob alle die angekündigten ca. 13 Bände repräsentativ für Bönings und Siegerts Projekt sind, sei dahingestellt. Sinnvoll wäre es zumindest gewesen, R.Z. Beckers *Noth- und Hilfsbüchlein* und sein *Mildheimisches Liederbuch* als erstes zu veröffentlichen. Hier scheint ein Projekt ohne Außenkritik seine Eigendynamik entfaltet zu haben. Warum R.Z. Beckers *Versuch über die Aufklärung des Landmannes* von 1785, der nichts anderes ist als eine Ankündigung seines *Noth- und Hilfsbüchleins*—zu einem Zeitpunkt, wo von dem *Hilfsbüchlein* "noch keine Zeile auf dem Papier" (so Siegert im Nachwort zu R.Z. Becker, *Versuch über die Aufklärung des Landmannes*, 297* [Paginierung des Herausgebers]) stand—, in dieser Reihe erscheinen mußte, ist schwer einzusehen. Gewiß, es ist interessant zu beobachten, wie Becker sein

Projekt *Noth- und Hilfsbüchlein* mit seinem *Versuch* lanciert, gewissermaßen als Subskriptionsbroschüre, inklusive zweifarbigem (!) Titelblatt des *Noth- und Hilfsbüchleins*. Insgesamt war es Beckers Versuch, Bürgertum und Adel von der Notwendigkeit der Volksaufklärung zu überzeugen. Aufklärung war für Becker „*practische Aufklärung*“ (61*), aufgeklärt ist der Bauer, der glücklich, „ein guter Hausvater, ein verständiger Landwirth, ein redlicher Nachbar, ein treuer Staatsbürger und ein wahrer Christ“ ist (64*). Bürgertum und Adel in die Pflicht der Privilegierten gegenüber den Benachteiligten zu nehmen, sah Becker als seine Aufgabe—und er entwickelte da durchaus kräftig sozialkritische Ideen—, aber all das werden wir hoffentlich bald in der anstehenden Ausgabe seines *Noth- und Hilfsbüchleins* ohnehin breit ausgeführt finden.

Daß Beckers *Versuch* im vorliegenden Reprint mit der Abhandlung des Pastors Heinrich Gottlieb Zerrenner zum Thema *Volksaufklärung* von 1786 zusammengebunden ist, macht den Band nicht besser. Reinhard Siegerts Bemerkung im ansonsten recht informativen Nachwort trägt selbst etwas ratlos der mäßigen Qualität von Zerrenners Schrift Rechnung: „Was er [Zerrenner] zur Theorie der Volksschriften zu sagen hat, ist nicht schlecht“ (319*)—kein gutes Argument für einen derart teuren Reprint.

Der Nachdruck von *Das räsonnirende Dorfkonvent* des protestantischen Pastors Johann Adam Christian Thon mit einer Auswahl aus den Jahrgängen 1786 bis 1788, des „ersten volksaufklärerischen Periodikums mit regelmäßigen Zeitungsnachrichten“ (363*, Bönings Nachwort), ist zwar keine grundstürzende Textsammlung, kann aber wohl für sich beanspruchen, einige genauere Einsicht in die publizistische Praxis der Volksaufklärung zu geben. In neunzehn „Diskursen“—Dialogen zwischen Amtsrat Paulinus, Dorfrichter Weise, Kantor Rebus und Pächter Ehrlich, später kommt gelegentlich noch Nachbar Frühauf hinzu—werden Wege, Möglichkeiten und Voraussetzungen der Volksaufklärung erörtert. Probleme der Pfarrer, Lehrer, Bauern, Pächter werden vorgestellt, und jeder Nummer sind Berichte angehängt, wie wir sie heute als Nachrichten in den Zeitungen gewohnt sind. *Das räsonnirende Dorfkonvent* ist als Reprint ein gelungener Versuch, einen Eindruck von volksaufklärerischer Publizistik zu vermitteln. Der Band kann gut als Bestandteil von Lehrveranstaltungen vom Einführungs- bis zum Doktorandenniveau dienen, auch wenn er die hohe Preisbarriere vor sich gestellt hat und die Bibliotheken an ihre Pflichten erinnert.

Ein besonders glücklicher Griff der Herausgeber der Reihe *Volksaufklärung* scheint mir die Wahl von Johann Christoph Greilings *Theorie der Popularität* von 1805 zu sein. Greiling (1765–1840; protestantischer Pastor und Ehrendoktor der Universität Jena) entwickelt darin eine Theorie der Popularität, die auf die Differenzierung in untere und obere Erkenntnisvermögen zurückgreift und sich kritisch an Garve, Mendelssohn, Jacobi, Dusch, Pestalozzi und andere anlehnt. Sein Kronzeuge für die Grundlegung seiner Theorie aber ist Kant, genauer: der § 59 der *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (neben seiner *Logik* und *Anthropologie*). Im § 59 (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*, B 256) setzt Kant sich mit dem Konzept *Hypotypose* („Darstellung, subiectio sub adspectum“) auseinander. Was Hans Blumenberg 1960 im Rahmen seiner philosophischen Bemühungen um eine Philosophie, in der Metaphern neben Begriffen gleiches Stimmrecht haben, zur Entwicklung seiner *Paradigmen zu einer Metaphorologie* anregte (neu aufgelegt Frankfurt am Main 1998), führte Johann Christoph Greiling 155 Jahre zuvor zur Ausführung einer Theorie der *Versinnlichung*. Mit seiner Feststellung, der „Inbe-

griff dieser sinnlich und konkret denkenden, und einer anschaulichen lebhaften Erkenntnis des Wahren bedürftigen Menschenklassen, heißt eben (im Gegensatz zu den Gelehrten, die die Wahrheit theoretisch spekulativ behandeln,) das Volk" (21*), ist Greiling nicht originell. Originell hingegen ist seine Anwendung ästhetischer Kategorien auf soziale Sachverhalte. Populär sein heißt laut Greiling nicht, sich jovial anzubiedern und opportune rhetorische Register zu ziehen. Populär kann nur sein, wer gelehrt ist und sich im wertfreien Verständnis zum Volk "herabläßt"—ein Begriff, der im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert immer noch die "Herablassung" (*Condescendenz*, 19*) Gottes zu den Menschen konnotierte. Der Vermittler von Wahrheit, um den es Pastor Greiling geht, ist "Volkslehrer" (58*), vulgo: Prediger, das, "was Merkur in der Mythologie ist, nämlich ein Gottesbote, der Vernunftgesandte an die unwissende große Menge" (58*), "Dollmetscher" (59*) ist er, indem er das den Menschen Unfaßliche den Sinnen faßbar macht, kurz: der sinnlichen Erkenntnis—*aisthesis*—vorlegt. Greiling nennt jene Form der Versinnlichung ästhetisch, "die einen Begriff anschaulich und schön darzustellen versucht" (77*). Daß Baumgartens entscheidende Erfindung der irreduziblen ästhetischen Wahrheit, daß Ästhetik *nicht* logische Propädeutik sei, hier ineingesetzt wird mit Mendelssohns "sinnlicher Vollkommenheit" (78*), in der die sinnliche Erkenntnis der Verstandeserkenntnis bloß zuarbeitet, nicht aber ein eigenes Reich bildet, sei vermerkt. Greiling ist kein Revolutionär, aber seine Ehrenrettung von Bildlichkeit, Analogie, Metapher und Symbol im Zusammenhang mit der Frage, wie das Volk aufgeklärt werden könne, ist ein beachtlicher Schritt. Greiling *Theorie der Popularität* sollte in jeder wissenschaftlichen Bibliothek stehen, die Anspruch darauf erhebt, die Aufklärung mitzuvertreten.

Für die Zukunft der Reihe *Volksaufklärung* sei Herausgebern und Verlag eine ruhige Hand gewünscht. Den abschließenden Band der Bibliographie darf man mit Ungeduld erwarten.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

—Hans Adler

Literatur und Geschichte. Ein Kompendium zu ihrem Verhältnis von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart.

Herausgegeben von Daniel Fulda und Silvia Serena Tschopp. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002. vii + 605 Seiten. €128,00.

Die traditionsreiche Diskussion um das Verhältnis von Literatur und Geschichte hat sowohl durch neuere Geschichtstheorien (New Historicism) als auch durch die Etablierung der Gender-Studien und Medienwissenschaft sowie durch die Renaissance des historischen Erzählens neue Impulse bekommen und in den letzten Jahren eine Fülle von neuen Fragestellungen und Publikationen hervorgebracht. Dieser Band setzt an bei der Sicht der Geschichte als Textualität, als Konstruktion, die den Glauben an die 'eine Geschichte' abgelöst hat. Dem Band ist es gelungen, zugleich mit neuen Einzelfallanalysen den literaturwissenschaftlichen und geschichtstheoretischen Forschungsstand zu systematisieren und Desiderate aufzuzeigen, die zu Recht vor allem in Fragestellungen gesehen werden, die Geschichte, Literatur und *gender* verbinden.

Der Anspruch dieses Buchs, einen Abriss des komplexen und vielgesichtigen Verhältnisses von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart zu geben, ist kein geringer, auch wenn es nicht auf Vollständigkeit, sondern "zweckhafte Selektivität" gerichtet ist (5).

Er wird eingelöst durch die Zweiteilung in einen theoretischen Teil und einen thematischen Teil mit Analysen des Geschichtsdiskurses (1) (etwa im Verhältnis 1:5). Der erstere ordnet die methodische Vielfalt aktueller Fragestellungen in "Systematische Perspektiven." Der Hauptteil bringt ausführliche und überwiegend einsichtige und überzeugende "Fallstudien" (5) zu "Epochen und Gattungen," die chronologisch angeordnet der 'Sattelzeit' um 1800, dem Historismus des 19. Jahrhunderts, der 'Emphatischen Moderne' sowie der Gegenwart gelten und darin jeweils an drei bis fünf Fällen Formen und Gattungen der Geschichtsdarstellung und ihre gesellschaftliche Funktion und den Zusammenhang von Geschichtsauffassung und Erzählen untersuchen. Für die Ausgewogenheit der Auswahl spricht, daß innerhalb der literarischen Gattungen neben dem Roman und dem Drama auch die Lyrik berücksichtigt wurde, außerdem die wissenschaftliche Historiographie. Dem inter- und multidisziplinären Charakter dieser Revision des Forschungsstandes entsprechend kommen die Beiträger/innen nicht nur aus Germanistik und Geschichtswissenschaft, sondern auch aus Philosophie, Anglistik und Romanistik. Alle sind durch einschlägige Publikationen ausgewiesen.

In einer knappen Einleitung gibt das Herausgeberteam einen erfreulich knappen Überblick zur Entwicklung des modernen Geschichtsbegriffs und fragt nach den daraus folgenden Konsequenzen für die Reflexion über das historische Denken als Prämisse der Geistes- und Kulturwissenschaften seit dem späten 18. Jahrhundert. Außerdem zeigen Fulda und Tschopp übergreifende Tendenzen der Beiträge auf. Der theoretische Teil widmet sich neben den wichtigsten Methoden den Hauptsträngen der Theoriebildung sowie Formen, Funktionen und Wandel von Narrativität in Geschichtsschreibung und historischer Literatur. Im theoretischen Teil werden ferner drei komplexe "Leitaspekte" (171) der aktuellen Diskussion im Spannungsfeld von Literatur und Geschichte konzipiert, nämlich Shoah-Geschichte(n) (Manuela Günter), Populärkultur (Wolfgang Struck) sowie Geschichte und *gender* (Annette Simonis). Die Analysen beginnen mit dem modernen Geschichtsbegriff um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts in Romanpoetik und Ästhetik, Historik und Geschichtsphilosophie.

Diese Rezension kann die einzelnen Aufsätze und ihre Verdienste nur andeuten, keineswegs ihnen gerecht werden. Nur wenige seien hier knapp hervorgehoben. Daniel Fulda (2) erörtert fundiert die strukturanalytische Hermeneutik als geeignete Methode zur Korrelation von Geschichte und Textverfahren, zeigt aber auch ihren "Innovationsbedarf" auf, den er in einem erweiterten Gattungsspektrum einschließlich nicht oder nicht nur textueller Medien, der Berücksichtigung des geschichtskulturellen Mechanismus 'Gedächtnis' sowie in der Frage nach Geschlechterdifferenzen postuliert (55). Moritz Baßler macht "Vorschläge zur methodischen Beerbung des New Historicism" (87) und plädiert "für einen materialen, kulturwissenschaftlichen Begriff des Paradigmas" (96), für eine Analyse, die bei der Untersuchung eines Texts die Beziehungen zwischen diesem und den Texten seines kulturellen Umfeldes entfaltet. Einen wichtigen Beitrag zum heißen Diskussionsfeld Nation und Geschichte leistet Wolfgang Weber, indem er die "nationalgeschichtliche Hochphase" der historistischen Geschichtswissenschaft (1840–1880) untersucht und im 'nationalen Princip' die Ursache für eine "Zweiteilung der Adressaten" (3) ihrer Texte und die Ausprägung unterschiedlicher Gattungsformen erkennt (362), die entscheidend zur Entfremdung der Zunft vom Bildungspublikum und seinem ästhetischen Geschmack beitrug. Dem

Zusammenhang zwischen Dramenform und Geschichtsauffassung als theoretischem und praktischem Problem im 19. Jahrhundert gilt der scharfsinnige Beitrag der Kulturhistorikerin und Mitherausgeberin Silvia Serena Tschopp. Bettina Heyl fragt nach den Kriterien der literarischen Moderne im historischen Roman und untersucht die verschiedenen Ausgestaltungen des Teufelsmotivs "zwischen Heilsgeschichte und Groteske" (489) in Werken von Döblin, Gertrud von le Fort, Alfred Neumann und Thomas Mann. Geschichtsphilosophische Perspektiven im Werk Heiner Müllers, vor allem den Dramen *Weiberkomödie*, *Die Schlacht—Szenen aus Deutschland*, *Leben Gundlings* (4) sowie *Der Auftrag*, zeigt Stephanie Stockhorst auf. Die Frage, ob mit Müller der "Endpunkt des historischen Dramas" erreicht sei (531), verneint sie mit Verweis auf innovative Tendenzen in der Auseinandersetzung mit Geschichte in der Dramatik (von der Geschichtsdarstellung zur Geschichtsdeutung), die eine Erweiterung der Gattungsdefinition nötig machten. Die Lyrik komme auch in dieser Besprechung nicht zu kurz: Markus Fauser stellt eingängig die historische Ballade als "die konsequente Ausprägung der Ballade im Zeitalter des Historismus" (393) heraus, und Dirk Niefanger erörtert übersichtlich verschiedene Formen historischer Lyrik in der Moderne, die er in *ars pictura* (Heym und Kraus), *ars combinatoria* (Hofmannsthal und Weiner) sowie Monumentalische Lyrik und Gedächtniskunst (Rilke) systematisiert.

Mit Ausnahme von zwei Beiträgen zu Flaubert (Christoph Brecht) bzw. zu den Anregungen der Postmoderne aus der schwarzafrikanischen und lateinamerikanischen Gegenwartsliteratur (Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink) sowie dem Schwerpunkt Foucault als Historiker in den Erörterungen von Linda Simonis zu modernen Geschichtskonzepten "im Spannungsfeld von Kontinuität und Diskontinuität" (123), ferner zum Teil den Shoah-Geschichte(n) bleibt der Band im Rahmen der deutschsprachigen Literatur und Geschichtsschreibung, hat allerdings insbesondere die amerikanische Literatur- und Geschichtstheorie in hervorragender Weise aufgearbeitet.

Als einführendes Lehrbuch für Studierende der deutschen Literatur wird sich dieses Kompendium wohl nur begrenzt eignen. Die Aufsätze folgen keinem wie immer gearteten Kanon von Autoren und Texten, geben dafür einen guten Überblick über die wichtigsten Methoden, Fragestellungen und Themen im Feld "Literatur und Geschichte." Die Lesbarkeit der Beiträge ist unterschiedlich. Alle sind übersichtlich gegliedert und mit hilfreichen Auswahlbibliographien versehen. Dem Stil und Anmerkungsapparat der meisten Beiträge sieht man doch den Ursprung des Bandes in einem anspruchsvollen Kolloquium an. Ein Pluspunkt ist, daß die Beiträge vielfach aufeinander verweisen und so Unterschiede in Methoden und Schlüssen verdeutlichen und weitere Ansätze eröffnen. Alle an diesem vielfältigen Forschungsfeld in Literatur- und Geschichtswissenschaft sowie Literaturtheorie Interessierten werden zweifellos von den fundierten Aufsätzen und Analysen profitieren und wichtige Anregungen erhalten. Der Band zeigt tatsächlich "Ansatzpunkte, jene theoretisch-methodische 'Hauptkampflinie' zwischen Hermeneutik und Dekonstruktion zu überwinden" (4) und leistet einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Vernetzung der auf mehrere Disziplinen verteilten Forschung in diesem komplexen Feld.

The Cambridge Companion to Goethe.

Edited by Lesley Sharpe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
xvi + 277 pages. \$60.00 hardcover/\$22.00 paperback.

The Cambridge Companion to Goethe offers a good introduction to Goethe studies for a variety of reasons. First, the volume covers the most important aspects of Goethe's works, from his poetry to his science and from his politics to his aesthetics. Second, most of the chapters provide the overall context of Goethe's works, examining both his influences and those he in turn influenced. Third, the volume as a whole offers numerous strands of Goethe scholarship, including scholars who are highly critical of aspects of Goethe's works. Thus, the volume as a whole is informative and does not try to whitewash the scholarly debates surrounding the "Olympian" Goethe.

The book is quite strong in providing the historical context for Goethe's life and works. It begins with a very useful chapter by Thomas Saine. Saine succinctly covers the main historical events occurring during Goethe's lifetime. His discussion of the Holy Roman Empire is particularly informative. Saine's chapter is followed by Nicholas Saul's discussion of Goethe's literary and cultural contexts. Saul examines Goethe's main literary phases of development against the backdrop of his contemporaries, including Lessing, Schiller, and the Romantics. In many ways, this chapter serves as a companion to the last chapter of the volume: Gerhart Hoffmeister's piece on Goethe's reception in Germany and abroad. Whereas Saul seeks to uncover Goethe's "self-understanding as a writer in the context of the literary epochs through which he lived" (25), Hoffmeister focuses upon how scholarship has shaped our understanding of Goethe. In particular, he provides a detailed discussion of Goethe's relationship to European Romanticism, including an account of how the non-German world came to view Goethe as a "Romantic."

The most revisionist of the historically-oriented pieces is W. Daniel Wilson's, "Goethe and the Political World." Wilson argues that Goethe was a conservative reactionary, who even in his youth was less of a non-monarchist/democrat than has been portrayed. According to Wilson, while Goethe was an anti-absolutist who despised war, his politics advocated the support of the landed nobility, even after the French Revolution. In the course of the chapter, Wilson links Goethe to the illegal restriction of peasant rights, the sale of peasants to Britain to fight the wars in America, and a vote that reinforced the death penalty for infanticide.

Lesley Sharpe's piece, "Goethe and the Weimar Theatre," rounds out the historical essays by examining Goethe's efforts to direct the Weimar theater within the larger context of the state of German theater as well as of Goethe's influence upon the German stage in the nineteenth century. Sharpe paints a vivid portrait of Goethe's difficulties in running the theater, which included Carl August's meddling (instigated by his mistress, who was an actress in the company).

The bulk of the remaining chapters deal with literary issues. Several chapters take up specific genres (poetry, prose, drama, autobiography), one examines Goethe's literary friendship with Schiller, and one addresses the controversial topic of Goethe and gender. Of these, the least accessible to a general reading audience is the chapter on poetry. Although the chapter provides an extensive overview of Goethe's poems and his development as a poet, its emphasis upon poetic structures (meter, forms, etc.) is a barrier for non-German readers. (This is the only chapter that does not

provide English translations for all of the quotations.) In addition, Williams does not always quote the lines that he is analyzing and one therefore would need to find the poems in another source in order fully to appreciate his analysis.

Faust receives an entire chapter for itself. Within her excellent and comprehensive treatment, Jane Brown emphasizes the revolutionary aspects of Goethe's magnum opus. It is revolutionary not only in that one needs to read it within the backdrop of the various upheavals (American and French Revolutions, industrialization, shifts in economic power, Romanticism, etc.) that occurred during its composition, but most importantly in its subversive content. Thus, although Goethe's "own politics were often conservative, *Faust* embodies the revolutionary ethos of its time so profoundly that it has been seen as celebrating phases of that development that had not even been conceived at the time it was written" (85). In the course of her interpretation, Brown analyzes the sources for *Faust* as well as its stages of composition.

The remaining chapters deal with the more non-literary aspects of Goethe's writing: his scientific and aesthetic studies and his relationship to religion and philosophy. All three authors (Daniel Steuer, Beate Allert, and H.B. Nisbet) demonstrate the importance of Goethe's scientific works upon his thought as a whole. Steuer provides a good overview of Goethe's science, and Allert's discussion of Goethe's science of perception sheds much light on his aesthetics. Nisbet remains the more traditional of the three: Nisbet treats Goethe as a poetic pantheist rather than as a philosopher or serious thinker, even in matters of aesthetics. Both Steuer's and Allert's chapters serve to challenge several of Nisbet's arguments.

In the introduction, Sharpe promises that the volume will "provide an overview of the subject and combine information with critical evaluation in a sophisticated and yet approachable manner" (4). The volume lives up to this promise. In addition to the essays, the volume also includes a bibliography for further reading for each of its chapters. This book is a good reference source, and I would recommend it as background reading for any course on Goethe.

University of Illinois at Chicago

—Astrida Orle Tantillo

Hegel: A Biography.

By Terry Pinkard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
xx + 780 pages. \$24.95.

Terry Pinkard's study of Hegel's life and work is a substantial achievement. J.N. Findlay's *Hegel: A Re-examination* (1958), Walter Kaufmann's *Hegel: A Re-interpretation* (1965), and Charles Taylor's ambitious *Hegel* (1975)—all strangely absent from Pinkard's bibliography—are the main comprehensive studies in English after World War II of Hegel's life and work. All of these books are still useful and, especially in the case of Taylor, even indispensable. However, they have been for some time in need of a serious update and, in light of the wealth of new insights in recent scholarship, of numerous corrections. Pinkard's biography is a sophisticated scholarly contribution that makes a convincing case for Hegel as an original and important philosopher, who has been neglected by much of contemporary Anglo-American philosophy at its own peril. Pinkard devotes much of his attention to the historical situation in Germany and Europe around 1800 and the consequences of modernization for Hegel and his gener-

ation. To buttress his claims, he relies on the most recent scholarship on Hegel and his time, including such areas as the complex history of the emergence of German Idealism and the distinct political histories of different German states and regions, most notably Württemberg and Prussia.

Pinkard's elaborate answer to the question "Who then was Hegel?" intertwines Hegel's life, his works, and the historical situation in Germany and Europe into a rich narrative. He demonstrates in great detail that the emergence of modernity, with its political and intellectual upheavals, was a necessary condition of Hegel's thought but never considers the historical context a sufficient condition of Hegelian philosophy. From the beginning, Pinkard insists, Hegel envisioned his philosophy not only as a way of dealing with the challenges of modernity but also as a momentous upheaval of thought, an advancement of modernity in its own right.

To write a comprehensive study that could do justice to Hegel's many facets would have to be, as Pinkard concedes, "a multivolume affair"—perhaps something along the lines of H. S. Harris's two volumes on *Hegel's Development*. Although Pinkard cannot match Harris's extensive attention to textual detail and philosophical argument, he nonetheless displays a scholarly erudition and critical acumen that at times outshine and subtly correct Harris's more meticulous account. Thus, to give but one example, Pinkard senses that Hegel's one poem of note, "Eleusis," was not only dedicated to Hölderlin, but also written "under [his] influence" (77). Harris, by contrast, is at pains to downplay the many external influences on Hegel's philosophy. Overall, Pinkard, like Hegel's first biographer, Karl Rosenkranz, aims at depicting the philosopher's legendary personal idiosyncrasies as of a piece with his thinking. But instead of subscribing to the romanticizing notion of "genius," Pinkard offers sociological and psychological models of explanation. Thus he describes how Hegel's "halting, obscure lecture style" (456), long an obstacle in his attempt to secure a university appointment, became a fashionable and imitated Hegelian trademark at the height of his fame in Berlin that was taken as a sign of particular profundity. But Pinkard also tells us that Hegel had developed a serious speech impediment already in childhood, possibly as a result of his mother's early death or the subsequent tensions with his father.

At once entertaining and scholarly, Pinkard's biography often reads like a gripping novel. It should prove accessible to students with no prior knowledge of Hegel's philosophy. If anything, Pinkard errs on the side of explicitness. His writing is marked by a certain repetitiveness that, on occasion, can grow tiresome. However, Pinkard's redundancy is useful when he recapitulates information from preceding chapters and thus allows for reading (and assigning) each chapter independently. Excellent summaries and philosophically astute assessments of Hegel's main works provide an invaluable service to the non-initiated without resorting to the over-generalizations found in most synoptic introductions. Pinkard avoids the danger of being clear at the cost of distorting Hegel's mode of thinking; at the same time, he is mindful of the need to translate Hegel for non-Hegelians. After all, if it was Hegel's hope to "teach philosophy to speak German," it should be every English-speaking exegete's goal to teach Hegel to speak English (and, as the dialectic would have it, vice versa).

Pinkard's interpretation of Hegel's thought in the self-contained philosophical chapters on the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, the *Logic*, and the *Philosophy of Right* displays a wealth of original insight and analytic power. Furthermore, the second-to-last chapter of the book provides a condensed survey of Hegel's views on nature, religion,

and art, as he presented them in lecture courses during his mature years at the University of Berlin. For the professional philosophers these chapters will be the highlights of Pinkard's biography.

But it would be a pity if they did not read the rest. The greatest achievement of this biography is how well it explains the connections between Hegel's life-world and his theories. The greatest obstacle that a contemporary reader must overcome before she can come to terms with Hegel consists of the numerous prejudices and legends that surround this enigmatic philosopher. Hegel's very originality, as Pinkard shows, led to many of the more widespread misconceptions and caricatures. It is deplorable that such canards as Hegel's alleged justification of the Prussian state and authoritarianism still enjoy wide currency, even in reputable histories of philosophy. Pinkard's account of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*, in tandem with Frederick Neuhouser's simultaneously published *Foundations of Hegel's Social Theory*, should lay to rest once and for all the caricature of Hegel as a proto-Fascist "master-thinker" and "enemy of the open society." Instead of parroting such erroneous accusations, the contemporary reader of Hegel, whether analytically or continentally inclined, would do well to examine Neuhouser's suggestion that Hegel offers a sophisticated political and social theory that avoids the contemporary stalemate between liberalism and communitarianism. As Neuhouser shows, Hegel's political philosophy is based on an integrative notion of "social freedom" whose philosophical value is independent of the fate of his metaphysics. In Pinkard's book, this reading receives biographical confirmation and historical grounding. Nonetheless, Pinkard acknowledges that Hegel may have contributed to some of the misunderstandings of his political philosophy by relentlessly attacking liberals with whom he happened to disagree. As a result, many critics have preferred to perpetuate the image of Hegel as a reactionary, although he explicitly rejected the emerging German nationalism and Anti-Semitism and had an outspoken reverence for the values of the French Revolution throughout his life.

Hegel has been used as a convenient stand-in for every imaginable Teutonic aberration and has received particularly shabby treatment in Anglophone philosophy. In spite of this, however, he has, "as if he were an unwanted guest, [. . .] refused to go away" (xii). The specter of Hegel continues to haunt modern philosophy and its practitioners. "[N]o matter how many new paths they take, they will find all of them to be dead ends, with Hegel waiting at the end of each of them, smiling" (xi), reads Pinkard's paraphrase of a French philosopher whom he slyly refuses to name, all the better to bring home the point that these remarkable words could have been uttered by Sartre or Foucault, Merleau-Ponty or Derrida.

Hegel's life, however, was, for the most part, no smiling matter. The complex texture of Derrida's *Glas* contains a strand that points insistently to the strange attraction between Hegel and his sister Christiane. Pinkard spells out the mundane details of their relationship as well as the tragic story of excessive sisterly love, madness, and suicide in the more conventional format of biography. Similarly, we learn of the sad life of Hegel's illegitimate son, Ludwig, all the way from birth to premature death, including Hegel's shocking failure in his role as a father. The reader would like to know more about the causes and consequences such failures and tragedies had in the life of the philosopher. But Pinkard abstains from extensive psychobiography—wisely, I think—and is content with presenting the documented facts. It is precisely in these instances that the question "Who then was Hegel?" gains an uncanny depth. The reader's

certainties are shaken, and the essential elusiveness of Hegel's—or of any life—becomes tangible. On such occasions, Pinkard's magnificent biography achieves an unusual emotional density through its very reticence.

Cornell University

—Peter Gilgen

“Der Zauber steckt immer im Detail.” Studien zu Theodor Fontane und seinem Werk 1976–2002.

Von Christian Grawe. Dunedin: University of Otago, 2002. 431 Seiten. NZ \$50.00.

Christian Grawe, emeritierter Professor an der Universität Melbourne, zählt zu den kenntnisreichsten und scharfsinnigsten Interpreten in der modernen Fontaneforschung. Umso begrüßenswerter ist es also, daß die meisten seiner Essays über Fontane und sein Œuvre aus den letzten dreißig Jahren jetzt gesammelt erscheinen. Grawes intensive Beschäftigung mit Fontane geht auf die Betreuung einer Examensarbeit über einige Romane Fontanes zurück: “Das veranlaßte mich, seine Werke genauer zu lesen, und es dauerte nicht lange, bis ich begriff, wie sehr Fontane die genaue Lektüre belohnt, wie sehr bei ihm ‘der Zauber [. . .] immer im Detail [steckt]’” (7). Die ersten Ergebnisse seiner Bemühungen um Fontane waren ein Aufsatz über den *Stechlin* (403–25) aus dem Jahr 1974 (nicht 1976!) und ein *Führer durch die Romane Theodor Fontanes. Ein Verzeichnis der darin auftauchenden Personen, Schauplätze und Kunstwerke* (Ullstein 1980, Reclam 1996), der analytische und interpretatorische Ansätze zu Grawes späteren Essays über einzelne Romane enthält.

Teil I besteht aus neun Essays über den mittleren und späten Fontane, über die *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg* und die *Kriegsbücher*, Fontanes Schiller- und Freie Bühne-Kritiken, Fontanes und Henry James' Italienerfahrungen, Preußen 1803–1813 in den vaterländischen Romanen von Willibald Alexis, George Hesekeil und Fontane, und schließlich Zweideutigkeiten in Fontanes Gesellschaftsromanen. Aus verschiedenen Gründen hatte die frühere Fontaneforschung von Wandrey (1919) bis Reuter (1968), mit Ausnahme besonders von Jolles (1936 u.ö.) und Nürnberger (*Der frühe Fontane: 1840–1860* [1967]), den frühen und mittleren (1860–1880) Fontane entweder negativ oder stiefmütterlich als den noch nicht “eigentlichen” Fontane (1880–1898) behandelt. Dagegen hat Grawe als einer der ersten den in seinen “mittleren” Jahren konservativen, “vaterländisch” orientierten Fontane wirklich ernst genommen und die *Wanderungen* (1861–81) und *Kriegsbücher* (1866–76) genau analysiert und als selbständige, kritisch-realistische Prosawerke gewürdigt. Wichtig sind auch die Essays über den “vaterländischen Roman” *Vor dem Sturm* (1878), über “Frivolität” in Fontanes Romanen (d.h. “die suggestive, gelegentlich sogar den schmutzigen Witz nicht scheuende Art, wie über Sexuelles gesprochen wird, die dem Fontaneschen Roman die Atmosphäre des Erotischen verleiht,” worin der Erzähler “weiter als der realistische Roman seiner Zeit” gehe [201]), sowie über Fontane als “unsicheren Passagier” (besonders Fontanes Antisemitismus; trotz seiner heftigen Kritik an Deutschland Verteidigung eines nationalen deutschen Standpunkts) im letzten Jahr seines Lebens (1898).

Teil II besteht aus zehn Essays über acht der insgesamt siebzehn Romane Fontanes: *Vor dem Sturm*, *Schach von Wuthenow*, *Cécile*, *Irrungen*, *Wirrungen*, *Quitt*, *Frau Jenny Treibel*, *Effi Briest* und *Der Stechlin*, sowie über den “autobiographischen

Roman" *Meine Kinderjahre*. Noch Ende der 1970er, Anfang der 80er Jahre hatte man behauptet, Fontane sei "kein verschlüsselter Schriftsteller, die Suche nach komplexen Symbolen" sei "bei ihm fehl am Platze" (Remak, 1979), oder an der angeblichen "Künstelei" von Fontanes "Finessen" (1887) Kritik geübt (Guthke, 1982). Dagegen hat Grawe immer wieder auf überzeugende Weise in seinen Einzelinterpretationen die Doppelbödigkeit und versteckte Symbolik (disguised symbolism [vgl. Schuster, 1978]) der nur scheinbar unkomplizierten oder oberflächlichen realistischen Romankunst Fontanes beleuchtet. "Entsprechend seinem [Fontanes] Motto 'Der Zauber steckt immer im Detail' [1893] sind diese Dimensionen [künstlerische Gestalt und kritischer Zeitkommentar] seiner Werke im Text verborgen und müssen durch sorgfältige Analyse erschlossen werden" (271), zu der Grawe den Leser auch ständig anregt: "Hier wie auch in so vielen anderen Motivbereichen [in *Cécile*] kann der Leser seine Kombinationsgabe spielen lassen, um weitere Bezüge zu entdecken. Er wird immer wieder die [. . .] Erfahrung machen, daß jeder Roman Fontanes ein außerordentlich dichtes Gewebe von Verweisen darstellt" (281).

Unter den hier nicht wieder veröffentlichten Fontane-Essays Grawes (vgl. Bibliographie, 428–31) sind auch folgende besonders zu empfehlen: "Es schlug gerade . . .": Zur Gestaltung eines Zeitelements [hörbare Zeit, besonders Uhren- und Glockenschlag] in Theodor Fontanes Romanen" (*Fontane Blätter* [1991]) und "Der Fontanesche Roman" (*Das Fontane-Handbuch* [2000], 466–84). Leider enthält vorliegender Band eine Reihe von Druckfehlern, z.B., Hinweis auf Brinkmann (1967) fehlt im *Vor dem Sturm*-Essay (255, Anm. 35), "Obadia" (wird aber abwechselnd mit dem richtigen Namen "Obadja" im *Quitt*-Essay [307, 312 usw.] benutzt), "Dubslaw" ([408 usw.] richtig ist Dubslav von Stechlin), "Berens" ([418, 425] richtig ist Erich Behrend [1929]), *Theodor Fontane. Romane und Novellen—Interpretationen* (Reclam) erschien 1991 (nicht 1990), der *Führer durch Fontanes Romane* (Reclam) erschien 1996 (nicht 1995) und das *Fontane-Handbuch* (Kröner) erschien 2000 (nicht 1999). Das sind aber nur Kleinigkeiten in dieser sonst wertvollen Essay-Sammlung des verdienstvollen Fontaneforschers Christian Grawe.

Southern Illinois University-Carbondale

—Frederick Betz

Karl Kraus und *Die Fackel*. Aufsätze zur Rezeptionsgeschichte / Reading Karl Kraus. Essays on the Reception of *Die Fackel*.

Herausgegeben von Gilbert J. Carr und Edward Timms. München: Iudicium, 2001. 246 Seiten. €25,00.

The first issue of Karl Kraus's inimitable journal *Die Fackel* appeared in 1899, dated "Anfang April." Its allusively formulated, but deadly serious statement of purpose—"kein tönendes 'Was wir bringen,' aber ein ehrliches 'Was wir umbringen'"—made it clear, however, that this was no April Fools' joke. For thirty-seven years in 23,000 pages Kraus went on to wage a satirical onslaught unparalleled in the literature of the twentieth century. He countered the brutalities and stupidities of the age with a radical critique of their distorted reflection in the daily press. As Walter Benjamin would later write, in the *Fackel* "there is a piece of flayed flesh hanging off every comma."

In 1999, exhibitions mounted by the Jewish Museum in Vienna and the Deutsches Literaturarchiv in Marbach commemorated the centenary of the *Fackel*.

The former faced the issue of Kraus's alleged Jewish self-hatred head on, drawing on a newly acquired *Teilnachlaß* with many unknown manuscripts and photographs. The latter trumped with a spectacular display of Kraus's interactions with the visual arts. The only scholarly gathering of substance during the anniversary year was the symposium in London on which this volume is based. The editors, who were also the organizers, have added and subtracted from the sum of papers presented there and arrived at a useful collection of quite disparate contributions loosely grouped around the idea of "reception."

A select group of these essays, written by five of the foremost authorities on the satirist, coalesces into something approaching a coherent investigation of the aesthetics and history of Kraus reception. António Ribeiro provides a theoretical foundation with his brilliant disquisition on the term "Nachwelt," a keyword in the *Fackel*, where it appears some two hundred times. As Ribeiro shows, Kraus's subtle formulation of this concept led to a rhetorical strategy that both guided his unruly contemporary readership and constructed the once and future implied reader.

In the first of four complementary historicist case studies, Kurt Krolop discusses the lively writing about Kraus in Czech during the period between the World Wars. Prague, where the first translation ever of *Die letzten Tage der Menschheit* appeared in 1933, reveals itself as an arguably more important locus than Berlin for a critical understanding of what Kraus's great contemporary Karel Capek called the satirist's "Moralphilologie." Sigurd Scheichl searches for ideological prejudice in Austrian literary histories of the postwar era and finds instead an innocuous historiographical reluctance to deal with a satirical writer whose work resists conventional generic categories. French receptiveness to Kraus's work during his own lifetime was, as Gerald Stieg shows, so strong that Nobel Prize nominations of the satirist, supported incidentally by Sartre's grandfather Charles Schweitzer, regularly came out of Paris in the 1920s. Gallic *Germanistik* of the postwar period, led by Claude David and, later, Jacques Le Rider, has tended, however, to see Kraus more negatively as a mere polemicist and Jewish anti-Semite. Recently, the Wittgenstein expert Jacques Bouveresse has demonstrated a philosophical interest in Kraus's critique of the media, which in turn was taken up briefly but effectively by the late sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Helmut Arntzen hands out mostly mediocre report cards to major biographically oriented studies of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s including Edward Timms's well-known monograph. More important, however, than the muted objections to Timms and long-overdue critical remarks directed at Werner Kraft's two overrated books on Kraus is Arntzen's insistence on the unacknowledged, underappreciated, or suppressed reception of the satirist. He makes special mention of Adorno and Siegfried Kracauer.

The most original contribution to the volume takes a reception anomaly of this kind as its jumping-off point. Paul Reitter asks how such critical authorities as Benjamin, Scholem, and Horkheimer, who would not have been blind to the pointed use of anti-Jewish rhetoric of *Die Fackel*, could nevertheless praise its editor and author as a "great Jew." He finds a preliminary answer in Kraus's sustained transformation of the pernicious cliché of the Jewish writer as journalist and purveyor of flawed mimesis into satirical texts of great discursive and poetic complexity. Other essays of interest in the volume include those by the editors themselves (Gilbert Carr on Kraus's mythologization of the "old" Burgtheater and Edward Timms on the Judeo-Christian "religious vision" of the satirist), two studies that compare the implicit methodology

of Kraus's language critique with current linguistic and literary theory (Jay Bodine and Bill Dodd), and Andrew Barker's revealing comparison between Kraus's reaction to the February uprising of 1934 and the Communist response dramatized in Friedrich Wolf's *Floridsdorf. Ein Schauspiel von den Februarkämpfen der Wiener Arbeiter* (1935).

Perhaps the most important of the topics this volume addresses only marginally if at all is the central motif of performativity in Kraus's work. Although Peter Hawig delivers a fine essay on various aspects of Kraus's unique one-man presentations of Offenbach's operettas, the larger implications of the satirist's public readings and indeed of the performative nature of his writing in general received little attention. Here a single object, shown for the first time in the Vienna and Marbach exhibitions, might have pointed the way. In 1917, a young Fritz Lang, who had not yet broken into the movies, drew a portrait of Kraus, which was reproduced and sold as a postcard. Sketched in a spare paraphrase of Schiele's style, the image captures Kraus the literary performer, his figure artfully reduced to the head and a pair of expressively gesticulating hands. The only other portrait drawing of Lang's surviving from this period shows the future director in an almost identical pose. This striking act of identification suggests that the labyrinthine path of Kraus's impact also wends its way through the Expressionist cinema.

Wesleyan University

—Leo A. Lensing

Theater under the Nazis.

Edited by John London. Oxford, UK: Manchester University Press, 2000.
xiii + 356 pages. \$74.95 hardcover/\$35.00 paperback.

Der vorliegende Band hat sich als Ziel gesetzt, Irrtümer und Fehltritte in der Forschung über das Theater in der NS-Zeit aus dem Weg zu räumen: Weder die Auffassung, das gesamte Nazitheater sei zu verdammen, noch die Auffassung, das Theaterleben sei von der Nazi-Ideologie weitgehend unberührt geblieben, erlauben ein differenziertes Bild dieser Zeit. Versucht wird, dem unter den Nazis entstandenen Drama aus historischer und theaterpraktischer Perspektive analytisch zu begegnen.

In der Perspektivenvielfalt des Sammelbandes liegt zugleich seine Stärke und Schwäche. Mit seinen gut recherchierten Essays, einer ausführlichen Bibliographie und zahlreichen Daten bietet dieser Band vielerlei Neues, stellt Bekanntes unter einem neuen Aspekt dar, und kann trotz allem nicht ganz seinen Versprechungen gerecht werden. Unterschiedliche Themen werden angeschnitten, ergänzen sich, zusammenfassende Schlußfolgerungen bleiben größtenteils aus. Die am Ende des Bandes zusammengestellte Auswahlbibliographie nimmt nur zum Teil die in den Anmerkungen zitierten Titel auf, gibt eine umfassende Bibliographie von *Thingspielen*, doch keinerlei weitere Daten über andere im Dritten Reich entstandene Dramen. Die lange Liste von Zeitungen und Zeitschriften ("Newspapers and magazines") sowie Theaterzeitschriften und Publikationen des Dritten Reiches ("Theater periodicals, internal government newsletters, annual publications and other relevant periodicals of The Third Reich") ist imponierend, umfaßt jedoch nur die Titel ohne jegliche weitere Angaben.

In dem ausgezeichneten Einleitungssatz bietet der Herausgeber John London einen Überblick über das Theater in der NS-Zeit: von seinen Anfängen vor der Macht-

übernahme 1933 bis zur Wiedereröffnung der Theater nach 1945. Gemeinsam mit den konservativen Kräften der Weimarer Republik machten die Nationalsozialisten sich daran, das Theater von seinem jüdischen Einfluß zu befreien und eine systematische Reorganisation des Theaterbetriebs durchzuführen. Anhand spezifischer Beispiele weist London nach, wie sich persönliche Interessen mit ideologischen vereinten und Veränderungen im Theaterbetrieb herbeiführten. Bestehende Tendenzen wurden ideologisch umgepolt und extremisiert, ohne wesentliche Erneuerungen innerhalb des Theaterbetriebs zu schaffen. So fanden Volksbühne und *Thingspiel* ihre Vorläufer in den Masseninszenierungen von Max Reinhardt und Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Ein großes Hindernis bei der Auswertung bestehenden Materials ist, daß ab November 1936 jegliche Theaterkritik zum Schweigen gebracht wurde, um nur noch nach vorbestimmten Richtlinien — wie national-politischen Werten — zu urteilen. Die zeitgenössische Dramenproduktion betreffend muß man allerdings beachten, daß sie nur einen geringen Teil des Theaterrepertoires ausmachte, wobei das Unterhaltungstheater 50 Prozent des Spielplans füllte. Zu Recht widmet London einen Teil seiner Einführung der Klassikerrezeption, der kein weiterer Essay gewidmet ist. Verstärkte Aufmerksamkeit wird im folgenden dem Theater während der Kriegszeit und dem jüdischen Kulturbund geschenkt.

William Niven bietet in seinem Beitrag "The birth of Nazi drama? *Thing Plays*" einen Überblick des *Thingspiels* zwischen 1933 und 1936 als eine neue einmalige Form des Dramas. Mit den theoretischen Ausführungen über das *Thingspiel* und seine völkisch grandiosen Inhalte stellt Niven den Versuch dar, das Theater in seinen Festen zu reformieren und eine nationale Revolution herbeizuführen, um die ideologischen Grundfesten des Dritten Reiches zu stärken. Inhaltliche Schwächen und enorme Produktionskosten einerseits und diverse Manifestationsformen des Heroismus und Deutschtums wie die Nürnberger Aufmärsche andererseits führen schließlich zur Ersetzung des *Thingspiels*.

Als zweite mit dem Dritten Reich assoziierte Dramenform steht das Geschichtsdrama. In seinem Aufsatz geht Glen Gadberry weniger auf die Aufführungspraxis historischer Dramen ein als auf ihre Produktion unter den Anweisungen von Reichsdramaturg Rainer Schlösser, der dem Genre somit einen offiziellen Status verlieh. Ausführliche Statistiken, ein Appendix der erfolgreichsten deutschen Geschichtsdramen mit ihren Aufführungsdaten und -orten sowie kurze Modellinterpretationen erlauben den Schlußfolgerungen des Autors zu folgen: Dargestellt wurden 2000 Jahre germanische Geschichte auf heroische und dementsprechend einseitige Weise. Wenig bedeutende, heute der Vergessenheit anheim gefallene Dramen erlebten bemerkenswert erfolgreiche Aufführungen.

Der Anhang einer Liste von Opernerstaufführungen zwischen 1933 und 1944 ergänzt das ausgewertete Material von Erik Levis Essay über Oper im Dritten Reich (inkl. Österreich, Böhmen und Mähren). Levi zeigt auf, daß während der Zeit nicht eine bemerkenswerte Oper komponiert wurde und sich bei den Opernaufführungen wiederholt die Widersprüche innerhalb der nationalsozialistischen Ideologie manifestieren. Einerseits geht Levi auf die Kontinuität der Opernentwicklung im 20. Jahrhundert ein, andererseits unterstreicht er die Einzigartigkeit einiger Aspekte der Opernpolitik. Das Repertoire unterlag zusehends gewissen Kontrollen, und nicht zuletzt spiegeln die verschiedenen Spielpläne die persönlichen Querelen zwischen den Naziführern, besonders in bezug auf die Aufführungen von Opern mit jüdischen Li-

brettisten oder jüdischen Komponisten. Im Gegensatz zu vorherrschenden Meinungen innerhalb der Sekundärliteratur läßt Levis Analyse die Schlußfolgerung zu, daß die Gesamtentwicklung der Oper und des Opernrepertoires keineswegs einen Einschnitt bildet, sondern im großen und ganzen der gesamteuropäischen Entwicklung folgt.

Der komplexen Stellung des jüdischen Kulturbunds und seines Theaters unter dem Nationalsozialismus widmet sich Rebecca Rovit. Sie geht der Frage nach, wie der Kulturbund mit den Zensurbehörden umging, auf welche Weise dies sein Programm beeinflusste, und wie kulturelle und nationale Identität innerhalb des Kulturbunds diskutiert und definiert wurde. Anhand der exemplarischen Analyse des Kulturbunds in Berlin vertritt Rovit die These, daß jüdische Schauspieler und Musiker ihr Repertoire innerhalb des Dritten Reiches nicht wesentlich veränderten, sondern die erworbene Tradition fortsetzten, wobei gerade die Frage einer jüdischen Identität zu Seite geschoben, wenn nicht gar verneint wurde. Die Schwierigkeiten, dem Kulturbund historisch gerecht zu werden, zeigen die unterschiedlichen und zum Teil widersprüchlichen Zeugenaussagen von überlebenden Schauspielern und Mitgliedern des Kulturbunds auf.

Mit den Aufführungen von ausländischen Dramatikern auf deutschen Bühnen beschäftigt sich John Londons Beitrag "Non-German Drama in the Third Reich." Neben dem italienischen, spanischen und skandinavischen Theater widmet London George Bernhard Shaw besonderes Augenmerk. Der Hauptteil ist Shakespeare, dem nach Schiller meistaufgeführten Autor im Dritten Reich, gewidmet.

Der letzte Beitrag, von William Abbey und Katharina Havekamp, führt in die Nachbarländer. Anhand des Beispiels des deutschen Theaters in Lille, Frankreich, wird dem Versuch der Nazis nachgegangen, auch im Ausland über das Medium Theater nationalsozialistisches Gedankengut zu verbreiten. Daß dies fehlschlug, zeigt sich nur zu genau; das Publikum bestand im großen und ganzen aus Besatzungssoldaten, die es als gewünschte Abwechslung begrüßten.

Der Band macht deutlich, daß die Widersprüche, die Drama und Theater im Dritten Reich beeinflussten, aufzuzeigen aber nicht aufzulösen sind: Das Theater in der NS-Zeit ist von persönlichen Interessen, internem Wettbewerb und keineswegs von einer einheitlichen Politik gezeichnet. Daß oft menschlich individuelle Vorgangsweisen über jede Art von Theorie dominierten und man sich in der Alltagspraxis über Verordnungen und Gesetze durchaus auch hinwegsetzte, wird nur zu deutlich. Die Fülle an vorgestelltem Material und die dargebotenen Schlußfolgerungen fordern zu weiteren Auseinandersetzungen und Stellungnahmen heraus.

Universitat de València

—Brigitte E. Jirku

Deformierte Lebensbilder. Erzählmodelle der Nachkriegsautobiographie (1945–1960).

Von Hans-Edwin Friedrich. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2000. vi + 456 Seiten. €64,00.

Hans-Edwin Friedrich's *Deformierte Lebensbilder*, which appears as the seventy-fourth volume of the series "Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur," seems to be a tall order. It asks the community of critics of German literature—the exclusive audience at whom it is leveled—to take up the body of autobiographical nov-

els from the postwar era toward a recognition of the generative nature of its form. Critics are asked to recognize here a new order of experimentalism in narrative strategy, spawned by a crisis of identity and individualism, a crisis itself precipitated not, as is commonly held, by the advent of Modernism, but rather by the fall of the Third Reich. This study is, then, an attempt to draw attention to the most intimate narratives of the self, the arena of reporting and story-telling critics have avoided, for the very reasons its authors were motivated to write. Friedrich postulates that the authorial impetus to consider experience and construe meaning that gave rise to an array of novel forms contained, in many cases, a radical self-reflexive critique.

Friedrich begins with the observation that there was an outpouring of autobiographical writing of many types and by people in many walks of life from 1945 to 1960. The study presents extensive documentation on the variety of textual forms and venues for publication, noting the tendency to categorize this writing as either history or fiction, thereby dismissing the totality of autobiography as a specific genre of writing, as well as the tendency to term this literature, across the board, apologetic ("Rechtfertigungsliteratur"); for these reasons, Friedrich notes, this literature has remained to date relatively unknown.

After a richly annotated review of critical debate on the factual/fictive nature of autobiography in its German-language locus (Chapter 2), which concludes with a deft ontological synthesis, the reader comes to the heart of the business of this study: the attempt to focus critical attention on postwar autobiography through structural analyses (Chapter 3). Friedrich narrows the scope of his study to works written by self-proclaimed professional writers who did not emigrate. The writers whose works are treated are (in this order): Hans Friedrich Blunck, Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer, Ernst Wiechert, Reinhold Schneider, Arnolt Bronnen, Gottfried Benn, Otto Flake, Gustav Hillard, Friedrich Georg Jünger, Hans Grimm, Hans Carossa, and Ernst von Salomon. The order of presentation of structural analyses of these authors' works follows upon a trajectory of the "semantics" of presentation of the self, which spans identity to individuality, both of which, following Friedrich, arise from a spontaneous parabiological autopoeisis, also referred to in *Deformierte Lebensbilder* as "vitalisierend," (or "vitalizing," a term that suggests "vitalistic," from Vitalism, the age-old philosophy that attributes a mystic life force to matter and here, presumably, to a text about a lived life and a body of these texts).

The two primary subdivisions of this central chapter (which are subsequently further divided three times, e.g., through to section 3.2.2.3) are the "inkludierte Individualität," or narrative voice that identifies with the [National Socialist] group, and the "Ich als autonome Form," or the narrative voice that disidentifies. The gamut runs from Blunck, whose narrated self is vested "in Volk und Landschaft," to Solomon, whose narrated self is decimated, "am Nullpunkt." The bibliography of primary literature (407–446) demonstrates the selection of authors and their works is highly representative.

The structural analyses are carefully carried out to show how authors have taken license with conventions of representing time and place. Of particular merit is the section on Salomon's generative narration that scrambles and conflates chronological time toward the higher purpose of structuring self in crisis (with a contrastive chart of narrated and actual time). Salomon's autobiographical writing is both the apogee of structural innovation and the expression of the most evolved individuation process.

The reader—this reader—is comforted to discover that Friedrich’s alignment of the authors’ degree of formal experimentalism with a characterological dissuasion to identify with the other or group has eased the task of reviewing postwar autobiography. The net effect of considering Friedrich’s argument is the recognition that formal innovation, the criterion for recognizing this literature, was the contribution of those authors who were constitutionally or *a priori* at odds with the totalizing sense of self and the totalitarian agenda. It further seems that the deformation of these images of the self in letters—a deformation inflicted by negative reception—bears most critically on the writers Carossa and Salomon, writers whose works critics are generally more apt to take under kind consideration.

University of Texas at Austin

—Stephanie Ortega

Thomas Bernhard: The Making of an Austrian.

By Gitta Honegger. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001. 352 pages. \$29.95.

February 12, 2004 marked the fifteenth anniversary of the death of the author Thomas Bernhard, who already during his lifetime had become an imposing figure in Austrian culture. Honegger’s monograph is a welcome addition to studies that assess the overall importance of Bernhard’s life and work, not only to German-language theater and literature but also to the Austrian nation with which he was usually at odds. The strength of this text stems in part from the unique position that Honegger occupies. She is an Austrian expatriate and dramaturg who has established herself as an American academic and translator of Bernhard’s works. She is at home both in Austrian theater circles and in the Anglo-American culture for which she writes. While rendering Bernhard’s contexts accessible to the uninitiated, her writing has a creative flair that makes for compelling reading. The style is at times gossipy, at others dramatic or complex, but always lucid and appropriate to the topic at hand, whether it be the silence surrounding Bernhard’s sexuality and personal relationships (78–79), the dark associations evoked by Upper Austrian place names (83), or Bernhard’s prose as a narrative correlative to the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein (150–51).

Honegger explores nearly all of Bernhard’s oeuvre in detail. The study’s thirteen chapters are organized thematically rather than chronologically. They bring together explications of literary works of various periods, copious biographical information, intellectual history, and accounts of relevant political and cultural developments in Austria and West Germany during Bernhard’s lifetime. Each of these topics illuminates the others, demonstrating how Bernhard’s life as an Austrian influenced his writing, and vice versa. In addition, five in-depth excursions (on the concept *Heimat*, Bernhard’s friend Karl Ignaz Hennetmair, the history of the castle at Ambras, Paul Wittgenstein, and the *Burgtheater*) illustrate the extent to which Bernhard’s chosen settings and themes relate to real people and institutions.

Honegger refers to Bernhard’s *Frost* (1963) as a “bildungsroman in performativity” (227). One might assert something similar about Honegger’s monograph. It represents the coming of age of the author Bernhard through complex interaction with his social environment. However, as Honegger asserts, the identity that emerges through this process, like that of all of Bernhard’s literary protagonists, is malleable. It is ultimately constructed and performed; it is always open to appropriation and reinterpretation.

tation. Since his death, the erstwhile maverick Bernhard has become a “national treasure” (304) and “trademark” in a nation that “keeps producing him” (308).

Honegger’s Bernhard is an author concerned above all with the theatrical and performative aspects of language. She identifies the influence of Bernhard’s theatrical training in both his prose and his dramas. The prose narratives appear here as solipsistic monologues on the stage of the mind. This approach to language, Honegger argues, is appropriate in a postwar Austrian society most interested in basking in cultural achievements that predate the Nazi era. These, it is hoped, will cast the Third Reich as a historical “aberration” and “bridge the rupture” that it caused (155, 156). However, the result is “cultural consciousness as a mausoleum” (156). Awareness of the implications of language as a problematic means to reconstitute what came before permeates Bernhard’s works. Furthermore, Honegger reads Bernhard’s emerging public persona as a sort of performance. This is most apparent in the scandals surrounding the 1988 premiere of *Heldenplatz* and the author’s last will, but also in his self-enacted transformation from the poor son of a provincial Austrian family to the heir to an Austrian cultural legacy linked to nobility and prestige.

Honegger has succeeded in integrating a wide range of material and presenting her ideas coherently. The text evinces an impressive amount of research, including interviews with Bernhard’s siblings, friends and collaborators, with the author Elfriede Jelinek, and, in 1981, with Bernhard himself. The presentation of Bernhard’s family background is thorough. Honegger addresses other secondary work on Bernhard effectively and discusses published reviews of the theatrical productions at length. She vividly portrays the theater practitioners who staged Bernhard’s dramas and, in some cases, after whom Bernhard modeled his characters. Moreover, well-articulated explanations of political and social developments guide the reader toward an understanding of Bernhard’s relationship with Austria.

Readers interested primarily in isolated, close readings of individual works should look elsewhere, such as the 2001 monograph by J.J. Long. In Honegger’s study, general readers will encounter a well-contextualized introduction to Bernhard and, more broadly, to Austrian cultural politics during the second half of the twentieth century. Scholars of theater or literature who are familiar with secondary work on Bernhard will find a wealth of interesting and original detail here.

Valparaiso University

—*Timothy B. Malchow*

The German Cinema Book.

Edited by Tim Bergfelder, Erica Carter and Deniz Göktürk. London & Berkeley: British Film Institute/University of California Press, 2003. xi + 291 pages. \$24.95.

Both students and scholars will certainly welcome the publication of *The German Cinema Book*, edited by and including contributions from Tim Bergfelder, Erica Carter, and Deniz Göktürk. This extensive collection brings together twenty-three original essays, largely written by German and British scholars, and surveys the history of German cinema from the early twentieth century until today.

This collection does not, however, intend to survey “German-film-history-as-usual.” Indeed, the editors take specific aim at what they call “classical histories” of German cinema, with their isolated attention to three controversial, and seemingly iso-

lated, film historical periods: Weimar cinema of the 1920s, Nazi cinema of the 1930s and 1940s, and the New German cinema of the 1970s. Although the editors acknowledge much important work published to date, they nevertheless criticize the tendency to privilege historical periods which are over-determined in their political and national symbolism. More egregiously, they are critical of classical histories that neglect “those periods (e.g. Early Cinema, the 1950s) and cultural manifestations (popular genres, stars, audience diversity) which threaten to expose the perceived homogeneity of German national cinema (and the nation itself) as a fiction” (4).

In an effort to break with the past, the editors therefore introduce new thematic and historical categories in the study of German film history: popular cinema with nationally specific genres, a broader history of cultural identities in a rapidly emerging modernity and, finally and perhaps most promising, an international and internationalizing film and cultural context, attentive to transnational migrations and image flows. Most importantly, these new themes and categories allow for new subjects and subjectivities to emerge as topics for historical analysis (such as early film audiences, queer traditions in German cinema, legacies of Jewish Diaspora and exile as well as a re-emergence of a more multicultural German identity in recent years). And yet they also return us to familiar debates and troubling blind spots, particularly regarding the relationships among aesthetics, politics, and popular culture and the critical paradigms through which these relationships are best understood.

For instance, the editors explain that problematic conceptions of German cinema as a “national” and/or an “art” cinema complement “commonly held ideas and stereotypes of German identity and culture which remain in circulation both abroad and in Germany itself” (2). In an effort to get beyond these conceptions, the editors propose a “new film history” with distinct theories and methods, and dismiss older traditions of “austere intellectualism and romantic melancholy” (2)—which they attribute equally to Germanist, art historical, and Frankfurt School traditions. Not surprisingly, the new theories and methods highlighted here, which include archival study, empirical research, and a focus on audience reception, hardly seem novel. More troubling still, however, is the view of older theories, such as the Frankfurt School (and its apparent view of the audience as passive victim of mass manipulation), psychological studies of the nation, and psychoanalytic film theory.

To be sure, the conceptual framework of the “new film history” outlined here mirrors wider assumptions in film studies as a discipline today: the rejection of psychoanalysis and of so-called “seventies film theory,” the disinterest in modernist aesthetics in favor of popular culture and traditions, the disdain for critical theory, especially that espoused by Horkheimer and Adorno (which is often, and unfortunately, oversimplified as mere elitist attack on “the people” and on “popular” culture). As the editors themselves note, even Adorno—well known for his disdain for popular culture and view of the culture industry as expression of capitalist ideology—emphasized that “mass culture and high art” were “two halves of a whole that do not add up.” In other words, even the critical theory held most responsible for maintaining “austere intellectualism and romantic melancholy” in studies of German cinema and culture recognized a more complex historical terrain of ruptures and continuities, convergences and disjunctures in the history of the German (and not only the German) nation.

To be fair, the editors ultimately acknowledge as much, although they attribute all that is good about critical theory to Kracauer and Benjamin (rather than a discred-

ited Horkheimer or Adorno). Following their lead, the editors have put together a comprehensive, engaging, and intellectually diverse collection of essays. Perhaps most promising of all is the editors' reassessment of Weimar cinema as an international film culture that embraced filmmakers and performers as well as intellectuals who understood film's status as "the early twentieth century's foremost popular art" (9). With reference to the theoretical writings of Kracauer and Benjamin as well as Arnheim and Balázs, the editors trace the emergence of a "modern cinema whose production modes, film styles, and popular appeal derived as much from German film's relation to international as to national film-cultural, political and economic developments" (8). This, as they note, has a profound impact on our understanding of German cinema's international and transnational identity in the past as well as today and has recently enabled a rethinking of postwar German "national" cinema in terms of developments shared across the FRG and the GDR.

For this and many other reasons, *The German Cinema Book* does indeed break new ground in our understanding of the place of German cinema within a wider film history. And although the desire to showcase archival research and empirical study in this volume are welcome in opening up new avenues for analysis and new subjects for critique, most impressive—and most important—of all is the recognition and conceptualization of German cinema history within an emergent history of internationalization and globalization that extends as much beyond conventional historical periodizations as beyond any single aesthetic form.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

—Patrice Petro

Aftershocks of the New: Feminism and Film History.

By Patrice Petro. *New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2002. xiv + 215 pages. \$22.00.*

Beginning with her 1986 essay "Mass Culture and the Feminine: The 'Place' of Television in Film Studies," Patrice Petro's groundbreaking work has been characterized by a critical focus on the unarticulated preoccupations, hidden biases, and veiled narratives that shape our fields of study. By subjecting these unspoken premises to a historicizing critique and exposing their gendered dynamics, Petro has produced some of the most insightful and influential writing in film studies, feminist studies, and German studies in the past two decades.

Like her important book *Joyless Streets: Women and Melodramatic Representation in Weimar Germany* (Princeton UP, 1989), Petro's essays productively deploy the insights of these three disciplines in tension with one another. The essays collected in *Aftershocks of the New: Feminism and Film History* consistently address German themes, texts, and theories, bringing German studies work to bear on film studies and vice versa. These essays also offer a strong argument for the continued relevance of feminist theory to both disciplines. *Aftershocks of the New* contains nine essays written between 1986 and 2001, two of which are published here for the first time. Loosely organized into three thematic clusters, the volume provides an excellent overview of Petro's work, much of which was originally published in film studies journals, for a German studies audience.

The three classic essays in the book's first section offer a metacritical perspec-

tive on the state of film studies in the late twentieth century, arguing for the necessity of transnational, historical, and feminist approaches to the field. In “The ‘Place’ of Television in Film Studies” (as the 1986 essay has been retitled here), Petro compares early German film theory with contemporary Anglo-American debates about television in order to unmask the pervasive historical tendency to “employ gender-specific oppositions in order to evaluate the differences between art and mass culture” (15). Rather than resorting to such conventional tropes, Petro suggests that film studies would benefit from attention to the historicized (and gendered) dimensions of mass cultural reception practices, a central argument of *Joyless Streets* and one to which these essays return consistently. In “Feminism and Film History” (1991), Petro offers a brief history of feminist approaches to film, while underscoring the central importance of historical scholarship for feminist film studies and cautioning against the tendency to separate film theory—in particular feminist work—from film history. “German Film Theory and Anglo-American Film Studies” (1991) locates Siegfried Kracauer’s work in historical perspective in order to explain as well as provide an antidote to the problematic reception of German film theory in Anglo-American film studies, where French theory has traditionally predominated.

In Petro’s own words, the book’s second section makes up a “boredom trilogy,” which is concerned “with theorizing another side to modernity—precisely after the shock of the new—when the new ceases to be shocking, and when the extraordinary, the unusual, and the sensational become inextricably linked to the boring, the prosaic, and the everyday” (7). Petro theorizes boredom as an essential dimension of women’s experience of modernity; for women in the 1920s, and female artists in particular, sexuality and gender difference—far from producing a reaction of shock or sensationalism—often generated a feeling of ennui at how little things actually changed. Thus, for Petro, boredom is a useful trope for understanding conceptions of time and history as well as the status of feminism itself, which, she argues, has consistently displayed a tendency to exhaust and regenerate itself. The chapters in this section engage with modern and especially postmodern theories of time and history, and provide close readings of the photography of Brassai and Steven Meisel, the writing of Djuna Barnes, Weimar expressionist painting and cinema, and the photomontages of Hannah Höch.

The final section of the book focuses more explicitly on feminism and film history, with a particular look at the role of the national and transnational in understanding film theory and practice. A chapter on Nazi cinema examines the notion of the “classical narrative” in film studies, arguing that “Nazi cinema might be perhaps the most classically coded cinema of all time” (134–135), a status typically accorded Hollywood. In a similar revision of conventional conceptions of cinematic influence, an essay on Josef von Sternberg’s *Blonde Venus* maps the transatlantic transit of discourses of race in the 1920s, examining the “New Woman” of Weimar not only as a gendered ideal, but also as a racialized one, and rereading the persona of Marlene Dietrich as an imitation of Josephine Baker.

Appropriately, *Aftershocks of the New* concludes with an essay on nostalgia. This piece addresses the recent nostalgia for feminism and seventies film theory, but it is also a meditation on the current state of things in academe: the changing status of theory in our disciplines, the role of political engagement in scholarship, and the (perceived) waning influence of feminism in general. Taking stock of these

trends, Petro reads the wave of nostalgia for the past on the part of certain scholars as the longing for “*a community of the question*: a community dedicated to a shared sense of what matters, of what questions need to be asked, of what issues need to be thought, of what battles remain to be fought” (172). In an increasingly fragmented and compartmentalized academic world, Petro’s exemplary critical, feminist, interdisciplinary work invokes the best of the past and provides a model for the future of just such a community.

University of Oklahoma

—Hester Baer

Literature and Film in the Third Reich.

By Karl-Heinz Schoeps. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003. 371 pages. \$75.00.

Nazi Cinema as Enchantment: The Politics of Entertainment in the Third Reich.

By Mary-Elizabeth O’Brien. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003. 294 pages. \$75.00.

Karl-Heinz Schoeps’s *Literature and Film in the Third Reich* is the translation of his tried and tested *Literatur im Dritten Reich (1933–1945)*, which was published originally in 1992 as part of the “Germanistische Lehrbuchsammlung” (Peter Lang) and then—after the series migrated to Weidler Verlag—in an updated and expanded version in 2000. Kathleen M. Dell’Orto’s competent translation of this second edition includes English renderings of all German titles, dual-language texts of all verse excerpts, and brief explanations of German institutions and organizations. In addition, Schoeps has updated the bibliography (including English translations of any relevant texts quoted) and expanded the chapter on “Film in the Third Reich” for this edition.

The volume presents for the first time access in English to a body of material that remains *terra incognita* for many students and teachers: National Socialist-oriented and Nazi party literature published during the Third Reich. Despite the title the primary focus is on literature, with a single, short chapter summarizing recent, especially North American contributions to the cinema in the Third Reich. Following a brief, five-page historical introduction that describes the major steps in the coming to power of the NSDAP, the second chapter on “The Ideological Context” outlines Schoeps’s methodological approach that seeks reflections of Nazi ideology in literary texts, i.e., evidence of “*völkisch* national Germanness, hero worship, and the leader principle” (15). While ideology and literature are not equated but rather seen as mutually dependent aspects of cultural life, the representative literary examples are chosen because they reflect specifically the elements of ideology that Schoeps defines as central for the Nazi project. The third chapter, which was greatly expanded for the second German edition in order to integrate more recent scholarship by Uwe-K. Ketelsen and Jan Pieter Barbian, outlines the institutional factors that governed literary production, censorship, and reception in the Third Reich. The following chapters present in sequence the National Socialist novel, drama, poetry, and cinema, each organized around the analysis of a series of textual examples that treat themes such as war and battle, blood and soil, race and community. Schoeps explicitly distances himself from aesthetic or literary historical judgments, instead striving to detail a body of literature de-

financed as that which enjoyed official sponsorship in the Third Reich. An additional, lengthy chapter discusses pertinent examples of non-National Socialist and anti-National Socialist literature published in the Third Reich. The volume concludes with bio-bibliographical sketches of 60 authors (but no film makers) mentioned in the main text, an extensive research bibliography organized according to the chapter headings, and a comprehensive index.

Schoeps's scholarship, which is carefully documented, reflects for the most part the state of the discussion in the 1980s with a few nods to more contested positions that developed over the past 15 years (e.g., the status of Ernst Jünger's modernism or Günter Eich's complicity). While he points out controversial issues, he does not pursue them here. For teachers the volume provides a solid initial survey of the material; for students individual chapters or excerpts may prove to be a useful supplement for a course or a course component on the Third Reich.

Mary-Elizabeth O'Brien's monograph on *Nazi Cinema as Enchantment* extends recent revisionist approaches that question the dominant view of a strict division between ideologically oriented propaganda and harmless entertainment films produced during the Third Reich. (Disclaimer: I evaluated this manuscript for the publisher and gave it an enthusiastic endorsement at the time.) In five well-balanced chapters she examines as many popular cinematic genres in order to demonstrate how entertaining movies articulated positive social fantasies in such a seductive way that the status quo of National Socialism seemed acceptable, if not even desirable to the viewing audience. The research draws on a broad corpus of films held at the Bundesfilmarchiv, and the arguments are grounded in extensive readings in the social history of the Third Reich as well as in background material about production issues and stars gleaned from contemporaneous movie industry journals and popular press accounts (all amply documented in the endnote and bibliographical apparatus). Genre cinema, i.e., movies that are structured by and play with familiar plots, characters, and conflicts, not only combines ideology and social values but also serves as a vehicle to negotiate contradictions within a specific society's constraints. O'Brien argues that this kind of popular culture in the Third Reich functions within a complex discursivity of seduction by appealing to the public's hunger for intense emotions, domestic security, and moral certitude in a society characterized by oppressive and invasive state institutions, rapid social change, and increasingly by military aggression and destruction.

Each chapter is constructed around paradigmatic readings of several films that demonstrate the limits and possibilities of popular fantasy under a totalitarian regime. Chapter one examines the historical musical as a representative form for nostalgic, sentimental representations of socially defined happiness. *Tanz auf dem Vulkan* (1938) and *Robert und Bertram* (1939, the Third Reich's only anti-Semitic musical) both employ music, song, and stories set in the nineteenth century to model how an exclusive and excluding community are the best guarantors of a strong nation and leader. Chapter two treats the adventure genre as a cinematic form for engaging alterity. *Kautschuk* (1938), *Verklungene Melodie* (1938), and *Frauen für Golden Hill* (1938) displace their plots respectively to Brazil, Africa and America, and Australia in order to "visualize popular notions of gender, race, and power surrounding national identity" (66). Chapter three focuses on a subgenre of the war film called the home-front feature, which de-realizes war as aggression against an enemy and instead portrays entertainment and

culture as the goals that unify the nation in struggle. O'Brien shows that the box office hits *Wunschkonzert* (1940) and *Die große Liebe* (1942) paralleled the wave of initial military successes by showing viewers how war is a positive force not unlike the experience of collectively enjoying the spectacle of a movie. The later and less popular *Die Degenhardts* (1944) reflects in contrast both the deterioration of the German military situation and the reduced appeal of war for the "national community" by shifting the focus from the structuring and metaphorical topos of light entertainment to the preservation of traditional German culture at all costs. Chapter four discusses two popular melodramas, *Opfergang* (1944) and *Damals* (1943). Melodrama is, of course, the stuff of family conflict, a vehicle for representing in particular women's desire and feminine feelings. These two "fascist melodramas" (as O'Brien refers to them) interrogate issues of sexuality and gender roles within the confines of the patriarchal family structures idealized by National Socialism. Finally, Chapter five presents three "problem films," a genre characterized by the serious and honest treatment of social problems and thus in direct contrast to the films discussed in the first four chapters. While the Propaganda Ministry, critics, and the public consistently called for films addressing life's reality, they would seem to have no place within the actual movie industry of the Third Reich. And indeed, *Das Leben kann so schön sein* (1938), *Der verzauberte Tag* (1943–44), and *Via Mala* (1945) were all banned because of their defeatism and pessimism. Problem films—because they express desires and fantasies that can not be contained by happy endings—expose for O'Brien most succinctly the real politics and limits of entertainment in the Third Reich.

This important monograph is written in a crisp, non-jargonistic style that recommends it not only to the scholar but also to the general reader and student audience. Since all citations are in English translation with the original German provided in the endnotes, the volume serves the needs of multiple readers. This is an important consideration since O'Brien made the risky and welcome decision to include lengthy analyses of films that are not available either on film or video with English subtitles. Yet the readings are integrated within a larger, compelling argument about the function of entertainment within the framework of Nazi culture so that the focus convincingly broadens the understanding of the complexities in this crucial period of German film history. Possibly this kind of sophisticated discussion will even lead to a more widely available "canon" of Third Reich films. Both of these Camden House volumes are nicely presented (carefully proofed, good-quality paper, a sprinkling of pertinent black-and-white reproductions) and extend the publisher's growing catalog of important contributions to German Studies.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

—Marc Silberman

Popular Cinema of the Third Reich.

By Sabine Hake. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001. xv + 272 pages.

\$55.00 hardcover / \$24.95 paperback.

In this book Sabine Hake demonstrates again how important theoretical rigor and careful historical contextualization are when writing about the cinema. She also joins a number of scholars who have authored books that finally bring the sophistication of recent Anglo-American film studies to the topic of films produced in Nazi Germany,

beginning with Eric Rentschler and Linda Schulte-Sasse almost ten years ago, and followed recently by scholars such as Lutz Koepnick and Antje Ascheid. Hake's introductory chapter provides an excellent historical summary of the scholarship on Nazi cinema, and she demonstrates that one central problem for that scholarship has always been the interpretation of the popular entertainment cinema of the Third Reich.

Already in the 1960s, two poles had emerged: Gerd Albrecht and Erwin Leiser interpreted Nazi cinema almost exclusively in terms of political propaganda, whereas David Stewart Hull read the many entertainment films produced in the Third Reich—by far the largest category of films produced—as “apolitical” and thus basically free of the taint of complicity. In the 1970s new approaches informed by “ideology critique” went beyond the emphasis on overt propaganda and on documented instances of direct state intervention, control, and/or censorship on the part of Goebbels's “Ministry of Propaganda.” Such approaches analyzed the underlying assumptions of the “apolitical” entertainment film as inherently fascist. The problem with this type of analysis, however, was that it resembled all too closely similar analyses of the underlying ideology of the “classical narrative cinema” produced in Hollywood. Could Hollywood and Nazi cinema really be so similar? Seeing classical narrative cinema as the ultimate evil was a mainstay of Anglo-American film studies in the 1970s, just as for some postwar Marxists, the equation of American capitalism with German fascism was a favorite (if obviously polemical) position. But the latter results in a leveling of differences and specificities that is clearly problematic, especially for those whose goal was to confront the Nazi legacy in Germany—and in the German film industry—in an honest fashion.

While Goebbels exerted a great deal of control over the film industry during the Third Reich—and indeed he intervened constantly in film production—, at the same time he did not approve of overt propaganda in the entertainment film. He also wanted German entertainment films to compete with Hollywood cinema, and they did achieve popularity (but so did American films, at least until they began to be banned on a wide scale from 1939 on). The popular genre cinema of the Third Reich contradicts many of our assumptions and expectations, and this is the problem Hake makes the center of her book, the problem that she attempts to explain with greater care and nuance than has long been the norm. She writes, “Defying speculation about the nature of fascist aesthetics, the many genre films produced during the Third Reich have given rise neither to a discernible film style nor to a particular ideological agenda”; furthermore, “they might be described as an impoverished, derivative version of the Hollywood original” (12).

Hull's thesis that the bulk of the cinema of the Third Reich was “apolitical entertainment” and that thus the film industry was some sort of refuge from the politics of the regime was at best a gullible recycling of apologist revisionism by former members of a complicitous industry. Nonetheless the clear attempt by the National Socialist state to make popular cinema conform to its ideological agenda was never completely successful: “[U]nlike the forced coordination of the industry, the coordination of filmic fantasies was never fully achieved”; the popular, Hake argues, was “a compromise formation within the fictions of national culture and identity” (18). What this compromise entailed was a division between official ideas about folklore and national/racial culture, which informed the *Staatsauftragsfilm* (in the tradition of the

Weimar art film but combined with more overt political ideology), and modern versions of the popular, which flourished in the conventional genre cinema.

Hake makes clear, however, that even in the genre cinema, political considerations, while rarely overt, played a significant role. In her chapter on the transitional films of 1933, she demonstrates how the loss of Jewish directors and actors impoverished the romantic comedies and operetta films that would continue to be made in the Third Reich. The Jewish producer Erich Pommer had developed these genres in the early sound cinema, and many Jewish directors and actors had contributed to their success. In her analysis of films by Jewish directors released in 1933 (after the Nazis came to power), Hake asserts that underlying the humor in films like Reinhold Schünzel's *Viktor und Viktoria* is a specifically German-Jewish anxiety about identity. Indeed, she argues that the cross-dressing in the film does not actually refer to any "queer" ambiguity about gender or sexuality but is instead displaced anxiety about ethnic identity and "passing."

This reading demonstrates Hake's insistence on careful historical contextualization to fend off seductive but anachronistic readings based on theories fashionable in subsequent periods. Similarly, her chapter on Detlef Sierck/Douglas Sirk follows Gertrud Koch in questioning exactly how "Brechtian" an artist he was in late Weimar or in the melodramatic German films he directed during the Third Reich. Hake then demonstrates that it is precisely the affinity to the art film and even the self-reflexivity in these films (the very qualities read as subversive in his American melodramas of the 1950s) that make the films most complicit with Nazi ideology.

In the same way, her chapter on the depiction of women in German films during World War II rejects any attempt to see them as somehow "empowering," for these representations are clearly circumscribed by the misogyny of Nazi ideology—yet of course the anxiety about women's roles and the need to appeal to the female audience of wartime Germany create contradictions in the films that are productive to analyze. Other chapters examine different aspects of the cinema of the Third Reich: the performance of masculine anxiety in the comedies of Heinz Rühmann; the domestication of modernism in set design; the problem of what film audiences actually liked (and the anxiety of both the industry and the state in monitoring them); German-American film relations right up to the end of 1941; the special situation of Austrian film within Nazi cinema and the myth of Vienna; film theoretical writing in the Third Reich—which attempted to overcome any conflict between the national and the popular in very symptomatic ways; and continuities between early postwar cinema and the cinema of the Third Reich.

Again and again Hake shows how complicated the situation of popular cinema in the Third Reich was, neither conforming neatly to our assumptions about totalitarian ideological control nor justifying any fantasies about a "refuge" from politics. This book is an invaluable addition to the work being done on cinema in the Third Reich and its postwar legacies, and it will appeal to readers interested in many of the larger issues involved in the relationship of film, consumerism, and national politics in modern (and postmodern) societies.

University of Minnesota

—Richard W. McCormick

Hitler's Heroines: Stardom and Womanhood in Nazi Cinema.

By Antje Ascheid. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003. x + 274 pages.
\$19.95.

Antje Ascheid's *Hitler's Heroines* makes a valuable contribution to both Third Reich Film Studies and Women's Studies. Well-researched, informed by theoretical and methodological developments in Film Studies and German Studies, and lucidly written, this volume enriches current understandings both of the Nazi film industry and of tensions between party ideology and the media's images of women in the Third Reich.

Ascheid argues that the star personae of Nazi Germany's biggest divas reveal the conflict between Nazi gender ideology and the desires and experiences of real women in Nazi Germany. This conflict stems from the ambitions of the Propaganda Ministry and the film industry to produce films that were both ideologically effective and commercially viable. The drive for commercial success allowed the box office to become a way for women to influence film production. Ascheid reveals how the dialectic between official ideology and the desires and experiences of female audiences manifests itself in the personae and films of Kristina Söderbaum, Lilian Harvey, and Zarah Leander.

Hitler's Heroines adds to the significant body of recent scholarship on popular film of the Third Reich. Employing a similar methodology that combines archival research and historically and theoretically informed close readings, Ascheid's work differs from other recent monographs on Nazi film in its joint emphases on womanhood and star theory. This combination yields fresh results regarding individual films and stars. It also participates in the ongoing discussion regarding the role of audiences in the Third Reich and the extent to which they may have influenced film production. Likewise, *Hitler's Heroines* contributes to research on gender in the Third Reich via its studies of female stars, its theses about the agency of female audiences, and its explorations of the contradictions and tensions between theory and praxis of gender in the Nazi period.

Any reader of this book will be pleased with the detailed archival research and the informative accounts of Nazi gender ideology, the film industry, star theory, and the personae of the three stars studied. The overall argument is clear, thought-provoking, and well-supported, although there are two ways in which Ascheid could have made her case even stronger. Firstly, Ascheid argues that the inconsistencies in the star personae of Söderbaum, Harvey, and Leander arise in part from the desires and experiences of women living in the Third Reich, but there is little discussion of these desires and experiences that is not extrapolated from the stars and films themselves. A cultural studies approach that examined other media, as for example Patrice Petro does in *Joyless Streets* (Princeton UP, 1989), or that analyzed other historical sources about lives of women in the Third Reich would allow readers better to determine whether women's desires truly influenced the film industry to the extent Ascheid's analyses of the stars and films suggest. Secondly, Ascheid analyzes at length the ways in which publicity materials and individual films attempted to negotiate the contradictions and tensions manifest in the star personae. Her analyses of the films, however, are heavily narrative and dialogue-based. While the analyses presented do support the assertions made, more discussion of how formal elements (editing, lighting, cinematography, sound, etc.) may have exaggerated or contained the tensions embodied in the female stars might have produced richer, more compelling analyses.

While *Hitler's Heroines* speaks most directly to scholars in Third Reich film studies, its clear argumentation, detailed background explanations, and effective prose will make its data and analyses accessible to students and scholars in other fields. Readers in German Studies, Film Studies, Women's Studies, and History will all find this book of interest. It represents rigorous, sophisticated scholarship; yet, because of its clarity and lack of assumptions about its readers' expertise, *Hitler's Heroines* could be used successfully in the classroom at either the graduate or undergraduate level.

University of Nevada-Reno

—Valerie Weinstein

That Was the Wild East: Film Culture, Unification, and the “New” Germany.

By Leonie Naughton. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002.
xviii + 267 pages. \$29.95.

The literature dedicated to the legacy of the GDR continues to grow and shows no signs of abating. Despite some early predictions that scholarly interest in the culture of East Germany would soon fade with the “end of the GDR,” the publication of new books and articles suggests that the unifying rupture of the *Wende* will continue to fascinate. Leonie Naughton has written a straight-talking and fact-studded account of post-wall films that engage German unification. Beginning with a consideration of film production in the GDR, the author devotes the first part of the book to the East German media scene and its fate following the privatization of the nationalized film studio, known as DEFA (Deutsche Film-Aktiengesellschaft), as well as the incorporation of GDR television into West German broadcasting structures. Naughton's view of these events is highly critical, and there is no denying that the assimilation of the GDR to the Federal Republic took place at a speed and under political conditions that left little room for thoughtful discourse and an appreciation of the experiences of easterners.

Whereas the book's shorter first half reads almost like empirical media analysis—with attendance figures for the last films mounted by the DEFA studio, detailed information on the sale of DEFA, and survey results on post-wall media preferences—the second set of chapters are dedicated to contextualized readings of the unification films themselves, including treatments of unification comedies, the “Trabi films,” western representations of East Germany in terms of “Heimat,” and the ongoing work of former DEFA directors in the “New Germany.” The films considered by Naughton cover a spectrum of genres and also vary greatly in terms of audience address, with readings of low-distribution films by former DEFA directors alongside productions aimed at the mainstream.

A fascinating characteristic of unification features has been the preoccupation with notions of “Heimat.” While East German filmmakers have clearly been faced with the more wrenching changes since 1989, westerners, too, have been inspired to interrogate previous concepts of national identity since the end of the GDR. Naughton focuses on this theme in a chapter entitled “Heimat Tradition and Revival,” in which stimulating parallels are drawn to 1950s Heimatfilms and this earlier period of restoration in German history. Where the analysis falls somewhat short in my opinion is in its narrow definition of *Heimat* in terms of genre and the corresponding view, ultimately, that *Heimat* belongs uniquely to West German cinema. While it may not be

overstating the case too much to contend that the Heimatfilm in the Federal Republic was “[a] genre whose Weltanschauung was anathema to the socio-political values and priorities of the ex-GDR” (138), the films DEFA actually produced are frequently concerned with the notions of community and the tensions between the modern and tradition that mark the Heimatfilm. This is significant because Naughton regards the return to the “Heimat genre” as the imposition of a construct that recasts the East in western terms. While I am sympathetic to the author’s politics, my sense is that things are more complicated than this in the area of film. Perhaps an understanding of *Heimat* as a frame for negotiating issues of belonging—instead of a genre—would yield interpretations that register not only the dislocations between East and West, but also points of contact and shared patterns for projecting German identities. This raises an additional concern regarding the unexamined weight resting on Naughton’s East-West opposition in general. The author’s efforts to distinguish between “eastern” and “western” unification films given the realities of production and financing are sometimes strained, and the pressures of migration and globalization would also seem to deserve more attention in an attempt to come to grips with identity issues in contemporary German society.

These selective comments notwithstanding, *That Was the Wild East* is an informative and readable book that takes a bead on a still-evolving subject. It provides useful background information not readily available in English and should be required reading for anyone interested in cinema in Germany since 1989.

University of Toronto

—Stefan Soldovieri