MHRA TEXTS AND DISSERTATIONS
VOLUME 34

BITHELL SERIES OF DISSERTATIONS
VOLUME 17

Dialogue and Narrative Design in the Works of Adalbert Stifter

BRIGID HAINES

Published by
THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
for
THE INSTITUTE OF GERMANIC STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
TEXTS AND DISSERTATIONS
(formerly Dissertation Series)
VOLUME 34

INSTITUTE OF GERMANIC STUDIES
(University of London)
BITHELL SERIES OF DISSERTATIONS
VOLUME 17

DIALOGUE AND NARRATIVE DESIGN IN THE WORKS OF ADALBERT STIFTER

DIALOGUE AND NARRATIVE DESIGN IN THE WORKS OF ADALBERT STIFTER

BRIGID HAINES

Published by
THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
for
THE INSTITUTE OF GERMANIC STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
1991

ISBN 978-1-83954-672-3
doi:10.59860/td.b6af3ea

Published by
The Modern Humanities Research Association
for
The Institute of Germanic Studies
(University of London)

HONORARY TREASURER, MHRA
KING'S COLLEGE LONDON
STRAND, LONDON WC2R 2LS
ENGLAND

ISBN 0 947623 44 2

ISSN (Bithell Series of Dissertations) 0266–7932

Printed in England by
W. S. MANEY & SON LIMITED
HUDSON ROAD LEEDS

FOR NICK

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank all the friends and colleagues at the University of London and the University College of Swansea, at the British Library and at the Adalbert Stifter-Institut des Landes Oberösterreich in Linz who gave me their support and assistance during the preparation of this study. I should also like to record my particular debt to Bill Abbey, Dr Janet Wharton, Professor Roy Wisbey and Dr David Yeandle. My biggest word of thanks goes to Professor Martin Swales, for his perceptive and stimulating critical comments and his enthusiastic support.

PRIMARY LITERATURE AND ABBREVIATIONS

Works by Stifter

As far as was possible I have used the new critical edition of Stifter, *Werke und Briefe: historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe*, edited by Alfred Doppler and Wolfgang Frühwald (Stuttgart, 1978ff.; hereafter referred to as Doppler and Frühwald). For works which have not yet appeared in the new edition I have used the *Sämtliche Werke*, edited by A. Sauer (Prague, 1901ff.; hereafter referred to as Sauer). I have retained the archaic spellings and the punctuation of the two editions, which are at times idiosyncratic and inconsistent. The footnotes for each chapter explain which edition I have used for each work to which I refer.

Other Abbreviations

Stiehm, Lothar (ed.), *Adalbert Stifter: Studien und Interpretationen: Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, edited by Lothar Stiehm (Heidelberg, 1968) is referred to as: *Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*.

Lachinger, Johann, Alexander Stillmark and Martin Swales (eds), *Adalbert Stifter heute: Londoner Symposium 1983*, Schriftenreihe des Adalbert-Stifter-Institutes des Landes Oberösterreich, Folge 35; Publications of the Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, volume 33 (Linz, 1985) is referred to as: *Londoner Symposium 1983*.

Full bibliographical details appear in the Bibliography, pp. 147–56.

Abbreviations for periodical titles are in accordance with those used in *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*.

PREFACE

I would like to start with a word of explanation concerning both the scope and the structure of this study. The title refers to 'the works of Adalbert Stifter' yet only three works are examined in detail. In Chapter One the attempt is made to establish some recurring features in Stifter's *œuvre*. Chapters Three, Four, and Five deal with the texts *Der beschriebene Tännling*, *Der Nachsommer*, and *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters* respectively. The three works analysed chart the spectrum of Stifter's narrative exploitation of dialogue and direct speech. This is particularly the case since two of them, *Der beschriebene Tännling* and *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*, exist in early and late versions and thus illustrate well the author's development as a writer. To illuminate these effects, detailed analysis is needed, of a length such as to preclude treating more than a few works in that degree of necessary detail. But I believe that the findings of this study apply to Stifter's work as a totality, and that the illustration of the range of effects he achieves by his use of dialogue could not greatly have been enhanced by the inclusion of more texts.

Chapter Two offers an extended and detailed summary of the theoretical discussion of literary dialogue. The point of this summary is neither to adopt the taxonomy of any critic or group of critics, nor to develop a taxonomy of my own. It is rather to explore the range of possible effects inherent in that process whereby a narrator suspends his or her own discourse and allows the characters to express themselves in direct speech. This phenomenon is a richly complex one and the chapter draws attention to some of its manifold implications before moving on to the detailed analysis of the three texts.

The theoretical section also highlights the fact that any discussion of dialogue and direct speech in narrative must entail a discussion of the narrative discourse which houses that dialogue. Hence Chapters Three, Four, and Five, which analyse specific texts, pay great attention to the narrative perspective. For it is only when the narrative perspective is established that one can begin to explore the implications of those passages where the voices of the characters make themselves heard and thereby challenge (if only briefly) the exclusive dominance of the narrator.

CHAPTER I

STIFTER'S WORKS: CONSISTENCY AND CHANGE

> 'I sensed at once that in the perfect order of the universe a breach had opened, an irreparable rent.'
>
> Italo Calvino, *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller*[1]

> 'Ich versuche dramaturgisch immer einfacher zu zeigen, immer sparsamer zu werden, immer mehr auszulassen, nur noch anzudeuten. Die Spannung zwischen den Sätzen ist mir wichtiger geworden als die Sätze selbst. Meine Dramatik spielt sich zwischen den Sätzen, nicht in den Sätzen ab, vom Schauspieler her gesehen.'
>
> Friedrich Dürrenmatt, *Porträt eines Planeten*[2]

One of the characteristics of Stifter's writing which has been noted by generations of critics is the fact that it is remarkably consistent. Although contemporary events, in particular the 1848 revolution, did impinge on his work, he remained true to a particular literary terrain and a particular body of themes which form the basis of even his earliest work. There are no sudden changes of direction, few unexplained introductions of new ideas to disturb the general picture. The works, when taken together, form a more recognizably unified corpus than do those of many other writers. Understanding of the stories and novels can be furthered by comparing and contrasting them with each other, for although the early works differ significantly from the later ones in style and composition, the themes and the subject matter are often basically the same. If a progression of ideas, an advancement in thought is discernible in the later work (a trend which some critics deny, seeing only an entrenchment, a refusal to ask questions), this can best be highlighted by such a process of comparison.[3] To focus on this nexus of consistency and change, on the overlap between formal development and underlying aesthetic concerns, is to get to the heart of Stifter's *œuvre*.

Stifter's strength of purpose and single-mindedness have often been equated with a particular aesthetic and political ideology. Hence many early and some

more recent Stifter scholars have either praised or scorned his work because of its innate conservatism. To some his appreciation of beauty and wholeness, his understanding of continuity, particularly in nature, his firm placing of mankind within the natural world while yet insisting on mankind's educability and the possibility of self-determination according to moral precepts — all this makes his work especially valuable. Stifter's striving for moral certainty is all the more remarkable when one takes into account the facts of his personal unhappiness — the early loss of his father, his youthful love for the unattainable Fanny Greipl, his years of poverty as a tutor, his problematic marriage, his childlessness, his struggle even in later life to make ends meet, and, in his later years, his declining health. There is evidence, in his continued attempt to understand the forces guiding the world, of a not inconsiderable intellectual honesty, which is often overlooked.

To others Stifter's conservatism appears blinkered and stubborn, a wilful refusal to acknowledge the conflicts and the turbulence of the period in which he was writing. Hebbel, in a well-known attack, accused Stifter of extolling the virtues of only the small things in life to the exclusion of the human drama: 'Schautet ihr tief in die Herzen, wie könntet ihr schwärmen für Käfer?'.[4] A study by Horst Albert Glaser of Stifter's novel *Der Nachsommer* seeks to show that this work, which seems at first glance persistently utopian, is in fact an inverse reflection of very specific historical and political circumstances. He insists on the sterility of the relationships in the novel and interprets it as an 'Index der gesellschaftlichen Impotenz des Bürgertums'.[5] Stifter's desire for order and harmony was, it seems, symptomatic of his times, a retrogressive desire for a lost world which was itself only an illusion.[6]

Even accepting for the moment that idylls are an inverse reflection of reality, I would, however, deny that Stifter is a creator of idylls. A glance at his subject matter will demonstrate this. Time and again he chooses to centre his stories on figures who are isolated and apart from the human community: Abdias, the Jew, an outsider even in the land of his birth, Brigitta, a woman isolated from the human community by her lack of outward beauty, the old man in *Der Hagestolz*, his isolation from the human community symbolized by his living on a fortress-like island on a lake, the noble couple in *Prokopus* who struggle with incalculable emotional problems while the people in the village below live simple, uncomplicated lives, the lonely old man Georg in *Der Waldgänger*, the strange girl in *Turmalin*, the naïve and saintly priest in *Kalkstein*; the list could be extended to cover most of Stifter's stories. These characters do not, with the possible exception of the priest, exemplify the moral law, the law of stability and continuity which Stifter claimed was 'das menschenerhaltende'.[7] There is a persistent feeling that that centre of gravity lies elsewhere. Paradoxically Stifter's characters are unremittingly marginal to what he seems to identify as the centre.

Sometimes the thrust of the story lies in the socialization of these characters. Occasionally this attempt succeeds. Helen Watanabe O'Kelly shows how, in *Der Waldsteig*, the eccentric Tiburius's problem is diagnosed as sexual repression resulting from a lack of personal contact with adults in his childhood.[8] The story shows how he is slowly cured of his problems by an acquaintanceship with a young girl who later becomes his wife. While Tiburius recovers the balance missing in his life, another story, *Turmalin*, shows that so-called normality is sometimes merely a cipher for mediocrity. The strange young girl in the story conforms to the conventions of the day, but Peter Demetz shows us that she both gains and loses in the process, so that 'we do not know whether we should praise the young girl on her way to society, or weep over her fate'.[9] More frequently the gap between the characters and the desired sense of belonging refuses to close. Abdias dies as he has lived, alone, bitter, and misunderstood. When, in *Der Hagestolz*, Victor returns home to get married, the old man remains on his island, a hostile and brooding presence who nevertheless commands considerable sympathy from the reader and averts much of the narrative attention from what should be the joyful conclusion to the story: the wedding festivities.

Very often the tragedy of human life is registered in the recording of defective human relationships where the isolation of individuals from each other and the difficulty of adequate communication are thematized. Two stories must here be allowed to stand for the rest. *Der Waldgänger*, with its strangely convoluted structure, traces the lives of a couple who lose each other by a tragic mistake. Oppressed by what she sees as the sin of their childlessness, the wife, Corona, brings about a separation and divorce so that each can fulfil the 'heilige Pflicht' of producing children. She, however, is unable to go through with remarriage and when they meet again thirteen years later, the enormity of their mistake becomes clear to Georg. The tragedy of the story is heightened by the knowledge the reader already has of Georg's later life: abandoned by his two sons, he has a young boy as his companion. When the boy promises never to leave him, Georg says that this would be unnatural — and this is the harsh lesson he has learned from his life — for 'die Liebe geht nur nach vorwärts, nicht zurück' (p. 84).[10] There is no going back. The story bears witness to the waste of human lives which fail, through no fault of their own, to fulfil a norm of ordinary, contented existence.

The story *Prokopus* charts the course of an unhappy marriage where the problem seems to lie in the simple incompatibility of the protagonists. Their wedding festivities are dwelt on at length and the narrative stresses the simplicity of the lives of the villagers and the public nature of the event. When they are finally alone on their wedding night, however, the couple find that 'sie konnten nun, da sie allein waren, noch weniger sprechen' (p. 199). She is uncertain and finds everything in her new home strange, while he is confident

but abrasive. Despite their obvious love for each other the narrator tells us quite simply, even brutally, that 'das versprochene Glück ist nicht gekommen' (p. 203). With great delicacy the tensions between them are charted as they grow to be unbridgeable and finally reach a climax. There is no sudden separation as there is in *Der Waldgänger*, the protagonists here live out their lives together. But this is precisely their tragedy.

The depiction of isolated characters, of blighted relationships, and the concern with inadequate communication are all symptoms of a darker side of Stifter's vision. There is, underlying the works and occasionally rising to the surface, an awareness and fear of madness and unreason in the world order and in the self. There are only a few places where Stifter allows himself free rein to speculate about the order (or possible lack of it) in the world. One of the most sustained discursive passages on this subject is the opening section of the story *Abdias*. The narrator gives a vivid impression of the smallness and impotence of humankind in the face of an impassive nature:

> Aber es liegt auch wirklich etwas Schauderndes in der gelassenen Unschuld, womit die Naturgesetze wirken, daß uns ist, als lange ein unsichtbarer Arm aus der Wolke, und thue vor unsern Augen das Unbegreifliche. Denn heute kömmt mit derselben holden Miene Segen, und morgen geschieht das Entsetzliche. Und ist beides aus, dann ist in der Natur die Unbefangenheit, wie früher.

As an example of what he means he suggests the following:

> Dort, zum Beispiele, wallt ein Strom in schönem Silberspiegel, es fällt ein Knabe hinein, das Wasser kräuselt sich lieblich um seine Locken, er versinkt - und wieder nach einem Weilchen wallt der Silberspiegel, wie vorher.[11]

This acute sense of the tragedy and yet at the same time the absolute unimportance of individual human destiny gives a tension to much of Stifter's work and remains a central theme right up to the final version of *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*, which he was writing when he died. In this particular passage in *Abdias* he attempts to resolve the problem by saying that it is not fate which is behind the workings of the world but 'eine heitre Blumenkette' of 'Ursachen und Wirkungen', a chain which people, by use of their reason, may eventually be able to comprehend. This comprehension might eventually enable people to see the need for human pain: 'noch zieht der Schmerz im Menschenherzen aus und ein - - ob er aber nicht zuletzt selber eine Blume in jener Kette ist?' (p. 238).

But neither the story of *Abdias* nor any of Stifter's other works answers this question directly (although, as I hope to show in Chapter Five, the form of *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters* tries to contain it). Instead, this kind of questioning is frequently present in the background of the stories, the impression being given that Stifter was unable either to banish it and become a writer of idylls, or to focus on it and develop a sustained theory of tragedy. There is at the heart of

Stifter's work a certain paralysis of thought and yet at the same time a refusal to over-simplify the incalculability of human experience. Thomas Mann saw the excitement and danger of Stifter's peculiar mix of apparent blandness and hidden depth: 'Stifter ist einer der merkwürdigsten, hintergründigsten, heimlich kühnsten und wunderlich packendsten Erzähler der Weltliteratur, kritisch viel zu wenig ergründet'.[12] Other critics have drawn attention to the darker side of Stifter's creativity. Roy Pascal, writing of *Der Nachsommer*, talks of 'that gnawing uncertainty, which always lowers on the horizon of this apparently soothing book'.[13] Curt Hohoff claims that Stifter's painstakingly composed poetic world 'hat zu ihrem verschwiegnen Gegenpolen Tragik, Dämonie und Sünde'.[14] W. G. Sebald points out the depth of pessimism in Stifter and the accompanying unwillingness to question the validity of his convictions. Stifter's espousal of Christian humility, his pantheism, his assertion of the gentle law of natural life and the rigid moralism of his works are never developed or reflected upon. Thus although they are part of a 'Philosophie des Heils' embracing nature and history, they are fragile and 'vor der Desintegration nur dadurch zu bewahren, daß sie einmal ums andere invariant behauptet werden'. But the fragile rigidity of these values has little to do with the reality of an *œuvre* 'das ganz im Gegenteil seinen eigentlichen Schwerpunkt in einem profunden Agnostizismus und bis ins Kosmische ausgeweiteten Pessimismus hat'.[15]

So much for the basic thematic and philosophical concerns which underlie many of Stifter's works. Stifter's style was, however, always developing, as was his use of narrative structure. Most of the stories were rewritten over the course of his life and exist in two or three or even four versions. His later style is highly formalized and patterned, showing none of the youthful excesses found in such early works as *Der Condor*, which borrowed heavily from Romanticism. The later versions are also characterized by the increasing use of impassive, non-reflective narrators and a tightening up of the gaps and uncertainties in the stories. The combined effect of these changes is a more stately presentation which gives the impression of a greater objectivity.

But many critics have seen the stylization of his later work as an attempt to shore up[16] his narratives against the intrusion of unknown forces. This sometimes makes the stories appear brittle and defensive. Joseph Peter Stern points out that the narrative energy of Stifter's stories is always employed in a stringent attempt to cover up their implications. Stifter's stories, he says, frequently pose questions about the benevolence of fate and the extent of human understanding, and answer them in the negative: 'Wo dies geschieht, tut der Erzähler sein Äußerstes, einen schützenden Wall zwischen dem Dasein und den Gestalten in seiner Geschichte zu errichten, doch das Dasein läßt sich nicht vermauern'.[17]

The truth of the matter can perhaps be ascertained by looking at the rewriting process. Stifter's persistent refining of his style was a conscious, painstaking process: 'Was dem Leser das Einfachste und Natürlichste scheint, ist das Werk

der größten Kunst und Sorgfalt; wer es anders meint, der versteht von Kunst und ihren Hervorbringungen nichts'.[18] The urgency with which he strove to find the right mode of expression can be felt in an extract from a letter where he describes the process of writing *Witiko*, which of all his works shows the greatest degree of sustained stylization: 'Nur ich weiß, daß das, was ich da that, fast über menschliche Kräfte geht, und ich rang es mir ab, weil, wie ich sagte, sonst fast Verzweiflung über mich gekommen wäre'.[19] The search for form was thus not the dry refining away of subjectivity to the point of its total exclusion, as some of Stifter's more hostile critics have supposed. It sprang rather from a passionate desire to hit precisely the right note, a desire intensified by the constant fear of failure.

Stifter is perhaps at his best when he balances by means of this formal control the two impulses in his creative self: the desire for order and wholeness and also the narrative sympathy for the actual or potential tragedy of his own creations. Some of the best modern criticism shows how, often by rewriting the stories, Stifter achieved a formal balance in the narrative which does not just allow but positively encourages the reader to draw his or her own conclusions from the conflicting rhetorical strategies operating within the text. The net effect of the changes is that the later works, while being stylistically and thematically more controlled, frequently have wider interpretative implications. The toning down of the style means that moments of discontinuity retained in the plots (which spring from Stifter's underlying pessimism) stand out in greater relief. And the even tone set by the narrator often has to be relativized by comparing it with the events described.

In considering the issues of balance, of narratorial stance, and of the rewriting process in this chapter, I shall abstain from discussing *Der Nachsommer* and *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters* since they will form the main body of my argument and will be dealt with in some depth in Chapters Four and Five respectively. It is in these two works that Stifter's combination of creativity and formal control finds its greatest expression. The question of balance is crucial to the design of both, as is the choice and use of narrators within the texts; and the question of rewriting is central to any understanding of the *Mappe* material, which was reworked three times.

Peter Demetz shows how, in *Turmalin*, Stifter demonstrates that the world is divided into two kinds of people — those, like the two narrators, who believe that the world is governed by decent habits and established laws, and those strange people, like the protagonists, who disturb the picture (Demetz, p. 770). The contrast between them is felt in moments where the two collide, for example when the educated woman narrator simply does not know how to react to the strange flute playing that she hears, for it does not conform to any of the 'normal' criteria for judging music: 'she judges the truth from the assumptions of her own conventions, and she is at a total loss' (p. 774). The shock of

confrontation is made all the greater in that the reader is totally in the hands of the two narrators, for 'Stifter himself withdraws from the narrative and relegates the responsibility for stating the case to the actual narrators, the solid citizen and the wife of the civil servant' (p. 781). There is no guiding hand giving pointers to the reader. He or she is forced to draw his or her own conclusions from the juxtaposition in the work of the normal and the strange. The reader learns not because, but in spite of, the two narrators.

In another article on this text Karen J. Campbell shows how the strangeness and incoherence of the plot are thematized in the later version of the story. This version addresses 'the subject of aesthetic expectations and of *art which deviates from the norm*'.[20] The effect of the changes between the *Journalfassung* and the *Studienfassung* 'is both to make the strangeness of Stifter's original story — its already problematical causal nexus — stranger, while at the same time conveying from within a consciousness of the problem through more pointed textual allusions to art forms deviating from accepted norms of structural composition and order' (Campbell, p. 584).

In his article on *Brigitta* Albert Meier also shows how the composition of the *Studienfassung* better illustrates what he perceives to be the main theme, namely the learning process whereby individuals find their useful place in society without losing their individuality. In this work, though, the tightening up which occurs between the first and second versions is in the service of the didactic model. The story becomes more unified and the meaning clearer. The narrator in the first version travels because of a simple 'Reiselust', while the narrator in the second version is deliberately characterized as being aimless in order to contrast with the Major: 'der Major behauptet von sich, "ein Ziel" gefunden zu haben, während der Erzähler ziellos umherreist, weil er noch keinen festen Platz in der — sozialen — Welt eingenommen hat'.[21] There is therefore a psychologically motivated connection between the narrator and the Major, in the sense that the former learns from the latter the correct way to live. But this educating process is not limited to the narrator but is extended, through the structure of the story, to the reader as well. The information given to the reader is limited at any one time to that available to the narrator given the situation in which he finds himself (Meier, p. 219). The reader is thus integrated into the story and, like the narrator, is offered a model of behaviour which he or she learns to appreciate without asking questions. The lack of colour in the depiction of the narrator is here crucial for the didactic purpose for 'nur wenn der Erzähler als Individuum undefiniert erscheint, kann sich der jeweilige Leser in ihn hineinversetzen. Der Erzähler fungiert daher weniger als Person denn als problematische Struktur, als ein Identifikationsraster' (p. 220).

Eve Mason makes a similar point about the suitability of the choice of narrator in *Kalkstein*, but his importance here lies in his difference from, rather than his likeness to, his protagonist. In the *Journalfassung* Stifter has already decided that

his narrator should be a surveyor but 'er bleibt eine recht farblose, undifferenzierte Gestalt',[22] and the story also contains several authorial interventions which disturb the unity of the narration. In the second version, however, Stifter propels the story forward 'in wenigen, klar gegliederten, visuell eindrücklichen und aussagestarken Bildern' (Mason, p. 214) and the narrator's character and profession play a more important role. He and the priest function as two contrasting figures. The choice of a scientific man as his narrator allows Stifter to strike an objective tone and also to prod his reader into action, for the narrator's scientific approach is felt, when applied to the understanding of people, to be inadequate. The feeling is aroused in the reader that 'es gelte diesen Mangel auszugleichen, sodaß er [the reader] anfängt, verborgenen Zusammenhängen nachzuspüren' (p. 125). The scientific tone of the narrator throws up more questions than it can answer, and the simplicity of the priest, the main character, shows everything the narrator stands for in a bad light, making him seem self-satisfied and materialistic (p. 126).

Mason also demonstrates how the priest's narration of his own life story is of importance in contrasting the two men and in giving the reader a freedom of interpretation: 'Zum ersten Male ist der Leser, wenigstens vorübergehend, vom Gängelbande des Landmessers befreit. Stifter stellt sie beide auf die gleiche Rezeptionsebene. Der Leser kann ganz ungehindert und auf eigene Faust seine Schlüsse ziehen' (p. 133). Stifter leaves the reader the choice of rejecting or accepting the surveyor's reading of the priest's story; but he does not allow us to remain neutral. All the narrator seems interested in is clearing up the mystery surrounding the priest's fine linen, whereas the story, 'die sonderbare Geschichte eines fein nuancierten, komplizierten Seelenlebens' (p. 133), is of much wider interest than that.

In Stifter's finest work, then, it is crucially important not to equate a toning down of the style and a tempering of the direct portrayal of emotion with a greater rigidity of meaning and didacticism. The second versions are smoother in style, more carefully constructed and more thematically unified. Nevertheless in these works the firm ground of narratorial certainty found in some nineteenth-century authors is often absent and the reader is left searching, under the seemingly endless flow of smooth prose, for the often very elusive guiding hand of the author.

In such narrative contexts dialogue has a particular role to play. Indeed, it is my contention that the use of dialogue in Stifter is an area worthy of detailed study, for it is very often here that the authority of Stifter's narrators is challenged and the authorial concern with and sympathy for subjectivity is shown to be flourishing underneath the taut exterior of his prose.

Dialogue is always a crucial indicator of what is going on in any text for it is an interruption of narratorial account, the point where subjectivity, the otherness of characters, becomes admissible and knowable, the point where the reader has

direct access to consciousnesses other than that of the narrator. These points will be treated at greater length in Chapter Two.

Few critics have dwelt at any length on the role of dialogue in Stifter's works. Peter Küpper demonstrates in his study of *Bergkristall*[23] how the characters' speech can be one of the components in the text which causes the reader to be attentive and to find his or her own meanings from the contradictory aspects and the understatement in the text. In this work it is often the activity of speaking which is important rather than the truth of what is said. The reader therefore has to examine the relationship between dialogue and narrative to establish where the meaning of this most ambivalent of tales lies.

When the two children, Konrad and Sanna, are lost in the mountains, they talk throughout their ordeal about the predicament they find themselves in, Konrad assuming the role of leader and Sanna trusting him completely. His knowledge of the mountainside and of the weather is shown, during the course of the tale, to be faulty, and her trust in him (her 'Ja, Konrad' appears seventeen times in the *Studienfassung* as opposed to a mere four times in the first version) (Küpper, p. 179 and 181) to be misplaced.[24] But while what they say does not begin to comprehend the awfulness of their plight, the fact that they continue to speak, their adherence in their dialogue to the structure inherent in the verbal relationship of leader and led, saves them: 'Die Unerschütterlichkeit des Mädchens macht die inhaltlich sinnlose Formel unangreifbar: "Ja, Konrad" ist der feste Grund, auf dem sich sprachlich die spätere Rettung der Kinder aufbaut' (Küpper, p. 181).

It is not only the children's words which demand close scrutiny. The narrator does not comment upon the mother's mistaken readings of the weather (it is her certainty that it will not snow that acts as a trigger to the potential disaster); nevertheless there is extra information available to the reader which indicates that snow is in fact very likely. Küpper points out the importance for the reader of making sense of the discrepancy: 'Der Widerspruch muß vom Leser erkannt werden, er wird damit zu einer Funktion der Erzählung und in den Strukturzusammenhang des Werkes integriert' (p. 186). The reader has the overview to relativize and evaluate the narrative and the speech as complementary parts of a whole: 'Die von Stifter gestaltete Leserperspektive ist in der Erzählung potentiell vorhanden. Realisieren muß der Leser sie selbst' (p. 186).

Apart from Küpper and some very sensitive readings of dialogue by Hans-Ulrich Rupp in his book *Stifters Sprache*,[25] one of the few people to comment at some length on the use of dialogue is Peter Branscombe.[26] He indicates that Stifter's use of dialogue does not accord with a simple model. He points out that while 'a toning-down of emotional outbursts, a reduction in the length of sentences, a tendency to replace complex parentheses by simple consecutive sentences, are typical of Stifter's revisions', his use of dialogue 'does not regularly accord with this pattern' (p. 12). He explores carefully the peculiarities

of the stylized dialogue of one of Stifter's strangest stories, *Der fromme Spruch* (critics have hotly debated whether it is ironic, perhaps even intended to be humorous, or whether it should be taken at face value). He also highlights a passage from *Brigitta* where, when revising the work, Stifter can be seen 'to be increasing the degree of passion, and also to be moving away from dialogue that is actually speakable' (p. 21).

Dialogue in Stifter proves a remarkable barometer of changes that occur in the rewriting process. In *Bunte Steine*, in most of the *Studien* and in some of the later stories, Stifter's characters talk little. The depiction of marginal, lonely individuals does not seem to call for much speech. One notable exception is *Granit* where a large part of the story consists of the grandfather telling stories from the community's past to the little boy. But his voice is centred in the values of continuity and is totally stable. It is more often the case that where speech does occur it highlights the thematic issue of the difficulty of communication: the most dramatic points of *Der Waldgänger*[27] and of *Prokopus*, described above, occur in dialogue, as they do also in *Der Condor*, *Das alte Siegel*, *Brigitta* and others. The memorable dialogue in these works is usually confrontational, it illustrates in dramatic form the often irreconcilable differences between the protagonists or depicts directly before the reader's eyes the dynamic of argument.

But others of Stifter's works, largely those written in his later life, such as *Der Nachsommer*, *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters (letzte Fassung)*, *Witiko*, and *Der fromme Spruch* make much more extensive use of dialogue. This might at first seem strange when one takes into account that the later prose becomes more and more sacramental and formulaic. One would have thought that the risk-taking which dialogue involves, a stylistic recognition of voices beyond the narrator's control, would have been avoided. But this proves not to be the case. Dialogue in these works forms a large part of the narrative. Yet in most cases the risk-taking is securely contained, because the dialogue is as stylized as the surrounding narrative. The characters speak essentially with the same voice as the narrator, the voice of the work. The danger of subjectivity being introduced is thereby avoided. Indeed direct speech is very often actually preferred because the narrator's role is thereby reduced, giving a greater feel of objectivity.[28] Even the primacy of self demonstrated by having a strong, omniscient, manipulating narrator is to be avoided. The truth is meant to emerge from a narrative stance which allows people and things to develop according to their true nature. This, for Stifter, was the meaning of objectivity. Neverthless when tensions do surface, it is often in the dialogue or in the relationship between the dialogue and the narrative in which it is embedded. Because the narrative perspective in the later works is so sustained and imperturbable, because there is such an evenness of tone, any interruption, such as that caused by dialogue, will stand out, even if it is quantitatively slight. There is always present a potential risk of dialogue

undermining the apparent inscrutability of the narrator by showing his reticence and so-called objectivity to be not a symbol of security but instead a sign of uncertainty. The story as a whole, composed as it is of narrative and dialogue, can present a wider view than that posited by the narrator, and this wider view often incorporates Stifter's doubts about his own values.

I began this chapter by saying that Stifter's works are strangely hermetic, that he develops new and more rigorous ways of stating his basic concerns, that the works reflect and refract each other. Rudolf Wildbolz feels that there is consequently no development in the problematic of subjectivity which underlies the work: 'Stifter fasziniert, weil er, den unheilen Grund des Menschen vor Augen, kompositorisch und sprachlich ein System erfindet und im Alter — wider seiner Absicht — ad absurdum führt, das seinen eigenen Ursprung — Subjektivität — verhüllt, ohne ihn in Wahrheit überwinden zu können'.[29] Other critics, as I have elaborated, show that the balance of many later works is so finely tuned that the reader's judgement is inevitably brought into play and a stable meaning is not at all easy to find. I hope to show that the intersection point between dialogue and narrative is crucial to this interpretative process and that sections of dialogue and narrative are sometimes balanced in the text as a whole in such a way that the value of subjectivity is allowed expression, albeit as part of a total statement which simultaneously upholds the communal values of order and continuity.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Italo Calvino, *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller*, translated by William Weaver (London, 1982), p. 57.
2. Friedrich Dürrenmatt, Nachwort to *Porträt eines Planeten*, in *Friedrich Dürrenmatt: Werkausgabe in dreißig Bänden* (Zurich, 1980), XII, 197.
3. See Jean Louis Bandet, *Adalbert Stifter: introduction à la lecture de ses nouvelles* (Klincksieck, 1974), p. 117: 'Parce que Stifter est, de tous les auteurs allemands, l'un des plus repliés sur soi-même, des plus fermés au monde extérieur, parce que sa pensée s'est développée suivant une logique interne, sans subir aucune influence, sans qu'aucun événement ne vienne, du moins avant 1848, troubler ou infléchir une méditation exclusivement introspective, les éléments essentiels sont donnés dès le début, et c'est par une redistribution infiniment recommencée, par des déplacements d'accents parfois infimes que chemine sa réflexion, à travers un jeu perpétuel d'échos et de souvenirs'.
4. For an exposition of the disagreement between Stifter and Hebbel see Alexander Stillmark, 'Stifter contra Hebbel: An Examination of the Sources of their Disagreement', *GLL*, 21, no. 2 (1968), 93–102, and for a more recent appraisal of the similarities and differences between the two men see Alfred Doppler, 'Hebbel und Stifter: Gegensätze und Gemeinsamkeiten', *VASILO*, 34 (1985), 27–33.
5. Horst Albert Glaser, *Die Restauration des Schönen: Stifters 'Nachsommer'* (Stuttgart, 1965), p. 4.
6. For a survey of the trends in Stifter criticism from his own time to the present day, see Chapter Two of Martin and Erika Swales's *Adalbert Stifter: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 19–26. For other discussions of Stifter scholarship see Herbert Seidler, 'Adalbert Stifter Forschung 1945–1970', *ZDP*, 91, no. 1 (1972), 113–56 and 91, no. 2 (1972), 252–85, and Antje Schatter, 'Schwerpunkte des literaturkritischen Interesses an Stifter (2): Forschungsbericht', *LWU*, 2, no. 3 (Kiel, 1969), 196–208, and Alfred Doppler, 'Formen und Möglichkeiten der wissenschaftlichen Stifter-Rezeption', in *Londoner Symposium 1983*, pp. 4–11.
7. Vorrede to *Bunte Steine*, Doppler and Frühwald, II, ii, 9–16 (p. 15).
8. Helen Watanabe O'Kelly, '*Der Waldsteig*: sexuelle Erziehung eines Narren', in *Londoner Symposium 1983*, pp. 121–28.

9. Peter Demetz, 'On Stifter's and Fontane's Realism: *Turmalin* and *Mathilde Möhring*', in *Literary Theory and Criticism: Festschrift Presented to René Wellek*, edited by Joseph P. Strelka (New York, 1984), pp. 767–82 (p. 775).
10. References for *Der Waldgänger* and *Prokopus* are taken from Sauer, volume XIII.
11. *Abdias*, Doppler and Frühwald, I, v, 235–342 (p. 237).
12. Thomas Mann, *Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus*, in Mann, *Das essayistische Werk*, edited by Hans Bürgin (Frankfurt, 1968), p. 157.
13. Roy Pascal, *The German Novel* (Manchester, 1956), p. 70.
14. Curt Hohoff, *Adalbert Stifter: seine dichterischen Mittel und die Prosa des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Düsseldorf, 1949), p. 135.
15. W. G. Sebald, 'Bis an den Rand der Natur: Versuch über Adalbert Stifter', *Die Rampe*, 1 (1985), 7–35 (p. 10).
16. See M. R. Minden, 'The Place of Inheritance in the *Bildungsroman*', *DVLG*, 57 (1983), 33–63 (p. 61): 'it is Stifter's style . . . which shores up his content'.
17. Joseph Peter Stern, 'Adalbert Stifters ontologischer Stil', in *Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, pp. 103–20 (p. 107).
18. Letter to Gustav Heckenast, 24 December 1852.
19. Letter to Gustav Heckenast, 1 June 1856.
20. Karen J. Campbell, 'Towards a Truer Mimesis: Stifter's *Turmalin*', *GQ*, 57 (1984), 576–89 (p. 580; Campbell's emphasis).
21. Albert Meier, 'Diskretes Erzählen: über den Zusammenhang von Dichtung, Wissenschaft und Didaktik in Adalbert Stifters Erzählung *Brigitta*', *Aur*, 44 (1984), 213–23 (p. 214).
22. Eve Mason, 'Die Gestalt des Erzählers in Stifters *Kalkstein*', *VASILO*, 33 (1984), 123–40 (p. 124).
23. Peter Küpper, 'Literatur und Langeweile: zur Lektüre Stifters', in *Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, pp. 171–88.
24. See Martin and Erika Swales, p. 199, who talk here of 'speech acts of bad faith: with each "Ja, Konrad" the children move closer into disaster'.
25. Hans-Ulrich Rupp, *Stifters Sprache* (Zurich, 1969).
26. Peter Branscombe, 'Some Reflections on the Use of Dialogue in Stifter's Stories', in *Londoner Symposium 1983*, pp. 12–24.
27. For an analysis of the extraordinary dialogue between Georg and Corona when they meet again, see Joseph Peter Stern, *Re-Interpretations: Seven Studies in Nineteenth-Century German Literature* (London, 1964), pp. 239–300, 351–62, and 284–85.
28. See Ingeborg Maschek, 'Stifters Alterserzählungen: eine Stiluntersuchung' (unpublished dissertation, Vienna, 1961), p. 128, who makes this point, namely that there is more direct speech in the later works to increase objectivity by cutting down the 'Vermittlerrolle des Erzählers'.
29. Rudolf Wildbolz, *Adalbert Stifter: Langeweile und Faszination* (Stuttgart, 1976), p. 145.

CHAPTER II

DIALOGUE AND NARRATIVE

> 'What is needed is a vocabulary — a descriptive, rather than prescriptive, vocabulary — for forms. The best criticism, and it is uncommon, is of the sort that dissolves considerations of content into those of form.'
>
> Susan Sontag, *Against Interpretation*[1]

> 'The urgency of the moment always missed its mark. Words fluttered sideways and struck the object inches too low.'
>
> Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*.[2]

> 'The Major was a very accomplished talker — which took the form of not seeming to be accomplished at all, but never losing his grip on the way things were going.'
>
> Robertson Davies, *What's Bred in the Bone*.[3]

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 Dialogue in narrative: an overview

To analyse a piece of literary dialogue is a difficult undertaking because such a dialogue represents a complex intermingling of different rhetorical strategies. A literary dialogue is a conversation like any other and the reader can therefore look at the people involved and at what they are saying, how they differ, what emerges in the course of their discussion and so on. But the reader and the characters are not the only parties to this process: the characters' words are only reported because the narrator of the story makes them available to us. His or her attitude to the characters colours the impression we receive of them. Moreover, the characters and the narrator are themselves creations and cannot be said to exist in any real sense. They are not people of flesh and blood but themselves part of the text which is the creation of the author. They are realized by the reader during the reading process with the aid of his or her imagination and experience. A reader therefore accepts, albeit unconsciously, that reading a literary dialogue is not at all the same as, say, overhearing the report by one

party of a real life dialogue between two others, for a literary dialogue is a construct designed as part of the larger construct of the text and is aimed at a third unknown party: the reader.

At the very least then one must be aware of a four-cornered relationship radiating outwards from the dialogue — that of the characters to each other, that between the characters and the narrator, that between the passage of dialogue and the total text, and that between the text and the reader. There are many aspects of this complex network which need elaboration, but suffice it to note for the moment that underlying the whole is an overall architecture of the work which is kept in place by the tensions between its component parts, narrative and dialogue. And while literary dialogue does approximate to common (that is: extra-literary) speech patterns, its form is also influenced by its position and its role in the literary text.

2.1.2 Dialogue in narrative: a note concerning discipline

The discussion of dialogue in literary texts involves analysis using the tools of several disciplines. The question of what conditions are necessary to classify a particular speech act as, say, a promise, or a declaration, is answered by Speech Act Theory, as propagated by J. L. Austin and John R. Searle.[4] But as Stanley E. Fish, Reinhard Schmachtenberg,[5] and others have demonstrated, Speech Act Theory is only of limited value in the analysis of literature. Schmachtenberg points out that Speech Act Theory is of use within the parameters of the characters' speech in a work for it can give an indication of the characters' relationships to one another. Thus the 'Typologie illokutiver Akte als unterste Analyseebene' is 'eine notwendige Voraussetzung für die Beschreibung komplexerer Handlungseinheiten' (Schmachtenberg, p. 71). Fish finds the theory helpful with regard to *Coriolanus* but he points out that the play is essentially about the sincerity of utterances and is thus unusual in that it makes an issue of what is and is not a correct speech act. According to Fish, Speech Act Theory is 'an account of the conditions of intelligibility, of what it means to mean in a community, of the procedures which must be instituted before one can even be said to be understood'. But as a tool of literary analysis it is only intermittently helpful:

> In a great many texts those conditions and procedures are presupposed; they are not put before us for consideration, and the emphasis falls on what happens or can happen after they have met and been invoked. It follows that while a Speech Act analysis of such texts will always be possible, it will also be trivial, (a mere list of the occurrence or distribution of kinds of acts), because while it is the conditions of intelligibility that make all texts possible, not all texts are *about* those conditions. (Fish, pp. 1024–25; Fish's emphasis.)

Speech Act Theory is thus too narrow in its range to do justice to the network of speech relationships in a work. To describe the kind of utterances between

speakers may be useful but it can tell us little of the narrative context of that relationship, of what came before and after, of how the dialogue relates to the rest of the work.

Both Socio-Linguistics and Discourse Analysis seem to offer more help. For one may assume that by looking at the rules and conventions that govern speech and conversation in real life, it will be possible to ascertain the equivalent rules which govern literary dialogue, and to see what the differences are between literary and extra-literary dialogues.

But even this will not answer all the questions concerning the crucial factor dividing literary from real life speech: namely the relationship between passages of dialogue in a text and the overall statement of that text. Some literary theory has touched on this, but I know of no scholar who has made this important aspect of narrative the single focus of his or her attention.

Yet it seems to me that this is an area worthy of attention for both historical and analytical reasons. To trace the history of both the theory and practice of prose narrative, particularly in Germany, is to confront a perennial debate about subjectivity and objectivity. The general movement in the course of the development of the novel has been from the all-powerful, sovereign narrators of early novels in the eighteenth century, to the unstable world of some twentieth-century novels where much of the discourse is not attributable to any one voice. To map this gradual dissolve by focusing on the interplay between narrative voices on the one hand and the voices of their characters on the other, would seem to me potentially a most fruitful approach. And similarly to focus on any one work or group of works from any point in this spectrum and analyse them according to the balance of power between the elements of the text is likely to yield some illuminating pointers as to the character of the overall artistic statement.

For reasons given in Chapter One this method of analysis is peculiarly appropriate to Stifter. But before looking at specific texts I wish to take a closer look at the nature of speech and some theory of dialogue and of dialogue within narrative.

2.2 LANGUAGE: SOME PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

2.2.1 Language and time

A particular characteristic of the spoken word is that it exists both within and outside time. George Steiner describes the first aspect thus: 'language occurs *in* time. Every speech act, whether it is an audible utterance or only voiced innerly, "takes time" — itself a suggestive phrase. It can be measured temporally. It shares with time the sensation of the irreversible'.[6] Siegfried Grosse makes the same point even more emphatically: 'die momentane mündliche Äußerung steht fest und ist nicht mehr zu korrigieren',[7] as too does Roland Barthes:

La parole est irréversible, soit: on ne peut *reprendre* un mot, sauf à dire précisément qu'on le reprend. Ici, raturer, c'est ajouter; si je veux gommer ce que je viens d'énoncer, je ne puis le faire qu'en montrant la gomme elle-même (je dois dire: '*ou plutôt . . .*', '*je me suis mal exprimé. . .*'); paradoxalement, c'est la parole, éphémère, qui est indélébile, non l'écriture, monumentale.[8]

A linguistic utterance exists in time, and language itself has the capacity, through the use of tenses, to order and segment time and to establish a linear flow. This function of language, that of ordering events according to whether they are past, present, future or hypothetical, and of describing those events according to one's own point of view (one person's version of the past may be very different from another's, even if they refer to the same events), is of crucial importance in mankind's experiencing of the world and in the development of individual and collective consciousness.

A speech act is thus an act, and as such is within time and unique, and can also make time its subject by use of tenses. When general statements are made, language appears to have the ability to step outside time altogether. Eberhard Lämmert points out that if speech is incorporated into a work of narration it is 'bereits mit komplizierten Spannungen vorbelastet'. He describes three basic forms that this tension between event and utterance can take: 'Im gegenwärtig-momentanen Sprechakt kann die Aussage 1. andere Aktionen verwerten und vorbereiten, 2. selbst Aktion ausdrücken, 3. sich zur zeitlosen Feststellung erheben'.[9]

But I would argue that the prime characteristic of a speech act is that it is an act. Even when talking of the past or of the future or of all time or of imagined time, a speech act happens in the here and now: 'Whatever the tense used, all utterance is a present act. Remembrance is always now' (Steiner, p. 134). Thus while the content of a speech act can be timeless, the utterance of it cannot. It is unique, unretractable and stands in a relationship (anteriority, posteriority) to other events and speech acts. As will be seen, this is one of the major differences separating it from the written word.

2.2.2 Language and truth

The question of whether language can or cannot be used for speaking truths about existence belongs to the realm of philosophy, but socio-linguistics teaches us that in normal speech language does not exist 'to communicate absolute, elegant, unadorned truths'. Richard Wardhaugh continues: 'It *may* do this — as in the language of mathematics — but it is above all a social instrument used by rather fallible beings for a multiplicity of purposes, of which "telling the truth" and the search for "the truth" are but two, and not necessarily the most important ones'.[10] Speech is a form of social behaviour, and each utterance is spoken by someone in a certain situation or set of conditions, for a certain

purpose or set of purposes, of which the speaker may or may not be aware. The effects of the utterance may be different again, because once spoken, the words leave the control of the speaker and take on a life of their own, to be interpreted by quite other subjectivities than that of the speaker. The passage of an utterance from its conception to its consumption by the listener is therefore often more at issue than is the truth or lack of truth of its content.

Not only is human speech often not about truth in any exacting philosophical sense, it is one of the characteristics of human language, as opposed to, say, animal communication, that it is capable of lying and also, the positive side of the same thing, imagining. Falsity, George Steiner tells us, is not primarily negative: '*Language is the main instrument of man's refusal to accept the world as it is* . . . Ours is the ability, the need, to gainsay or "un-say" the world, to imagine and speak it otherwise' (Steiner, pp. 217–18, Steiner's emphasis). Fictional writing makes use of this capacity.

So throughout this study two crucial factors about speech underlie the argument, namely that speech can never be dissociated from the speaker or the conditions under which it is brought forth and consumed, and the fact that speech is creative as well as being referential.

> We communicate motivated images, local frameworks of feeling. All descriptions are partial. We speak less than the truth, we fragment in order to reconstruct desired alternatives, we select and elide. It is not 'the things which are' that we say, but those which might be, which we would bring about, which the eye and remembrance compose. (Steiner, p. 220.)

2.3 DIALOGUE: SOME GENERAL REMARKS

The term dialogue comes from the Greek 'dialogos', meaning conversation. The number of participants necessary for a dialogue to take place, as long as it is a plural number, is not contained in the word. Nevertheless the term dialogue is not synonymous with conversation. Although we have a specific word for a dialogue between two speakers ('duologue'), it is not in common currency, because in Western culture the connotations of the term dialogue are that it is an interchange based on a binary opposition of two speakers.

The origins of this idea lie outside the scope of this thesis but they can be located in the dialogues of Plato and the drama of Aeschylus:

> Aeschylus may not only have been the greatest of tragedians but the creator of the genre, the first to locate in dialogue the supreme intensities of human conflict . . . The formidable gaiety of the Platonic dialogues, the use of the dialectic as a method of intellectual chase, stems from the discovery that words, stringently tested, allowed to clash as in combat or manoeuvre as in a dance, will produce new shapes of understanding. (Steiner, p. 22.)

The idea then established a hold on Western consciousness when dialectics became a recognized discipline.

Apart from the term dialogue implying a conversation between two speakers, the literary model has also affected the other connotations the word holds for us today, namely that it should be based on a movement of ideas back and forth between the speakers, and that it should be based on a definite subject matter. A situation where one speaker dominates the discourse, the other merely interjecting his or her agreement, could not be called a dialogue in any significant sense, although there are two speakers involved, because it lacks the vital element of interchange, the dynamic of argument. And similarly a conversation which is essentially meaningless (and there are plenty of them — see the later section on phatic conversation), a conversation, for example, composed of stock formulae such as greetings or chit chat about the weather, would only be a very limited dialogue. A working definition of a dialogue is therefore that it is a dynamic and meaningful interchange between two persons, both of whom contribute something significant to the whole.

The specific qualities of literary dialogue will be examined later, but here I wish to mention briefly four main prerequisites of dialogue as such: co-operation, the observance of agreed rules, agenda, and context.

2.3.1 Prerequisites for dialogue

2.3.1.1 *Co-operation*

It is impossible to have a dialogue, an interchange, with someone who is unwilling to talk. One of the primary prerequisites for dialogue is therefore what H. P. Grice called the 'co-operative principle'. Both parties must combine in producing something which neither could have produced on their own: 'our talk exchanges do not normally consist of disconnected remarks, and would not be rational if they did. They are characteristically, to some degree at least, co-operative efforts; and each participant recognizes in them, to some extent, a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction'.[11] This co-operation involves assuming the coherence of the other person's utterances (Wardhaugh, p. 35), offering the right amount of information, being truthful, relevant, adequate, clear, brief, and orderly (p. 63). Now of course these guidelines are frequently breached, but it is a sign of their general acceptance that a person who does stray from what is normal behaviour stands out, and can be criticized for being long-winded, excessively guarded, or whatever.

An interesting proof of the joint nature of the exercise of conversation is that sometimes the participants may copy one another (p. 52) by sharing the same speech tempo, rhythms, and physical mannerisms. There is a natural tendency for speech activity to become synchronized, as anyone will know who has tried to stay calm with a furiously angry person or sulk when somebody else is

laughing. A common tone tends to be set for a conversation and it is difficult to hold out against this pressure to conform.

2.3.1.2 *Rules of conversation*

Conversation is a risky business. A speaker has to open him or herself up to another person and manoeuvre the conversation towards a final outcome. He or she will tend to guard against this outcome being disadvantageous for themselves. No one speaker can be in control, since there is an element of the incalculable in what the other may do. To minimize the risk inherent in conversation, each member of a society internalizes a set of rules similar to the grammar of a language. These rules ensure that the rights of each participant are respected and the danger of giving offence is minimized. In general these rules consist in being indirect about our aims in a conversation — directness being the exception rather than the rule (Wardhaugh, p. 33). We also tend 'to avoid the naked use of power or position and are generally reluctant to indulge in plain, blunt speaking in the form of either unequivocal commands or confrontational questioning' (p. 34).

The rules mean that silence must be avoided, subject matter must be negotiated as must endings — it is most unusual to break off a conversation unilaterally. The greatest degree of formality in any conversation is likely to be in the opening and closing stages (p. 129), for which many set formulae of salutation and valediction exist in all languages. Utterances are paired, 'and the pairing of utterances in conversation is so strong that you can regard a deliberate breaking of the paired relationship by a failure to supply the second member of the pair as a deliberately unco-operative act' (p. 72).

2.3.1.3 *Agenda and reference*

Another element is an agenda for discussion. A conversation has (with the important exception of so-called phatic exchanges, to which I shall return) to be about something, it has to be referential. But although the points of reference, the subject under discussion, may be fixed, the parties' view of them and their aims in the conversation will often be different. To cover all eventualities a subdivision has therefore to be made between public agenda, the course a conversation takes, which could be followed by an observer, and private agenda, the full picture of which is known only to the individual. The public agenda is open for negotiation and change throughout the entire course of the conversation, the private ones may remain hidden.

A partner may play the game of conversation, a game built on co-operation, but be trying to score points at the same time: 'an individual, "selfish" agenda may exist alongside a collective "co-operative" one, and it is often the tensions

between the two that become interesting, particularly to observers' (Wardhaugh, p. 56). Gains may be achieved not only by dominating the other party in speech, by using the rules to one's own advantage, but also by unfair play, by not stating one's own agenda: 'Obviously, we speak to communicate. But also to conceal, to leave unspoken. The ability of human beings to misinform modulates through every wavelength from outright lying to silence. This ability is based on the dual structure of discourse: our outward speech has "behind it" a concurrent flow of articulate consciousness' (Steiner, p. 46). Part of the dynamism of dialogue springs from each party's greater or lesser need to fulfil his or her own agenda coming into conflict with the desire of the other party to do the same thing.

But although the speakers in a dialogue are individuals, their exchange is a communal event. The meaning of a conversation is extremely fluid and is 'negotiated during the course of the conversation rather than directly expressed. What is going on, what is meant, depends on what has gone before, what is currently happening, and what may or may not happen. It is not fixed, but subject to constant review and reinterpretation' (Wardhaugh, p. 33). At any one point in a conversation each partner is likely to have a subtly different view of its meaning, its course, and its outcome. And in most conversations with any balance, the end product is influenced by both parties: 'many topics we try to introduce somehow quickly slip out of our control and take on a life of their own. A conversational topic is a consensual outcome, not a private programme or agenda' (p. 140).

2.3.1.4 *Conclusion*

The result of these conventions is that 'conversations are generally neither structured in advance nor are they entirely "free form"' (p. 75). Something may have been lost or gained, learned or conceded by either or both parties, i.e. something new will have happened, but in reaching their final positions they will have made use of a common heritage of tried and tested forms of language and behaviour.

2.3.1.5 *Phatic conversation*

The extreme form of rule-bound, and essentially meaningless conversation is so-called 'phatic conversation' as described by Roman Jakobson:

> There are messages primarily serving to establish, to prolong, or to discontinue communication, to check whether the channel works ('Hello, do you hear me?'), to attract the attention of the interlocutor or to confirm his continued attention . . . The endeavor to start and sustain communication is typical of talking birds; thus the phatic function of language is the only one they share with human beings. It is also the first verbal function acquired by infants; they are prone to communicate before being able to send or receive informative communication.[12]

Phatic conversations do not need much actual content because they consist of speech forms at the furthest remove from the truth-conveying function of language and much closer to the other function of language: mutual confidence-giving among human groups. Their purpose is the indication of social solidarity:

> They function much like human grooming behaviour in the animal world, showing only that the various parties acknowledge that they have a social bond which they have agreed to maintain . . . most conversations are so banal that they must have some other function than communication. They are part of the theatre of everyday life, commonplace and unremarkable in one sense but extraordinary and intriguing in another, in that they require people to exhibit such finely tuned skills and provide us with so much evidence of basic human goodwill. (Wardhaugh, p. 47.)

2.3.1.6 *Context*

Another factor contributory to meaning is that of shared context. For a dialogue to occur the participants must be linked by place (or its equivalent in the case, for example, of a telephone conversation), time (within wide boundaries — a series of letters can communicate dialogue) and medium, i.e. speech, writing, gesture, or some other sign. Another element of context is that of the relationship between the speakers. They may be well known to each other or strangers talking for the first time who will never meet again.

Context will generally be known to the speakers and may or may not become part of the subject matter of the conversation. But it is without doubt part of the meaning of the conversation and therefore of importance in analysis.[13] Indeed 'much that is said in conversation is so ambiguous as to be virtually incomprehensible outside the framework in which it occurs'.[14] For the most part, naturally occurring dialogue is not intended, and therefore not suitable for consumption by a third party. An eavesdropper cannot complain if he or she cannot understand what is going on because the relevant context is unknown to them. The dialogue is in no way deficient because it does not spell it out. The full meaning of a dialogue is therefore never ascertainable from the utterances alone.

2.3.2 THE STRUCTURE OF DIALOGUE

Two aspects of dialogue which I have already mentioned require further elucidation: the binary nature and the temporal dynamic.

2.3.2.1 *The binary structure of dialogue*

Dialogue is based on opposition in so far as any two speakers are bound to have separate identities. R. Petsch outlines two primary forms this opposition can take: that of question and answer (one person knows something or has something the other person wants access to) and that of challenge (the speakers cannot exist in equilibrium — one must be made to give way): 'Die beiden

Grundformen der "*Frage und Antwort*" und der "*Herausforderung und Abfertigung*" haben sich jedenfalls schon vor jedem dichterischen oder sonstwie geformten "Dialog" höherer Art entwickelt und begleiten ihn stetig'.[15] These primary forms account for many of the conventions of conversation, such as the pairing of utterances, the fact that a dialogue is often based on a disequilibrium between the speakers, and also the fact that nearly all speech can be characterized by its being addressed to someone: 'what all interpersonal dialogue mimes is the essential question-answer structure of all conversation — the inescapable need to address and, at some point, respond to another speaker'.[16] Lämmert also makes this point when he says that speech 'stets auf ein persönliches Gegenüber zielt, daß sie — als Ansprache an eine Runde so gut wie als Selbstgespräch, erst recht aber im gewöhnlichen Gebrauch — *Zwiesprache* ist' (Lämmert, p. 214, Lämmert's emphasis). Speech acts are not made into a void, and many speech acts are made in response to others. Thus we will often find that the content of a speech act is of less importance than the relationship in which it stands to other speech acts and, by extension, the relationship between the speakers which is thereby indicated.

A key factor in analysing what is going on in a dialogue is the balance or lack of it between the speakers. Petsch's two categories of question and answer and challenge both provide the possibility of one party dominating or being superior to the other, and although the rules of discourse on the whole prevent the naked use of power, much dialogue is based on disequilibrium. This may be formalized because of the roles of the speakers (teacher and pupil, officer and private and so on) or may be more subtle, but in any case 'the balance of speakers does provide, in a particular exchange or in a sequence of exchanges, the frame of interaction, while implicitly embodying something essential in the inner relationship of the speakers'.[17] This structuring principle of dialogue, which may be extremely fluid in real speech, becomes an important basis upon which literary dialogues are built, and an analysis of the balance of power in a literary dialogue will often be highly revelatory.

2.3.2.2 *Dialogue as an event*

Certain other characteristic features of dialogue derive from the temporal nature of speech. The fact that a dialogue is an event means that it is linear, it has internal continuity, and by its conclusion it has advanced the relationship of the speakers. The nature of speech as an event imposes an obligation upon the speakers to make themselves understood. One utterance must follow on from the other — a sense of discontinuity occurs when this is not the case. Even if a dialogue is not comprehensible to a third party because that party may not have access to the same contextual information, each speaker must know that the other can understand the frame of reference. If not he or she must explain him or herself. A speaker is not free to make disconnected remarks without giving an

excuse for so doing ('By the way . . .'). In general one utterance is bound in some way to the previous one and to the one following it. There is a strong bonding and linking of speeches.

Because it is an event, dialogue also has a dual possibility of bringing about irreversible change. It can first of all disclose something hitherto unknown, that is: the content of one speaker's speech can be new to the other. It can thereby alter the other person's consciousness. The content can also change the general state of affairs if a speech act has illocutionary force, for example the speech acts 'I promise' or 'I apologize'.[18] After the uttering of the act, providing that certain conditions have been fulfilled (for example that the speaker was sincere),[19] a promise or an apology has been made. But regardless of the content, a speech act can also be revolutionary because of the dynamic of interruption and change occasioned by it. The importance of this will be seen when it comes to the discussion of dialogue within narrative.

2.4 THE COMPOSITION OF NARRATIVE WORKS

Having looked at language and at certain characteristics of dialogue, I would like to turn to the all-important question of narrative context. I shall make some remarks about narrative in general before looking at literary dialogue. A narrative is a peculiar kind of speech act. It is not usually addressed to anyone in particular (although, as Iser and others have shown, it is in an important sense incomplete until it is reconstituted by a reader),[20] and it is not part of an interchange. The writer does not have to reckon with the possibility of overt contradiction and interruption. The agenda is his or hers alone. The constraints of conversation (to be brief, to be polite and so on) do not apply. A narrative is also a form which gives free reign to the creative capacity of language. The writer does not have to answer for the testable truth of what he or she writes.[21]

Yet the freedom which speaking into an apparent vacuum confers has as its reverse side certain demands of consistency and completeness. The work is a finished artefact. It has to be self-sufficient once it leaves the writer's hands. The reader cannot interrupt to ask questions, so all that he or she needs to appreciate the work has to be given. Since the writer and the reader will probably not share the same degree of context which two speakers would share, the writer must spell out within the work any context too important to be left to chance.

A narrative is also a strange kind of speech act in that it is not in itself an event in time. The amount of time taken to write it or to read it may be measured, but these statistics are not of interest in this connection. The reading of a work will be linear but the appreciation of it (as Iser has shown with his description of the process of a second reading)[22] is in large measure exempt from its linearity. Because of its extra-temporal nature, because it is a finished artefact, the parts of

a narrative relate to the whole in a way that does not depend upon mere temporal and causal linkages.

Another factor dividing narrative from other speech acts is its use of tense. The spoken word is characterized by its ability to use any tense. But the natural tense of narrative is the past. It is true that the effect of the epic preterite is to create not pastness but a fictional present, but nevertheless this present is contained within the fictional ordering that presupposes beginning, middle, and end.[23] To narrate implies knowledge of the past, knowledge of actions which are complete. This vantage point confers enormous power over the subject matter: the power to invent, to manipulate, to judge, curtail, select, edit.

All of these peculiarities of narrative lead one to see the fiction as an achieved artefact. It has long been a commonplace of literary theory that literature is no simple reduplication of life: 'To argue that the function of literature is to transmit unaltered a slice of life is to misconceive the fundamental nature of language itself: the very act of writing is a process of abstraction, selection, omission, and arrangement'.[24] Claims such as that of Christopher Isherwood's 'I am a camera with its shutter open, quite passive, recording, not thinking'[25] are regarded with scepticism. Narrative is by definition from a point of view: 'Toute description littéraire est une *vue*. On dirait que l'énonciateur, avant de décrire, se poste à la fenêtre, non tellement pour bien voir, mais pour fonder ce qu'il voit par son cadre même: l'embrasure fait le spectacle'.[26]

2.5 LITERARY DIALOGUE

Literary dialogue is a written approximation to spoken speech. It is subject to the same sorts of rules and constraints and conventions as spoken language. But in addition it tends to be both more compressed and more stylized than spoken language. The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly a literary dialogue is part of a larger whole, within which it has to achieve certain things. A certain efficiency is called for, the phatic function of speech must be reduced (unless the phatic function is part of the overall design). Secondly in a literary dialogue the extra-linguistic factors of real life speech have to be compensated for and can rarely be narratively encompassed in all their variety. John Fowles reminds us that novelists are not writing 'real' dialogue: 'Novel dialogue is a form of shorthand, an *impression* of what people actually say; and besides that it has to perform other functions—to keep the narrative moving (which real conversation rarely does), to reveal character (real conversation often hides it) and so on'.[27]

2.5.1 THE ROLE OF LITERARY DIALOGUE

In this section I intend to discuss some of the traditional roles ascribed to dialogue in narrative before going on to look at the actual structural differences between written and spoken dialogue.

2.5.1.1 *Characterization*

One frequently invoked function of dialogue is that it contributes to the process of characterization. In discussing characterization I prefer to distance myself from any concept of human essences which can be revealed, as though by drawing back a curtain. Character is a difficult enough concept when dealing with actual people, since people tend to be different things in different situations, while in a literary work it is a red herring, for in fiction character is a function of language. The very form of the word characterization indicates the fact that the characters, as part of the text, are the creations of the author. Character is a 'semantic construct, an aggregate of verbal and gestural indicators' (Steiner, p. 6). If a literary personage can be said to have any characteristics, these are deducible from what other people (for example the narrator) say about them, what they say themselves, or the way they interact verbally with others. The impression of character is created when the reader builds up a mental image of what they are like from the mix between this information and his or her own imagination.

Nevertheless an important part of the fascination which literary works hold for readers resides in this reconstruction of lifelike characters, and one of the main ways an author can give the impression of knowable people is to record their conversations using patterns of communication familiar to us all from daily intercourse, and by showing the participants speaking in different but equally recognizable ways, thus playing on the tendency of dialogue to contrast the speakers.

One method by which dialogue can be used to give the impression of two distinct individuals talking is to show that they are essentially involved in two monologues, that although they are co-operating in the joint exercise of dialogue, they are essentially working with private agendas. This notion is based on the gap felt in our common experience between the inner world of thought and feeling and the outer world where one communicates with spoken language. Petsch shows that

> sich in jedem dramatischen Dialog dasjenige in hoher Stilisierung regt, was sich im Leben ansatzweise und meist im Unterbewußtsein abspielt: auch wer zu andern spricht, redet immer zuerst für sich, um sich selbst über seine Lage, über seine Stellung zu den anderen und über seinen Willen klar zu werden. Immer behält er, in einem mitschwingenden Monologe, ein Letztes für sich.[28]

Grosse demonstrates this with a quotation from Grass's *Örtlich betäubt* where two characters involved in conversation talk past each other; and he comments, 'trotz der Verflochtenheit des Dialogs ist jeder Sprecher mit seinen Gedanken allein'. The simultaneity of dialogue is there used to good effect: 'Die Simultaneität verbindet die Sprechenden mit den Assoziationen, die der Rezipient herstellt, und sie trennt sie zugleich durch den syntaktischen Ablauf der Rede, der die Sprechenden in ihrer Isolation einschließt' (Grosse, p. 665).

Another way in which dialogue can be used to compare and contrast characters (a way which lies largely outside the scope of this study) is by use of idiolects. A writer can build up a character by making his or her speech distinctive in some recognizable way: by use of dialect, affectations, distinctive speech patterns or a combination of all of these resulting in the impression of an individual persona. Indeed, as Norman Page writes, 'the experience of repeatedly encountering well-known "voices" is one of the ways in which a sense of the distinctive world of a novel is acquired'.[29]

2.5.1.2 *Advancing the plot*

Because of the nature of a dialogue as an event, it is often used by the writer to advance his or her plot. A conversation, when recorded directly (as opposed to being in indirect speech), appears to happen in front of the reader's eyes, giving direct access to the actual words spoken. The reader is a party to what happens, it does not have to be described. Johann Jakob Engel pointed this out in 1774 when he wrote that '*in der Erzählung ist die Handlung bereits geschehen; in dem Gespräche geschieht sie eben jetzt im gegenwärtigem* [*sic*] *Augenblicke*'. He goes on to say that this makes a narrative writer more than just a narrator of stories. When he allows his characters to speak for themselves he is 'nicht mehr Erzähler; er wird auf diesen Augenblick dramatischer Schriftsteller'.[30]

Even the reporting of past actions can, owing to what Lämmert calls the 'ontologische Sonderheit des gesprochenen Wortes in der Erzählung', be made present: 'Der Erzähler kann durch Vermittlung einer Person weitausgedehnte, vielgliedrige Begebenheiten, fernabliegende Zustände und Schicksale *als* momentane Handlungen hervorbringen lassen: Die Rede *gibt* Erzählgegenstände und *ist* mit dieser Wiedergabe selbst gegenwärtiges Geschehen' (Lämmert, p. 209, Lämmert's emphasis). The use of dialogue to advance the plot has been said to be one of the prime characteristics of narrative. Käte Hamburger insists on this point when she writes that 'das Gespräch ja keineswegs nur die Gestalten selbst in ihrem Da- und Sosein darzustellen hat, es übernimmt auch in hohem Maße die rein schildernde Funktion des Erzählens'.[31]

2.5.1.3 *Heightening and releasing tension*

Apart from its use in advancing the plot, the dramatic potential of dialogue is also employed for heightening or releasing tension. A dramatic scene, Percy Lubbock tells us, accomplishes expensively in terms of time and space covered what might be accomplished for less with the summarizing capacity of narrative, so the novelist uses it mainly for the purpose for which it is supremely suited, namely 'to clinch a matter already pending, to demonstrate a result, to crown an effect half-made by other means'. Lubbock goes so far as to claim that drama has a pre-eminent position in narrative: 'Drama, then, gives the final stroke, it is the final stroke which it is adapted to deliver; and picture is to be

considered as subordinate, preliminary and preparatory'.[32] Although I feel he overstates his case here, he is right in his general claim that most writers do use dialogue at dramatically intense moments.

2.5.2 The patterning of literary dialogue

If the narrative work represents a written form of speech which is subject to various conventions, literary dialogue is similarly the product of a process of abstraction whereby the patterns of real speech are moulded to particular ends. But it remains mimetic. Most writers of dialogue feel a 'mimetic pull' (Kennedy, p. 10), a desire to imitate the speech patterns and grammar of real speech, to make their dialogue seem lifelike: 'However much the language of fictional narrative could flirt with the cadences and structures peculiar to pen and paper, writers have traditionally felt the urge to create dialogue, whether in prose or verse, in something resembling the image of daily speech'.[33]

However, a transcript of real speech inserted into a narrative would not be acceptable to either writer or reader. The discrepancies between real and written speech are quickly noticed, Grosse argues, when one listens to a tape recording of oneself speaking or tries to write a report of a discussion recorded on tape. The first is an embarrassing and strange experience, for one is surprised at one's own 'anscheinend stammelnde, oft von der Schulgrammatik abweichenden Syntax' (Grosse, p. 658). The second is bewildering for several reasons to do with the marked differences between spoken and written speech.

Various qualities of speech and of dialogue have been mentioned. A speech act is unique, though its content rarely is. In normal human speech surprisingly little truth is conveyed. A host of constraints and conventions operate to ensure that the endless possibilities given to speakers by grammar and by the diversity of situations they find themselves in are not made use of. Within a dialogue, context is of extreme importance in understanding what is going on, and the interaction with another person assures that a linearity is adhered to. A dialogue is a joint enterprise; and the wild leaps and gaps which occur in thought cannot, unless explained or apologized for, be used in dialogue. But it is also the case that no one party is in control of the course and outcome of the dialogue, and an element of the incalculable as to what the other party may do or say next is always present.

Literary dialogue is different in many respects. The utterance of a character in a novel is not a speech act as such in that it is not a unique event in time. It is a sentence or group of sentences in a written text. While a speech act is unretractable, a piece of dialogue can be written, edited and rewritten by the author during the writing process. Similarly it can be read and reread, dwelt on or ignored by the reader; its present tense, its 'now' is a repeatable moment, and an infinitely varied one, for it will be interpreted according to each reader's subtly

different reading of the text.[34] One result of this is that, although literary dialogue will imitate the linearity of real dialogue, it is in an important sense free from that linearity. A reader can see in the dialogue reflections and refractions of themes, images and ideas from elsewhere in the work of which the dialogue forms a part. This in turn brings us back to the unavoidable fact that the work is the creation of one mind, that of the author. He or she is in charge of the dialogue in a way in which no one is in overall charge of a real dialogue. He or she constructs it to suit his or her purposes by making use of a body of conventions which has been built up by successive generations of novelists.

The novelist writing dialogue lacks the context automatically present when any two real speakers converse. Since he or she relies on the written word, he or she also lacks such indicators as intonation, stress, and other phonological components of speech. Dialogue and its surrounding narrative must thus compensate for these factors and the result is that literary dialogue tends to be more heavily loaded with information than non-literary dialogue.[35] This gives it a 'clarity and precision that help to make "literary" dialogue essentially different from everyday talk — more self-explanatory and self-contained, sharper and surer in its effects, and therefore more memorable' (Page, pp. 8–9).

In comparison with real speech, literary speech is very compact. Despite the extra information it has to carry, it tends to be much more concise than spoken speech because of the need for economy within the narrative. For one thing, grammar is adhered to in a way that is rarely the case in genuine speech. People on the whole finish their sentences. They do not, as a rule, ramble (unless this serves their characterization, and even here it is a very artfully constructed version of rambling). They use language to convey information, to argue, to discuss, to express themselves, in other words they use it in a more active way than do people in real life. The redundancy of much spoken speech is not imitated (again unless this is precisely the point being made by the author).

Norman Page mentions three common conventions in the use of dialogue in the novel. There is a convention of total recall: dialogue, even in a first person narrative is reproduced 'without any reservations as to its accuracy or completeness: thus, conversations which are supposed to have taken place many years earlier are often given intact in all their details' (pp. 28–29). The novelist is also allowed to compress into a single speech what probably would have occurred as several speeches. The final convention is simply that when speech marks are used, the reader accepts that authentic utterances are being reproduced.

But it is of course very far from genuine speech. The effect of realism in the language is achieved, as in the novel as a whole, by stylization. Even writers whose characters speak in dialect, such as D. H. Lawrence or Alice Walker, to take two random examples, use a written stylization of a spoken speech which can only approximate, particularly to the ears of those unfamiliar with the real thing, to spoken speech.[36] And the same is true of the reproduction of slang in

the novel. Talking of novel dialogue Michal Glowinski writes 'seine Umgangssprachlichkeit und Gängigkeit resultiert nicht aus einer Reproduktion der lebendigen Rede, sondern aus der Herausbildung einer solchen Konvention, die die Illusion von Natürlichkeit, Gängigkeit usw. erzeugen hilft'.[37]

But although literary dialogue is 'likely to be more heavily burdened with informative and suggestive detail than the speech of everyday life' (Page, p. 8) and is undoubtedly more compressed and stylized, in another respect it is less rich. The variables at work in a speech situation, the shades of ambiguity, the possibilities for irony and for misunderstanding are potentially legion. The factors contributing to meaning in a speech situation can never all be listed. It is impossible to take into account everything to do with the speakers, their past relationships, their idiosyncratic use of language, the associations that objects, situations, words and phrases hold for them. A spoken dialogue is, as I continue to stress, a joint product, a literary dialogue is not, a spoken dialogue is normally produced by and for the speakers, a literary dialogue for consumption by a third unknown party, the reader, or in fact, a whole host of readers.

A literary dialogue is therefore in one sense less rich than a spoken one because it is a construct and its variables are limited. To attempt to reproduce the multifariousness, the open-endedness of extra-literary dialogue, is impossible. Grosse makes this point when he writes that 'die situationsbedingte Rollenvielfalt jedes Sprechenden literarisch kaum gestaltungsfähig ist, da sie beim Lesen den Eindruck verwirrender Inkonsequenz in der Zeichnung der Figuren hervorrufen würde' (Grosse, p. 663).

A writer who treads the very fine line between exploring to the full the multiplicity of meaning possible in dialogue and yet obeying the narrative need for a forward impetus in the plot, is Ivy Compton Burnett. She uses dialogue as the major narrative vehicle in her novels, which produces a peculiar effect because it presents the action

> in eine unmittelbare Gegenwart . . . Wenn sich aber alles nur in der Gegenwart abspielt, dann verdrängt die Dialogfolge jede außerhalb ihrer liegende Realität. Demzufolge schrumpft das Panorama gesellschaftlicher Wirklichkeit, das zu seiner Entfaltung der Staffelung von Gegenwart und Vergangenheit bedarf; da sich der Autor gleichzeitig hinter die Dialogfolge zurückgezogen hat und sich aller nennenswerten Eingriffe enthält, schwindet die Möglichkeit, dem Dauergespräch einen gerafften Hintergrund zu schaffen. Die daraus entspringende Verselbständigung der Gespräche macht die nach allen Seiten beziehungsfähigen Äußerungen der Figuren selbst hintergründig. Ihre völlige Isolierung von der sonst im Roman beschriebenen Welt gibt der nie abreißenden Gesprächsfolge das Unheimliche nicht ausschöpfbarer, weil niemals endgültig zu fixierende Beziehungen.[38]

There is a sense of danger and of openness in her dialogues which forces the reader to acknowledge the inherent ambiguity of all language for 'her characters don't only specialize in speaking; they're also expert listeners, bristling with fine antennae'[39] and so at any one point it is possible for the next utterance to surprise

the reader by altering the direction of the discourse. This style, when it does not quite come off, is bewildering. When it works, it gives an exhilarating sense of liveliness and intelligence.

In general then, literary dialogue is stylized and 'remains a distinct type of language; it is not spoken language written down'.[40] It is a reconstruction[41] of elements from life which are brought together to form a new type of language with its own peculiarities. It sets a peculiar challenge to the author, for the effect of realism so often required by his or her readers is achieved by artifice. Page refers to this as the central dilemma for the writer of dialogue, for the writer 'seeks to create by the use of one medium the effect of language used in another, and if there is a means by which this can be accomplished, however incompletely, it is certainly not by the slavish reproduction of the features of actual speech' (Page, p. 10).

The traps he or she may fall into are many. The writer of dialogue

> is synthesizing a 'spoken' language that will never be spoken . . . He has to imagine all the circumstances, all the effects upon his characters, and at the same time has to give the impression of fluidity of utterance without on the one hand falling into the profundities of formal, conventional prose, or on the other hand committing to paper the confusions and obscurities of actual speech.[42]

2.6 DIALOGUE AS SUBJECT TO THE CONTROL OF THE NARRATOR

There are many ways in which dialogue can be said to be subject to the control of the narrator within the overall scheme of the text. Firstly there are stylistic changes which occur in the text when a character's speech is introduced.

The first and most obvious of these is speech marks. They are the conventional sign of demarcation between the narrator's and the characters' discourse. Speech marks are a signal to the reader of a change in the origin of the words encapsulated within them.[43] They signify that the narrator bears a different kind of responsibility for them: they are not generally his or her own, for authorship of them is attributed to someone else, the distance between them and the narrative being indicated by the use of speech marks. Yet the narrator is, within the conventions of story telling that ascribe to him or her a persona, still responsible for them, for he or she has chosen to make them a part of the tale. They would not be reproduced but for this choice.

Moreover there are many devices which allow a narrator to signal his or her controlling presence behind a passage of dialogue. Phrases such as 'she said', 'he snapped', 'they joked', 'I replied' bear a number of indicators to the reader as to how he or she is to interpret the piece of speech which they introduce. The speech is attributed to a certain speaker, which lessens any confusion which might otherwise arise. This shows that the narrator is certain of what he or she is

reporting, it demonstrates his or her hold on the subject matter. These phrases also contain information as to the position of a certain speech within an interchange. The speech can be a greeting, an opening statement, a reply, a question and so on. In addition to this relatively neutral information, any level of bias in the narrator towards the characters is possible. Phrases such as 'she leered', 'he whined', 'they said ingratiatingly' imply a distinct attitude on the part of the narrator towards his or her characters which directs the reader's thoughts. Cohn, talking of a monologist in a third person text, says he is

> always more or less subordinated to the narrator, and our evaluation of what he says to himself remains tied to the perspective (neutral or opinionated, friendly or hostile, empathic or ironic) into which the narrator places him for us. Even a title (*Mr* Bloom), or an adjective (*poor* Emma) affects our interpretation of what a character is quoted as thinking.[44]

This applies equally to dialogue in a text.

Tacked on to these basic stage directions can be further commentary by the narrator which serves largely to make up for the lack of extra-linguistic indicators such as context, facial expression, movement and gesture. And the presentation of the speech itself can try to make up for the lack of intonation, stress, volume, vocal quality, etc. This can be achieved by such devices as capitalization, italicization and hyphenation (see Page, pp. 26–27).

A narrator is, almost by definition, dedicated to continuity and wholeness. He or she has a story to tell, an end to be reached, and his or her subject matter will be manipulated to this end. So while he or she may exploit the dramatic potential of dialogue at times to keep up the reader's interest, he or she will ultimately shy away from using its explosive potential to the full for fear of not being able to reassert any sense of direction at the end: 'Der kluge Erzähler wird sich davor hüten, "drastisch" zugespitzte Dialoge bis zum äußersten fortzuführen, denn er kann nachher den abgerissenen Faden des Berichts viel schwerer wieder anknüpfen als der Dramatiker seine Darstellung fortführt'.[45] Dissent from the narratorial voice is dangerous, for any voice which becomes too powerful might threaten to become more attractive to the reader than that of the narrator and might subvert the tale.

For this reason the poetics of narrative tend to produce a narrator who is relatively assured as an interpretative voice and even slightly authoritarian. (Exceptions will immediately spring to mind, but I do feel that this is a useful generalization.) The origin of this tendency is historical. In an interesting article, 'Der Dialog im Roman', Michal Glowinski traces this idea back to the specific nineteenth-century *Romankultur* where the voice of the narrator represented the prevalent views among the reading public: 'innerhalb dieser Kultur durfte der Erzähler nur im Namen des sanktionierten kollektiven Bewußtseins sprechen' (p. 3). The narrator's voice was not allowed to be colourful in the way that a

character's was, he or she could not speak in dialect or affect mannerisms which would alienate his or her readers.

Glowinski posits the idea of seeing the narrative surrounding dialogue as a 'metasprachliche Äußerung' in relation to the dialogues because it often carries within it the desired interpretation of that dialogue and it creates the conditions under which the dialogue can be reproduced (p. 7). Narration can give a commentary on the dialogue and an introduction to the interruption which the dialogue entails. Because of all this it is in a superior position and can serve to direct the reader's thoughts: 'Und eben darum geht es: der narrative Kommentar zu den zitierten Äußerungen ist eine Form ihrer Unterordnung, ein Mittel, ihnen ihre Selbständigkeit zu nehmen' (p. 8). Narrative commentary on dialogue is thus in a position of power, for 'er dient der Einführung von in jeder Hinsicht unterschiedlichen Dialogäußerungen in die Ordnung der Narration, in ihre stilistische, ideologische und moralische Ordnung' (p. 8).

But since this task is fulfilled by the use of a limited number of formulae, this metalanguage is much more formalized and inherently less varied than the speech it encapsulates: 'Dies stellt einen deutlichen Kontrast zum Reichtum und zur Differenzierung der Dialogrede selbst dar' (pp. 8–9). The greater freedom of dialogue to introduce variables will be discussed in the next section, but for the moment it is important to notice the far greater degree of authority invested in the narrator's words than in the dialogue. Glowinski demonstrates this with the example of the use of sayings. If one occurs in the narration 'so wird es im allgemeinen zu einer autoritativen Feststellung; sobald es hingegen im Dialog auftritt, hängt es von der Situation ab, in der es vorkommt, wird es zum Element des Idiolekts der Person und des besonderen Spiels, an dem diese teilnimmt, und ändert in Abhängigkeit davon seine Bedeutung' (p. 10). The power of the narrator is also felt in his prerogative to judge the characters without their having any recourse to defence. But who in turn can judge him?: 'Die Person kann falsche Meinungen vermitteln, sie kann sich irren; die Narration dagegen, zumindest in dem Romantypus, den wir hier als Muster akzeptiert haben, spricht die Wahrheit und ist fehlerfrei' (p. 10).

2.7 DIALOGUE'S POTENTIAL TO ESCAPE THE CONTROL OF THE NARRATOR

While dialogue may seem subordinate to the narrator, it is important to bear in mind that the narrator too is a created element in the text. It is perfectly possible, within the overall structure of the text, for narrator and characters, narrative and dialogue, to be played off against one another. Indeed narrative is inherently a mixed form standing between the lyric, where the poet's voice is all, and the drama, where the writer speaks only through his or her characters. Narrative draws elements from both and its success or failure very often

depends on the skilful intermingling of the two (see Lämmert, p. 199). The potential tensions in this area are crucial for the design of the work: 'Nicht nur, daß zwischen der Meinung der Personen und der "wahren" Meinung des Erzählers oft eine Spannung besteht, die zur Analyse reizt — auch zwischen der Aussage der Person und dem Fortgang des Geschehens besteht eine natürliche Spannung' (Lämmert, p. 196). The distinction between the utterances of the narrator and those of the characters is 'ein grundsätzlicher Zug des Textaufbaus des epischen Werkes'.[46]

Dialogue in narrative always constitutes an interruption. The narrator ceases to narrate, to describe his or her characters and lets them speak for themselves. Although he or she acts as editor to their speech, his or her voice is no longer heard and will only be heard again when the interruption finishes and the story is resumed. Dialogue offers a counter to the narrative in the possibility of lexical and syntactic contrast. It thus has an initial inherent advantage over narrative in that it automatically attracts the reader's attention by the novelty of introducing new perspectives: 'Jedesmal kann die fiktive Gestalt neue, sich vom Standpunkt des Erzählers unterscheidende Sprecherperspektiven und -aspekte eröffnen. Stets rückt der Autor in den Hintergrund, weil der Leser vergißt und vergessen soll, daß der wörtlich sprechende Gewährsmann nur frei erfunden ist' (Grosse, p. 655). Lämmert describes a natural tension between the dialogue and the surrounding narrative. Glowinski posits an inverse relationship between the continuity of them both:

> Jeder Dialog stellt eine Unterbrechung der Kontinuität der Narration dar. Diese Unterbrechung kann in verschiedener Weise verlaufen und verschiedene Grade der Deutlichkeit aufweisen. Sie wird um so augenfälliger sein, je größer die Disrekrepanz zwischen dem Erzählstil und dem Stil der zitierten Rede ist . . . Allgemein kann man sagen, daß das Verhältnis zwischen der Kontinuität der Narration und der Kontinuität des Dialogs, in dieser Sicht, umgekehrt proportional ist: je kontinuierlicher die Narration, desto diskontinuierlicher der Dialog; je diskontinuierlicher die Narration, desto kontinuierlicher der Dialog. Die Darstellung einer Szene aus der Nähe bedeutet immer eine mehr oder weniger einschneidende Unterbrechung der Kontinuität der Narration, eben diese Darstellungsweise ist jedoch eine wesentliche Bedingung für die Kontinuität des Dialogs. (Glowinski, p. 14.)

A passage of direct speech or dialogue creates the effect of immediate reality, and gives the impression of authenticity. The reader appears suddenly to have direct access to events and characters for the mediator, the narrator, has temporally withdrawn. The possibility of ambiguity of meaning between narrative and dialogue opens up, the narrator 'schafft durch die Einfügung der Personenrede eine echte Zweidimensionalität des Vorgangs' (Lämmert, p. 201). The dimension of speech may hold more appeal for the reader because elements of the narrator's story which would have appeared distant and controlled had they merely been narrated can, through the 'ontologische Sonderheit des gesprochenen Wortes in der Erzählung', be made present, the tense can be

switched from the past historic to the present, the verbs from passive to active: 'Der Erzähler kann durch Vermittlung einer Person weitausgedehnte, vielgliedrige Begebenheiten, fernabliegende Zustände und Schicksale *als* momentane Handlungen hervorbringen lassen: Die Rede *gibt* Erzählgegenstände und *ist* mit dieser Wiedergabe selbst gegenwärtiges Geschehen' (p. 209).

2.8 CONCLUSION

Stifter has often been accused of writing in a way that is so stylized, so abstract, so controlled, that spontaneity and subjectivity are excluded. Critics are sometimes particularly harsh about his dialogue. Walter Benjamin described it thus: 'Die Sprache wie sie bei Stifter die Personen sprechen ist ostentativ. Sie ist ein zur Schaustellen von Gefühlen und Gedanken in einem tauben Raum. Die Fähigkeit irgendwie "Erschütterung" darzustellen deren Ausdruck der Mensch primär in der Sprache sucht fehlt ihm absolut'.[47]

It is my contention that critics who argue thus do not understand what Stifter was trying to do or what he in fact achieved. It is true that his later works and many of his dialogues are more rigid and less lifelike than those of many other writers. But as I have shown, all literature is an artefact, a created thing, and it is a misconception of the nature of literature and particularly of literary dialogue, to accuse it of not being directly mimetic of life. Abstraction and stylization are present in different degrees in all literary works, although their presence may be more or less evident. What is relevant is how the parts of a work relate to each other and to the whole, and not how the work relates to empirical reality. As Iser reminds us: 'Fiktion ist Form ohne Realität'.[48] The strangeness of some of Stifter's dialogues comes from the fact that he makes obvious the conventions and stylization upon which literary dialogue is based. But this does not mean that his dialogues are lifeless, for unaligned subjectivity is sometimes allowed a voice; and when this occurs, the dialogues can be startling in the extreme and, in some cases, deeply moving, precisely because the stylization is elsewhere so sustained. While understanding Benjamin's frustration that Stifter's dialogue is not directly mimetic, one may also argue that in some of his finest dialogue 'Erschütterung' is precisely what he does achieve.

Consideration of the relationship between Stifter's dialogues and the narratives of which they form a part will also show that he is less clearly didactic and more aesthetically creative than is often supposed. While his narrators sometimes stress the didactic model, the dialogue often contrasts uncomfortably with the narrative, thus causing the reader to search for the meaning of the text at the point of intersection between the two. It is this surprising openness of form and of import that makes Stifter's best works the mature artistic statements that they are. Iser again reminds us of the importance of form when he writes 'daß literarische Texte wohl in erster Linie nicht deshalb als geschichtsresistent erscheinen, weil sie

ewige Werte darstellen, die vermeintlicherweise der Zeit entrückt sind, sondern eher deshalb, weil ihre Struktur es dem Leser immer wieder von neuem erlaubt, sich auf das fiktive Geschehen einzulassen' (pp. 248–49).

Iser in this observation highlights a general property of imaginative fiction. I suspect I am not the only reader who finds that Stifter's works not only allow but also demand that we constantly re-enter them. It is my contention in this study that part of the fascination of his art derives from his manipulation of dialogue. As we shall see in the sections of detailed analysis that follow, many of the characteristic features of literary dialogue which I have just discussed are present in his *œuvre*. I am thinking, for example, of the inherent drama of dialogue, the sense that it is an event in time that can engender other acts; of the interplay between ritualized (phatic) exchanges and dynamic confrontations. Above all else I am thinking of the question of the relationship between the narrator's control of his or her account on the one hand and the inroads of the characters' subjectivity on the other. At this particular interface Stifter often takes risks. And the resultant shock waves pass like an electric charge through the pages of imperturbable prose for which he is so famous (or notorious).

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Susan Sontag, *Against Interpretation and other essays* (New York, 1961), p. 12.
2. Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse* (London, 1977; first published 1927), p. 165.
3. Robertson Davies, *What's Bred in the Bone* (Harmondsworth, 1987; first published 1985), p. 176.
4. J. L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words* (Oxford, 1962) and John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge, 1969).
5. Stanley E. Fish, 'How to do Things with Austin and Searle: Speech Act Theory and Literary Criticism', *MLN*, 91 (1976), 983–1025, and Reinhard Schmachtenberg, *Sprechakttheorie und dramatischer Dialog: ein Methodenansatz zur Drameninterpretation*, Linguistische Arbeiten, 120 (Tübingen, 1982).
6. George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford, 1975), p. 130.
7. Siegfried Grosse, 'Literarischer Dialog und gesprochene Sprache', in *Festschrift für H. Eggers zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by H. Backes (Tübingen, 1972), pp. 649–88 (p. 661).
8. Roland Barthes, 'Écrivains, intellectuels, professeurs', *Tel Quel*, 47 (1971), 3–18 (p. 3).
9. Eberhard Lämmert, *Bauformen des Erzählens* (Stuttgart, 1955), p. 199.
10. Richard Wardhaugh, *How Conversation Works* (Oxford, 1985), p. 69 (Wardhaugh's emphasis).
11. H. P. Grice, 'Logic and Conversation' (1975), quoted in Andrew K. Kennedy, *Dramatic Dialogue: The Duologue of Personal Encounter* (Cambridge, 1983), p. 9.
12. Roman Jakobson, 'Linguistics and Poetics', in *The Structuralists from Marx to Lévi-Strauss*, edited by Richard T. De George and Fernande M. De George (New York, 1972), pp. 85–122 (p. 92).
13. See Wardhaugh, p. 89: 'the total meaning of an utterance derives from its context as well as from the actual grammatical form it takes'.
14. Ibid., p. 90. See also Grosse, p. 659: 'Die Situation der unmittelbaren Umgebung wirkt mit ihren außersprachlichen Faktoren beträchtlich auf den spontanen Gesprächsverlauf ein'.
15. R. Petsch, 'Der epische Dialog', *Euph.*, 32 (1931), 187–205 (p. 189; Petsch's emphasis). He later (p. 190) characterizes these two forms as 'die beiden Formen des Wissen-Wollens und des Überwinden-Wollens'.
16. Andrew K. Kennedy, *Dramatic Dialogue: The Duologue of Personal Encounter*, p. 7.
17. Kennedy, pp. 12–13, and further, p. 14: 'the dynamic balance, or imbalance, of speech between speakers is always significant and often offers a key to interpreting the more subtle forms of interaction between characters who have entered a (shared or contested) territory of exchange within a certain structure of dialogue'.

18. See Searle, pp. 23–25 for other examples of verbs denoting illocutionary acts and an elaboration of the concept.
19. See Searle, pp. 66–67 for a table showing the rules governing types of illocutionary act.
20. See Wolfgang Iser, 'Die Appellstruktur der Texte', in *Rezeptionsästhetik: Theorie und Praxis*, edited by Rainer Warning (Munich, 1975), p. 229: 'Bedeutungen literarischer Texte werden überhaupt erst im Lesevorgang generiert; sie sind das Produkt einer Interaktion von Text und Leser'.
21. This is meant in an immediate sense: the writer is of course subject to all sorts of social, economic, and cultural restraints as to what he or she may write, and is also the product of his or her own circumstances, so that even the use of the imagination does not cut his or her ties with reality.
22. Wolfgang Iser, 'Der Lesevorgang: eine phänomenologische Perspektive', in *Rezeptionsästhetik: Theorie und Praxis*, pp. 253–76 (p. 259).
23. For a discussion of 'das epische Präteritum' see Käte Hamburger, 'Zum Strukturproblem der epischen und dramatischen Dichtung', *DVLG*, 25 (1951), 1–26 (pp. 3–7).
24. Norman Friedman, 'Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept', *PMLA* 70 (1955), 1160–84 (p. 1179). See also Grosse, p. 657: 'Das Nacheinander der syntaktischen Fugungsfolge, das punktartige Zugleich großer Assoziationsketten, der weite semantische Interpretations- und Verstehensspielraum und die Notwendigkeit der Umsetzung des mit den Sinnen Wahrgenommenen in Sprache ist ein hochgradiger Abstraktionsvorgang, dessen wir uns aus der mangelnden Distanz der täglichen Übung nicht bewußt sind'.
25. Christopher Isherwood, *Goodbye to Berlin* (London, 1939).
26. Roland Barthes, *S/Z* (Paris, 1970), p. 61. See also Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago, 1961), p. 20: 'though the author can to some extent choose his disguises, he can never choose to disappear', and p. 116: 'The author cannot choose whether to use rhetorical heightening. His only choice is of the kind of rhetoric he will use'.
27. John Fowles, 'Notes on an Unfinished Novel', in *The Novel Today: Contemporary Writers on Modern Fiction*, edited by Malcolm Bradbury (Manchester, 1977), pp. 136–50 (p. 139; Fowles's emphasis).
28. R. Petsch, *Wesen und Formen des Dramas* (Halle, 1945), p. 364, quoted from Käte Hamburger, 'Zum Strukturproblem der epischen und dramatischen Dichtung', p. 17.
29. Norman Page, *Speech in the English Novel*, English Language Series, 8 (London, 1973), p. 15.
30. Johann Jakob Engel, *Über Handlung, Gespräch und Erzählung*, edited by Ernst Theodor Voss (Stuttgart, 1964; first published 1774), pp. 55–56 (Engel's emphasis).
31. Käte Hamburger, *Die Logik der Dichtung*, third edition (Frankfurt, 1977), p. 157.
32. Percy Lubbock, *The Craft of Fiction* (London, 1921), pp. 268–69.
33. Randolph Quirk, *Foreword* to Norman Page, *Speech in the English Novel*, p. vii. See also Michal Glowinski, 'Der Dialog im Roman', *Poet*, 6 (1974), 1–16 (p. 5), and I. A. Gorden: 'Dialogue . . . consistently echoes the accepted speech of the day', quoted in Page, p. 162.
34. See Iser, 'Die Appellstruktur der Texte', p. 229: 'generiert der Leser die Bedeutung eines Textes, so ist es nur zwangsläufig, wenn diese in einer je individuellen Gestalt erscheint'.
35. See Page, p. 9: 'Dialogue in a novel, which is written to be read, usually silently, will necessarily involve a redistribution of balance whereby the words themselves may carry as much as possible of that proportion of the total meaning which, in the spoken language, is conveyed by phonological features . . . Dialogue is likely, therefore, to be fuller and more explicit in its statements, lacking the suggestions and implications, the undertones and overtones, which may constitute a significant dimension of even the most trivial utterances'.
36. Siegfried Grosse demonstrates this point in his article when he analyses passages from Siegfried Lenz, Peter Handke, Günter Grass, and Max Frisch. He concludes (p. 666) that 'auch die scheinbar gesprochene Sprache in der neuen Literatur ist ein geschriebener Text', and (p. 668) that 'die wörtliche Rede wird kunstvoll stilisiert und bewußt als rhetorischer, figurenreicher Extrakt von der gesprochenen Sprache abgehoben, um Person und Situation in dieser gewollten Distanzierung zu charakterisieren'.
37. Michal Glowinski, 'Der Dialog im Roman', pp. 6–7.
38. Iser, *Der implizite Leser: Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett* (Munich, 1972), pp. 237–38.
39. Peter Kemp, *TLS*, 21 June 1985, p. 696.
40. Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens, 1964, quoted in Page, p. 162. They are writing specifically of dramatic dialogue, but what they say applies equally to all literary dialogue.
41. See Glowinski, p. 2. Novel dialogue is a written dialogue, 'ein Dialog also, in dem die Redesituationen nicht unmittelbar gegeben sind, sondern erst auf Grund dieser und jener Elemente rekonstruiert werden müssen'.

42. A. H. Smith and R. Quirk, 1955, quoted in Page, pp. 161–62.
43. See for example the *MHRA Style Book: Notes for Authors, Editors, and Writers of Dissertations*, Third Edition (London, 1981), p. 24 where the authors acknowledge, in their guidance for the use of quotation marks, the fact that quotation marks imply by definition the introduction of another voice: 'Avoid the practice of using quotation marks as an oblique excuse for a loose, slang, or imprecise (and possibly inaccurate) word or phrase. Quotation marks should normally be reserved to indicate direct quotation from other writers'.
44. Dorrit Cohn, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, 1978), p. 66 (Cohn's emphasis).
45. R. Petsch, 'Der epische Dialog', pp. 197–98.
46. Lubomir Dolezel, quoted in Glowinski, p. 1.
47. Walter Benjamin, *Briefe*, edited by Gershom Scholem and Theodor W. Adorno (Frankfurt, 1966), I, 197.
48. Iser, 'Die Appellstruktur der Texte', p. 231.

CHAPTER III

DER BESCHRIEBENE TÄNNLING: A TEST CASE

> 'We novelists must be grateful to the Spanish Inquisition for having discovered, before any critic did, the inevitably subversive nature of fiction.'
> Mario Vargas Llosa[1]

3.1 INTRODUCTION: DIALOGUE AS ARTICULATORY TOOL

I wish now to bring together some of the points raised in my first two chapters by looking in detail at the role of dialogue in one short work, namely one of the *Studien* called *Der beschriebene Tännling*. The work exists in two versions, the *Journalfassung* published in 1845, and the later *Studienfassung* which appeared in 1850. This is therefore one of the works where the rewriting process is of interest. Falling roughly in the middle of Stifter's creative life, the second version of the story has none of the youthful excesses of Stifter's early prose. It anticipates the later work in its willed objectivity, and also in some passages of highly stylized writing. As has been shown to be the case with *Turmalin*, *Kalkstein*, and *Bergkristall*, the reader is invited to interpret the work by reading between the lines of contradictory impulses within the text. But in this story the role played by the passages of direct speech is particularly crucial. In *Der beschriebene Tännling* more than in many of Stifter's other *Studien*, the direct speech and dialogue consistently serve as a focus of the tensions and conflicts residing in the text.

As in so much of Stifter's work there is a conflict between the moral intent of the narrative and the actual balance of sympathies within the text. The story is, at its most basic level, a cautionary tale about a young girl who sets herself apart from the inhabitants of her local community and marries a rich nobleman, spurning the poor but utterly devoted man whom everyone assumed she would marry. But the girl, Hannah, is not happy with her new-found fortune, while Hanns, her rejected suitor, though remaining humble, is rewarded with surrogate children: he adopts those of his dead sister. Once again the central figures of Stifter's story are not unproblematic members of the community — Hanna has always been different from the other children in the village, and

Hanns's attraction to her is the start of his undoing. Once again too the clear moral outline is clouded by the awakening of the reader's sympathy for the protagonists caught up in love relationships which cannot work. Hanna gets her man but does not become happy, neither does she learn the error of her ways; Hanns is the moral victor for he overcomes the baser side of his nature, but our last encounter with him shows a poor man with a furrowed brow whose memory of the past injustice done to him is undiminished (he recognizes her though she does not recognize him).[2] He never comes to understand that he and Hanna are fundamentally unsuited to each other. No one gains or profits from the events in the story, but rather four lives (those of the central couple, of Guido, Hanna's husband, and of Hanna's mother who is rumoured to be unhappy in her new abode) are shown to follow a sad course which unfolds with an unstoppable inevitability.

These central events are only a part of the picture presented. Behind them is a thematic complex concerning faith and superstition, obedience and temptation, seduction and despoiling. These themes are touched upon first in a lengthy preamble to the story[3] where the setting and associated legends are introduced. There is first of all the *Tanne*, an ancient pine tree, known as the *beschriebener Tännling* because generations of lovers have carved their names in its bark ever since it was a young tree; there is a strange rock called the *Milchbäuerin* because a beautiful farmer's wife was turned to stone there for ignoring a spiritual message; there are two little huts covering a spring, the water from which once restored the power of sight to a blind man who had the faith to believe his dreams; and finally there is the church containing a picture of the Virgin Mary found at the scene of this same miracle. The story of Hanns and Hanna is introduced as being itself a part of the folk memory of the people: 'Zur Zeit, als das Kirchlein auf dem Berge schon stand, als es aber noch so früh war, daß eben die Tage unserer Großeltern im Anbrechen waren, lebte in dem weißen Häuschen eine Frau . . .' (S. 390).[4] They too fit into the pattern of meaning given by the community to its past.[5] Hanna, like the *Milchbäuerin*, is beautiful but wilful. She ignores the tragic implications of the pietà tableau in her dream and sees only the glory of the Virgin, interpreting this to mean that she herself will one day be rich. Her wish comes true, but she remains emotionally unfulfilled. Hanns on the other hand, like the blind man, has his vision restored by his mystical experience. He is saved from spiritual blindness.

These themes are further exemplified in the story of the hunt which forms the backdrop to and actually brings about the fateful meeting of Hanna and Guido. The affair between the poor village girl and the young nobleman, unequal in everything except their beauty, is mirrored in the seduction of the local community by the extravagance and violence of the hunt which is as alien yet attractive to it as Guido is to Hanna. The hunt is felt, not by the villagers but by the discerning reader who follows the hints in the text, to be an intrusive

despoliation of the innocent countryside.[6] The interpretative framework of the didactic story (wayward individualism being punished) is perceived to be not quite so stable as it might at first appear: the community which blames Hanna for her behaviour and sees her to be an aberration, is itself rocked by temptation, seduced by glamour. A more serious wrongdoing than Hanna's betrayal of Hanns is committed by the noblemen whose behaviour is not based on any noble code of conduct, and by the villagers who are won over to the excitement and the blood lust of the spectacle played out in front of them.

The narrator gives no clues as to how the religious events are to be viewed, he does not pass comment on the hunt or on the central events, and he does not draw attention to the thematic links between the various parts of the story. Instead he remains reticent, giving a laconic, factual account, often preferring to depict events through the eyes of the crowd and to relay only what a detached observer would see. Thus for example the undoubted criticism of the hunt contained in the story is not made explicit by the narrator, for he describes the hunt from the point of view of the villagers who are excited by it. The reader can be sure of this criticism only by looking at the text as a whole and relativizing the narrator's attitude to the point where it became just one of the many indicators which help to establish meaning.

Critics have disagreed about the structure of the work. Eric A. Blackall claims that the story 'has all the occasional weaknesses of his [Stifter's] writing: diffuseness, lack of proportion, and no incisiveness in the presentation of the theme'.[7] Others are more perceptive, arguing that there is a sustained, albeit understated, formal coherence to the work. Lenel, for example, talks of the miraculous elements being 'like colored stones in a mosaic, lending the whole a certain hue. The reader is supposed to sense these elements subliminally rather than perceive them outright'.[8] Lachinger also uses the image of a mosaic in describing Stifter's depiction of the hunt: 'wie bei einem Mosaik entsteht das Bild einer Ganzheit aus Partikeln'. He is particularly sensitive to Stifter's method of letting the truth emerge from a plethora of apparently neutral detail:

> Stifter läßt die erzählten Fakten für sich selbst sprechen, aus ihnen und aus der Figurenrede muß sich der Leser sein Urteil bilden. Allerdings, und das ist eine bei Adalbert Stifter wiederholt angewandte Technik der Insinuation von Bedeutungszusammenhängen und Werturteilen, verleiht er Handlungselementen, Gesprächen, Gestischem usw. ausgeprägte Symbolfunktion, so daß sich erst mittelbar und oft genug in merkwürdiger Ambivalenz ein deutbares Sinngefüge ergibt. (Lachinger, p. 105.)

Lachinger mentions the importance of the conversations for the interpretation of this work. Johannes Klein goes into more detail about them. He points out the thematic unity of the story and also the disruptive effects of the passages of dialogue:

> Legende und Handlung aber sind innig aufeinander bezogen. Dadurch wird der Realismus der Auswahl eigentümlich durchlichtet. Die Entscheidungen, die hier fallen, verweisen

auf einen höheren geistigen Bereich. Denn in der Legende wie im einfachen Leben des Hanns kommen die gleichen Züge vor: die Erschließung des Auges und die Erkenntnis des eigentlichen Wesens der Liebe. — Es ist dabei fesselnd, wie in der an sich so wortkargen Handlung einige wenige lakonische Gespräche zum Aufhorchen zwingen. Sie weisen auf die Gefahr. Die Gefahr selbst wird verschwiegen. (Klein, p. 212.)

Klein touches here on the crucial role of dialogue in the story which other critics have failed to see, and also on the strange nature of that dialogue. It is crucial because it gives pointers to the hidden dangers of the story and thus contradicts the narrative statement which often seems oblivious to such negative implications. Within the overall thematic structure of the story, then, it complements the narrative. And although the passages of dialogue are rare in this 'so wortkargen Handlung' and the dialogue itself is laconic and simple in the extreme, these passages nevertheless command the attention of the reader. The dialogues serve to articulate (in the sense of to voice) themes and undercurrents for which the narrator does not want to take full responsibility, and to articulate (in the sense of to provide connections between) the various parts of the story. Dialogue thus both unifies the work and breaks it up. The passages of direct speech are thematically integrated into the work, yet they also interrupt the narrator's otherwise seamless account. The reader is forced, by the breaks occasioned through passages of dialogue, to seek meanings among a kaleidoscope of shifting perspectives in the text and must continually engage in a process of reassessment.

3.2 DIRECT SPEECH IN THE *JOURNALFASSUNG* AND IN THE *STUDIENFASSUNG*

Two passages of direct speech near the beginning of the *Journalfassung* are edited out in the later, more smoothly and carefully constructed *Studienfassung*. These examples show that Stifter was concerned to put into direct speech only what could not be conveyed otherwise, only what was essentially dramatic material dealing with specific situations. The first is as follows:

Einmal hat sich mit Hanna etwas zugetragen, was ihre Gespielinnen lange nicht vergaßen, es sich wieder erzählten, als sich mit ihr die Begebenheit zugetragen hat, die wir später berichten werden, und noch nach Jahren davon redeten, als sie schon längst Weiber waren, das eine und das andere Kind auf dem Arme trugen, und noch manches an den Händen oder der Rockfalte nachschleppten. 'Es war ihr schon aufgesetzt,' sagten sie, 'und es mußte in Erfüllung gehen, wie es sich damals am Beichttage gezeigt hat, aber wer weiß es, was es noch für ein Ende nehmen wird.' (J, 250.)

In the carefully understated style of the second version this would have represented clumsy story telling and it was therefore omitted. The fatalism, the idea that Hanna was destined for an unusual life from early days, is present as an idea in the final version but it is implicit rather than explicit. The final speculative line is also inappropriate, for the story has by that stage reached a conclusion and

no further developments are to be expected. Hanna has, to borrow a familiar phrase, made her bed and now she must lie in it.

In a second example the information given in direct speech in the *Journalfassung* is not omitted but relegated to indirect speech in the *Studienfassung*. The passage concerns the tradition of the Virgin Mary granting any wish made on the day of people's first confession. In the first version the passage reads as follows:

Manche Mutter hat zu Hause zu ihrem Töchterlein gesagt: 'Um was du heute an dem ersten Beichttage die schmerzhafte Mutter Gottes zum guten Wasser bitten wirst, aber du mußt es aus keinem Buche lesen, sondern aus deinem Herzen heraus sagen, das wird sie dir gewähren, und es wird in Erfüllung gehen. Das ist immer an dem ersten Beichttage so, und manche Nachbarn und manche Nachbarinnen haben es an sich selber erfahren. Drum bitte nur recht fleißig und geh' jetzt.' (J, 252.)

In the second version this passage is deemed to be not inherently dramatic and not to do directly with the human centre of the story and so it is given in indirect speech as merely the report of a local custom: 'In Oberplan herrscht der Glaube, daß dasjenige, um was man die schmerzhafte Mutter Gottes zum guten Wasser am ersten Beichttage inbrünstig und aufrichtig bittet, in Erfüllung gehen werde' (S, 391).

Although the second version is longer, therefore, the passages of dialogue are scarcer and are reserved for moments when a dramatic effect is required.

3.3 HANNA: THE SEEDS OF TRAGEDY

The first passage of dialogue retained in the *Studienfassung* is the conversation between Hanna and her friends on the day of their first confession. The passage does, however, undergo modifications. The *Journalfassung* passage is as follows:

'Um was hast Du denn die heilige Jungfrau gebeten, Lisabeth?' fragte Eine.

'Ich habe um langes Leben und gute Aufführung gebeten,' antwortete die Gefragte.

'Ich habe um gar nichts gebeten,' sagte Katharine, - 'ich auch nicht,' sagte Veronika;- 'mir ist nichts eingefallen,' redete Agnes.

'Ich werde etwas recht Schönes und recht Ausgezeichnetes bekommen,' sagte jetzt Hanna, die auch mit unter den Mädchen gesessen war und bisher nicht viel geredet hatte; 'denn da ich zur schmerzhaften Mutter Gottes recht inbrünstig betete, und sie recht dringlich bat, daß sie mir helfen und mir beistehen möge, so rückte sie auf ihrem Stande ein wenig hervor und zeigte auf die Bänder, die von ihren Seiten nieder gehen, und auf den Blumenstrauß und auf die gewundenen Stengel und Zweige der Goldstickerei, die auf ihrem schönen starren Seidenkleide sind, und das andere Gold und die Flitter an ihr zitterten und glänzten sehr in dem Lichte der Sonne. Und dann bin ich hinaus gegangen und hinauf zu dem heiligen Kreuze, und dann zu den zwei Brunnen, wo wir uns die Augen wuschen, und dann herüber auf die Steine der Milchbäuerin.'

'Geh, Du bist doch nicht recht vernünftig,' sagten Einige, 'daß Du solche Dinge daher redest,' - Andere schauerte es, da sie das Kind so erzählen hörten, und sie gingen bald auseinander. (J, 254–55)

The effect of the passage is clearly to contrast Hanna's wilfulness and imagination with the colourlessness and lack of individuality of her friends. Her emotional, individualized speech is juxtaposed with the flat and characterless speech of the other girls. The second version serves the same purpose but is stylistically tauter and thus more effective:

> Als die Sonne schon hinter dem Rande des Waldes hinab gegangen war, fragte eines der Mädchen ein anderes: 'Um was hast du denn heute die heilige Jungfrau gebeten, Elisabeth?'
>
> 'Ich habe sie um ein langes Leben und um eine gute Aufführung gebeten,' antwortete die Gefragte.
>
> 'Und um was hast denn du gebeten, Veronika?'
>
> 'Ich habe auch um einen guten Lebenswandel gebeten,' sagte diese.
>
> 'Und du, Agnes?'
>
> 'Ich habe um gar nichts gebeten.'
>
> 'Und du, Cäcilia?'
>
> 'Ich auch nicht, mir ist nichts eingefallen.'
>
> 'Und du, Hanna?'
>
> 'Ich werde etwas sehr Schönes und sehr Ausgezeichnetes bekommen,' sagte diese, 'denn als ich zu der heiligen Jungfrau recht inbrünstig betete, und das feste seidene Kleid sah, das sie anhat, und die goldenen Flimmer, die an feinen Fäden am Saume des Kleides hängen, und die grünen Stängel, die darauf gewebt sind, und die silbernen Blumen, die an den grünen Stängeln sind, und da ich den großen Blumenstrauß von Silber und Seide sah, den die Jungfrau in der Hand hat, und von dem die breiten weißen Bänder nieder gehen: da erblikte ich, wie sie mich ansah, und auf die goldenen Flimmer, auf die Blätter, auf die Stängel und auf die Bänder nieder wies.'
>
> 'Geh', du bist nicht recht vernünftig,' sagte eines der Mädchen.
>
> 'Ich bin doch vernünftig, und werde die Sachen bekommen,' antwortete Hanna.
>
> Die Kinder fing es an zu schauern, und da die Dämmerung auch schon sehr stark herein zu brechen begann, gingen sie allmählich nach Hause. (S, 393–94.)

The contrast between Hanna and her friends is made sharper by the stylization of the second version. In the *Journalfassung* each girl actively puts forward her own account of what she prayed for once the topic had been broached. In the *Studienfassung* on the other hand the question, albeit in abbreviated form, is repeated each time for each girl. A pattern develops of repetitive question ('Und du' followed by a name) and answer. In the *Journalfassung* the voice of the narrator is present in the passage in the returns to the narrative voice between the speeches, minimal though these are ('fragte Eine', 'antwortete die Gefragte' and so on). In the *Studienfassung*, in keeping with the reticence of the narrator here, his voice disappears altogether and the characters present themselves directly. Nevertheless the formal organization of the whole in the final version ensures that the spontaneity of the girls is kept to an absolute minimum. The girls are not thereby denied individuality (they had little enough in the first version), but each movement into the potential expression of individuality, each movement into speech, is fitted into an overall organizing pattern. The effect of control is thus much greater.

But this levelling process is not the whole picture. The smoothness of the litanesque question and answer section merely throws into relief Hanna's long speech at the end which indicates how very different she is from the others, and her character is strengthened at the end by the inclusion of her spirited retort 'Ich bin doch vernünftig, und werde die Sachen bekommen'.[9] Thus the changes in the second version highlight both the control and the disturbance. Hanna's voice disturbs and stands out precisely because the other voices are felt to be so anchored and stable.

This passage, although making effective use of the contrastive possibilities of dialogue, does not demonstrate in the dialogue any fact that is not already clear from the narrative: the reader already knows that Hanna is different from her friends, although he or she now has a clearer idea of what she is like. The next passage of direct speech is, however, much more disruptive for it shows a stark discrepancy between the villagers' harsh condemnation of Hanna and the narrator's dispassionate description of her. Before examining it I wish to look at the narrator's stance with regard to the protagonists of his story. He purports to have no inside knowledge of either of his central characters but merely to report what is common knowledge about them. Because, as will be shown later, the villagers are suspicious of and hostile to Hanna, while honouring Hanns as embodying the qualities of honesty, simplicity, and oneness with his surroundings, the view we receive of Hanns is more positive than the one we receive of Hanna.

The strongest approbation of Hanns is given in the description of him at work in the wood: 'Hanns war wie ein König in seinem bunten, einsamen, entfernten Schlage. Theils gehorchten manche ihm freiwillig, weil er ein guter Anordner war, theils scheuten sich manche, weil er große Körperkräfte besaß, und theils ehrten ihn Viele, weil er ein vorzüglicher Arbeiter war' (S, 400).

The narrator's account is more distant in his descriptions of Hanna. The stress when describing her is always on her mysteriousness, her apartness from the villagers. The terms in which her beauty as a child is conveyed give this attribute a touch of the legendary: 'Das Kind war ein Mädchen, und war so außerordentlich schön, daß man sich kaum etwas Schöneres auf Erden zu denken vermag' (S, 390). When describing how the child Hanna did not join in with the other children's games, he shows his lack of knowledge of her: 'Als das Kind größer geworden war, erschien es wohl auch bei den Spielen der Kinder auf dem Plaze zu Pichlern, allein es stand nur immer da, und sah zu, *entweder weil es nicht mitspielen durfte, oder weil es nicht mitspielen wollte*' (S, 391, my emphasis). The reason behind her behaviour is inaccessible. When describing her adult beauty the narrator does not sing her praises on his own account: 'obwohl sie sehr wenig gesehen wurde, so ward die zarte Schönheit ihrer Wangen und der Glanz ihrer Augen doch weit und breit bekannt' (S, 395). Other examples could be cited of his reluctance to comment beyond the boundaries of his firm knowledge of Hanna and of his unwillingness to pass judgement on her.

When it comes to relating the course of their love affair, the narrator also seems more certain of himself when talking of Hanns than of Hanna. This again is because he is reporting what other people say, and Hanns is more integrated into the community than Hanna, who is an outsider. The narrator does not say, for example, that she loves Hanns but rather that '*die Leute sagten*, Hanna fürchte und liebe ihn'.[10] The description of the love continues in a vein which demands a careful reading:

Dieser Hanns ging oft in das weiße Häuschen zu Hanna, er brachte ihr Alles, was er erarbeiten konnte, daß sie nichts entbehre und ihren Leib schmüken könne. *Die Leute behaupteten, sie sei auch dankbar, indem sie sagten, daß sie gesehen hätten*, wie sie neben den grauen Steinen und grauen Sträuchen ihre Arme um ihn geschlungen und mit ihren Lippen ihn geküßt hätte.

There is no doubt, it seems, of Hanns's love for Hanna, but the narrator is reluctant to impute to Hanna any feeling for which he cannot offer evidence. But he does not indicate directly the potential for discord, as his next words show: 'So war es auch, Hanns hatte selber kein Hehl darüber, er ging immer zu Hanna, und alle Menschen wußten, daß sie Liebende und Geliebte seien'. The first words here are emphatic, the narrator states a truth, although a vague one, namely that 'this is how it was', but his evidence shows only that his version of the truth is at this stage based on a reading only of Hanns's actions, and is derived from so-called 'common knowledge'.

A complex narrative strategy is therefore at work here. While apparently telling the story of a love affair, the narrator is managing at the same time to convey the impression that the affair may be one-sided, although nobody, himself included, has seen or knows this to be the case. But in the next passage of direct speech the potential tensions come to a head in the striking of a sudden jarringly discordant note given in direct speech. The narrator is describing the normal course of Hanns's visits to Hanna:

Wenn er dort anlangte, war meistens die Mutter, wie sie es am Abende gewohnt war, Außen herum. Sie schlichtete etwas an dem Holze, oder that sonst etwas, oder betete indem sie herum ging, und häufig zur Ziege redete, die sie nicht eher in den Stall that, als bis sie selber in die Stube ging. Im Innern saß Hanna in einem reinen schimmernden Gewande. Sie hatte vorher jedes Stäubchen von dem Tische, der Bank, dem Stuhle und dem Fußboden gefegt; denn auch das gehörte mit zu ihren Eigenthümlichkeiten, daß sie außerordentlich reinlich war. Sie wollte nicht mit der Hand und nicht mit dem Gewande an Staub rühren.

'Die wird Gott strafen, daß sie so stolz ist,' sagten oft die Leute, 'und ihn dazu, daß er so verblendet ist, und ihr Alles anhängt.'

Hanns ging hinein, Hanna sprang auf und grüßte ihn. Er blieb bis spät Abends, sie plauderten, koseten, aßen; die Mutter war bei ihnen, sprach mit, aß, oder nikte schlummernd ein wenig mit dem Kopfe, wie es eben kam. (S, 402–03.)

The first description of Hanna here shows her passive (she is sitting) and beautiful (she wears a 'pure shimmering robe', recalling the Virgin in the pietà

tableau). Her tidying up and her hatred of dirt are conveyed by the narrator in neutral terms although he admits by the use of the word 'Eigenthümlichkeit' that her fastidiousness does mark her out. But nothing the narrator has said so far has prepared the reader for the naked aggression and hostility of the words that follow, made all the more marked by being put into direct speech. The words of the villagers are an omen of what is to come, they link the central story to the themes of waywardness and punishment and of blindness, and they bring to a head the potential for tragedy which up to now has only been implicit. But they are in a vastly different tone to those of the impassive narrator. They give a whole new commentary, an unabashedly biased one, on the central events. The force of their words is made even stronger by virtue of the fact that the narrator straight away resumes his descriptive tone after the interjection with no acknowledgement of the unpleasant nature of the words he has just quoted. What comes across in his account is merely the pleasantness of the scene, the quiet, contented domesticity. It is as though he does not want to take responsibility for disturbing the picture given by his own narrative and so has consigned this task to the villagers. Stifter thereby makes full use of the dramatic and contrastive potential of direct speech in narrative to present two differing views.

The next example of direct speech is the only passage of dialogue between the central couple, and it again serves to highlight the discrepancy between the potential for tragedy in the story and the narrator's unwillingness to dwell upon it. It is the longest passage of dialogue in the text, the longest single section where the voice of the narrator is heard only in the most basic of stage directions. And it is extraordinarily revealing because the characters demonstrate how temperamentally different they are and how little true dialogue there can be between them:[11]

Einmal fragte ihn Hanna, um was er denn am ersten Beichttage die heilige Jungfrau Maria gebeten habe.

'Ich habe um nichts gebeten,' antwortete er, 'du weißt ja, daß ich nicht oft zu ihr in ihr Kirchlein hinauf komme, weil ich nicht Zeit habe; aber von ferne und von dem Walde aus, wo er eine Lüke hat, sehe ich das weiße Kirchlein sehr gerne, weil von ihm nach abwärts die Wachholderstauden anfangen, dann die Föhren der Pichlerner Weide stehen, und noch weiter unten das Häuschen ist, in dem du bist.'

'Du solltest aber doch gebeten haben,' sagte Hanna; 'denn sie ist sehr wunderthätig und stark, und was man am ersten Beichttage mit Inbrust und Andacht verlangt, das muß in Erfüllung gehen, es geschehe auch, was da wolle.'

'Das habe ich ja gar nicht gewußt', sagte Hanns, 'es hat es mir damals Niemand gesagt, und wenn ich es auch gewußt hätte, so hätte ich sie doch gewiß um nichts gebeten, weil mir nichts gefehlt hat. - Meinst du denn im Ernste, daß sie etwas thun kann, um was man sie recht bittet?'

'Freilich kann sie es thun,' antwortete Hanna, 'weil sie sehr mächtig ist, und sie thut es auch, weil sie sehr gut ist.'

'Aber am ersten Beichttage muß man sie darum bitten?' fragte Hanns.

'Um was man sie am ersten Beichttage bittet,' sagte Hanna, 'daß thut sie immer und jedes Mal; aber auch an jedem Tage kann man sie bitten, und sie kann die Bitte gewähren, weil ihre Macht außerordentlich ist.'

'Aber das ist ja kaum denklich,' erwiederte Hanns, 'weil sonst alle Leute daher kämen, und um die verwirrtesten und verkehrtesten Dinge bäten.'

'Wenn sie um verwirrte und verkehrte Dinge bitten,' sagte Hanna, 'so läßt sie diese nicht in Erfüllung gehen; aber bitten muß man sie immer, weil man nicht wissen kann, welches Ding verwirrt oder verkehrt ist, und weil sie allein die Entscheidung hat, was in Erfüllung gehen solle und was nicht.'

Hanns antwortete nun nichts mehr darauf.

Die Liebe, die Zuneigung und die Anhänglichkeit wuchs immer mehr und mehr. Hanns that Alles, was ihm sein Herz einflößte. Er ehrte die Zeiten, wie es in jener Gegend gebräuchlich ist. (S, 403–04.)

The subject of the conversation, which is initiated by Hanna, is the local tradition of the Virgin Mary granting wishes on the day of the first confession. Hanns is unaware of the tradition. This emphasizes his physical and spiritual apartness from the community. Because of his work in the forest he does not have time to go frequently to the church housing the statue of the Virgin Mary but he likes to look at it from a distance for it acts as a pointer to and reminder of the place where Hanna is. His fondness for Hanna and his basic lack of interest in the subject she wishes to discuss are what emerge from his first speech. When forced back to the subject he first of all dismisses it. He would not have made a wish even had he known of the tradition, for there was quite simply nothing that he lacked. All his humble needs were fulfilled by his present circumstances and any ambition to change his lot was totally absent. He does however take up the idea and question Hanna upon it, albeit incredulously. But as his final comment shows ('Aber das ist ja kaum denklich, . . . weil sonst alle Leute daher kämen, und um die verwirrtesten und verkehrtesten Dinge bäten'), his is a simple and pedantic mind, little given to flights of fancy and firmly rooted, for the moment at least, in the real.

Hanna on the other hand has internalized the sense of wonder implicit in her religious education and combined it with a strong personal ambition. Just as her friends gave her little feedback when she was seen in conversation with them, so too Hanns is a disappointment to her as someone with whom to converse and speculate. His sentimental appeal to her is countered with a strict rejoinder to return to the agenda she has set: 'Du solltest aber doch gebeten haben'. Her attitude to the Virgin, although couched in acquired religious terms ('denn sie ist sehr wunderthätig und stark') is nevertheless full of opportunism. The promise that a wish will be fulfilled makes it too good an opportunity to miss and she is impatient with someone who did not take up what she considers to be his due. When Hanns voices his objection (what if people should ask for unsuitable things?) her answer is pragmatic and shrewd: as in a lottery, even if one cannot be sure of winning, nothing can be lost by participating.

The conversation ends in a stalemate. The laconic 'Hanns antwortete nun nichts mehr darauf' attempts neither to conceal nor to reveal that these two people who are by nature so very different, have very little to say to each other. By breaking with the dynamic of speech and counter-speech Hanns unilaterally withdraws from the field leaving Hanna with, literally, the last word. They do not even go through the motions of negotiating an end to their discussion which would allow an outward show of unity. The conversation is instead truncated and left hanging, unresolved, the participants revealed to be the widely differing people that they are.

How much more extraordinary then are the words with which the narrator takes up his story again: 'Die Liebe, die Zuneigung und die Anhänglichkeit wuchs immer mehr und mehr. Hanns that Alles, was ihm sein Herz einflößte'. He makes no mention of the discord which has just been revealed. Indeed the tone of his comments implies that the relationship is progressing harmoniously. But it is simply not possible for the reader to take his words at face value. He talks impersonally of love and devotion, not attributing this love to either or both parties. It seems likely from the emphasis of the narration thus far and from the fact that the following sentence stresses Hanns's love, that the love, the affection and the devotion are all on Hanns's side. But if this restricted reading of the words is true, the preceding dialogue has undermined them still further, for Hanns's love and devotion are seen to be blind. He loves Hanna despite rather than because of what she is.

3.4 THE HUNT: MOUNTING TENSION

Thus far I have shown that Stifter employs a narrator whose tone does not match the tragic implications of the story he has to tell. But within the context of the story as a whole these implications emerge as it were in the seams of the narrative, in the places where the narrative cedes its primacy for a moment to dialogue or direct speech before resuming its course. The potential for disaster is glimpsed in the stark juxtaposition of the two narrative modes. In the later parts of the story dialogue and direct speech are of interest not just for their contrastive function, they also play a more active role.

Just after the first hunt which Hanns, because of his work, does not attend, Hanna by chance ('Da wollte es der Zufall, daß') finds herself next to a young nobleman Guido, who stands out from the crowd because he did not powder his hair as the others did (just as Hanna did not powder her hair on the day of her first confession) and because he had performed well during the hunt. Like Hanna, he is strikingly attractive:

Er war so schön, daß er, wie die Landleute sagen, wie Milch und Blut aussah, seine Augen waren groß und sanft, und er war schier prächtiger gekleidet, als alle Andern.

Da Hanna so neben ihm stand, erblikte sie ein Mann aus dem Volke, der sich unten in dem Nezraume befand, zeigte mit dem Finger hinauf und rief: 'Das ist das schönste Paar!'

Das Volk, welches ohnehin schon in eine höhere Stimmung gekommen war, welches an der Jagd den lebhaftesten Antheil genommen, mit den Fingern nach dieser und jener Stelle gezeigt und freudig gejubelt hatte, wenn sich etwas Merkwürdiges zugetragen hatte, war zu dem Ungewöhnlichsten aufgelegt. Kaum hatte es also die Worte des Mannes vernommen, so rief es gleichsam mit einer Stimme und laut: 'Das ist das schönste Paar, das ist das schönste Paar!'

Der junge Mann wandte sich in seiner Verwirrung gegen Hanna und sah sie an. Da wurde sein Angesicht so scharlachroth, wie die Bänder, an denen er seinen Hirschfänger hängen hatte.

Hanna wandte sich ebenfalls nach dem Rufe gegen ihren Nachbar, und da sie den ausgezeichneten Mann gesehen hatte, wurde ihr Antlitz gleichsam mit dem dunkelsten Blute übergossen. Sie sah ihn eine Weile mit offenen Augen an, dann drängte sie sich unter das Volk und ging über die Treppe hinab. Ihr Benehmen war wie das einer Trunkenen. (S, 413–14.)

Direct speech is again used here to dramatic effect. It brings to the surface something implicit in the text, namely that Hanna and Guido belong together because of their striking physical beauty. But this idea is a subversive one, it will bring about a near tragedy, it will confound the view of the future which is 'common knowledge', namely that Hanna will marry Hanns. So the task of uttering the subversive idea is given to an anonymous person, a man from the crowd, the idea then being taken up by the whole crowd unanimously. All of a sudden then, one self-evident 'fact' (that Hanna will marry Hanns) has been replaced in the public mind by another one which is its absolute opposite, namely that Hanna and Guido are the perfect couple. And again the dislocation of this is felt from the juxtaposition of the endlessly smooth narrative with the contrastive voice incorporated into it. The narrator thus depicts but remains apart from the new alignment of Hanna and Guido. The two voices, that of the narrator and that of the crowd, and their two standpoints interrelate to form a complementary whole, and although the second voice is heard so seldom and then so briefly, its effect is quite disproportionately weighty.

The next passage of dialogue in the text is curious because it is not dramatic but extremely formal and approaches the litanesque dialogues in some of Stifter's later works. It occurs when the orders for the second hunt are being given:

Jetzt trat ein Herr von dem Tische weg und rief: 'Nun wollen wir die Schüzen verlesen, auf welchen Ständen sie sich morgen vor Tagesanbruch einfinden sollen, und auf welchen Jeder, ehe die Sonne aufgeht, gerüstet dastehen muß.'

Es ward in dem Saale etwas stiller, und der Herr las mit lauter Stimme aus einem Papiere vor: 'Herr Andreas bei der rothen Lake.'

'Weiß sie nicht.'

'Gidi wird dich führen.'

'Herr Gunibald in der Kreixe.'

'Weiß sie.'

'Herr Friedrich von Eschberg am gebrannten Steine.'

'Weiß ihn nicht.'
'Der Schmied Feirer wird euch begleiten.'
'Herr Guido beim beschriebenen Tännling.'
'Weiß ihn.'
'Herr Albrecht Hammermann im Fuchslug.'
'Weiß es.'
'Herr Thorngar am Brunnkreß - Herr Wenhard am Obergehag - Herr Emerich im Auwörth.'
'Wissen es.'
Und so ging es fort, bis sämmtliche Herren und Schüzen herab gelesen waren. (S, 422.)

The passage is highly stylized.[12] For twenty-four lines a pattern is repeated of instruction and reply, the instructions indicating where each individual is to stand and the reply showing whether the men are familiar with the places to which they have been assigned. The replies are as follows: 'Weiß sie nicht', 'Weiß sie', 'Weiß ihn nicht', 'Weiß ihn', 'Weiß es', 'Wissen es'. There are two negative replies at the beginning, alternating with affirmative replies. The affirmative replies then take over, culminating in the very positive first person plural reply 'Wissen es'. Running contrapuntally with this progression towards unity are variations in the pronoun from 'sie' to the masculine 'ihn' to the neutral, universal 'es'. The heavy 'Wissen es' shows that complete unity of understanding has been achieved. Everyone knows and accepts his place in the overall plan. Differences (individuals not knowing the places to which they have been assigned) have been ironed out (if they do not know the places somebody will show them). All voices have become one.

This process of arriving at a consensus through a ritual airing of views is frequently to be found in *Witiko*, a staggering two thirds of which is made up of such dialogues.[13] But the differences between this story and others where this technique is used is that here the overall plan to which they are all agreeing (the hunt) is not a praiseworthy one and cannot be said to represent an ideal. For although the hunt is described for the most part in morally neutral terms, it is shown by the totality of the story to be something questionable, as Hertling has pointed out. So instead of an enlightened process of debate culminating in the correct conclusion being reached, a conclusion which is in line with the moral aim of the book, what we have here is collective excitement leading the whole company astray. They are unified, but this only means that they are all wrong, they are collectively off centre. The bloodshed of the preceding hunt scenes devalues the litanesque dialogue found here and shows it to be in the service of something questionable.

3.5 HANNS: TRAGEDY AVERTED, DÉNOUEMENT

It is in the figure of Hanns and in the account of his experience at the pine tree that the tale reaches its climax. Johann Lachinger has pointed out that underlying

the apparently harmonious scene where the instructions for the next day's hunt are given, there is an invisible barrier between the nobles and the poor people. In consequence Hanns feels excluded. When he sees Hanna sitting with Guido, he dare not intervene at this public setting but will wait to meet his rival the next day at the site of the *beschriebener Tännling* (Lachinger, p. 115). At the hunt scene the tensions lie beneath the surface and will come to a head later in Hanns: 'So ist in vielschichtigen Bezügen der Gegensatz zwischen Herren und Untertanen angedeutet, dieser Gegensatz bleibt aber an der Oberfläche zugedeckt durch eine harmonisch scheinende Gemeinsamkeit. Nur in der Figur des Hanns bricht dieser Gegensatz auf und wird zum bedrohlichen Konflikt' (ibid.).

Many critics have used the laconic description of Hanns's actions upon discovering the truth about Hanna and Guido as an example of Stifter's way of depicting inner emotion from the outside.[14] The narrator does not allow himself to comment directly upon Hanns's state of mind but builds up a feeling of tension merely by relating Hanns's solitary course, with axe in hand, first to watch the preparations for the hunt where he sees Hanna and Guido together, then to the church, where he prays, and on through the forest to the spot where the *beschriebener Tännling* grows. Hanns's intention, it is fairly clear, is to murder Guido, for it is at this spot that Guido is to stand at the next day's hunt. Hanns's isolation from the crowd is stressed when he asks 'einen Mann' (any man, woman, or child would do — they all know what is happening except him) what is going on:

> Hanns fragte einen Mann, an dem er dicht gedrängt stand, was es gäbe.
>
> 'Es werden die Treiber, die Heger, die Jäger und alles Andere verlesen, was morgen bei der Treibjagd im Langwalde statt haben solle,' antwortete der Mann.
>
> Wirklich sah Hanns mehrere Herren an einem Tische mit Papieren beschäftigt, er sah, wie sie sprachen, und an manche Bewohner der Gegend Zettel vertheilten.
>
> Oben auf der zierlichen Bühne sah er nebst vielen andern Menschen auch Hanna sizen. (S, 421)

The climax at the *beschriebener Tännling* is, as might be expected, understated but clear, the final incisive stroke coming in a short outburst of direct speech. There has been, as I have said, a build up of tension in the narrator's laconic account of Hanns's actions. It is significant that the turning-point should occur at this particular spot. Zinck points out the increased symbolic importance in the second version of the tree after which, of course, the story is named: 'Hanns konnte noch wahrnehmen, daß in dem Baum die Zeichen der Liebe eingegraben sind; in der neuen Fassung wie Zeichen oder Stationen seiner eigenen Liebe: ein Herz mit Flammen, ein Ring, der zwei Namen umfaßt, ein Kreuz, das aus Keilen emporragt, der Name Marias; wogegen früher der Ring mit dem Namen und Maria nicht genannt wurden' (Zinck, pp. 15–16).

Hanns falls asleep and has a vision of the Virgin who looks at him with a stern expression. On waking, he comes to terms with what he has seen by interpreting it as a warning:

Hanns erhob sich von seinem Size, trat ein wenig seitwärts, und sah wieder auf den Baum. Aber es war immer das Nämliche. Da fuhr Hanns mit der Hand über sein Angesicht, und sagte die Worte: 'Es muß etwas Verworrenes gewesen sein, um das ich gebeten habe.'

Dann nahm er den Rok etwas enger zusammen, und drükte die Oberarme gegen den Leib; denn es war ihm im Schlafe sehr kalt geworden. Dann ging er wieder gegen den Baumstamm, und griff mit den Händen in der Gegend, wo er die Axt hingelehnt hatte. Als er sie gefunden hatte, nahm er sie in die Hand, trat weg und sah wieder auf den Baum. Dann sah er noch einmal hinauf, schulterte dann seine Axt und ging von der Stelle fort. (S, 428)

The motifs of blindness and of religious belief come to the fore here but are not emphasized or commented upon. The narrator describes Hanns's experience without irony as an *Erscheinung* but also tells us that Hanns is asleep, and so, we assume, could merely be dreaming. Nevertheless the vision does have the effect, as Lachinger point out (p. 115), of a *deus ex machina*. Because of his vision Hanns realizes the wrongness of his intentions and abandons them. While the narrator's tone has remained laconic, and his distance from the characters constant, a catharsis has been achieved and the direct speech, albeit just one line murmured by the character to himself, is the manifestation of it. The speech signals the release of tension.

Hanns's decision is of wider import than merely his avoidance of a crime. He is thematically linked with the blind man of the legend whose sight was restored upon proof of his faith. In this sense Hanns's obedience is triumphantly vindicated. It is in this vein that the blacksmith alludes to Hanns as having been blessed in the final lines of the story:

Als eine Zeit nach Hanna's Vermählung sich ihre Gespielinnen an den Abend ihres ersten Beichttages erinnerten und sagten, daß Hanna's Voraussagung in Erfüllung gegangen sei, daß sie nun schöne Kleider habe mit gewundenen Stängeln und Gold- und Silberstikerei, und daß sich an ihr die Gnade der heiligen Jungfrau recht sichtlich erwiesen habe, erwiederte der uralte Schmied in Vorderstift: 'An ihr hat sich eher ihre Verwünschung als ihre Gnade gezeigt — ihre Weisheit, Gnade und Wunderthätigkeit haben sich an Jemand ganz anderem erwiesen.' (S, 432.)

Nevertheless we also feel that Hanns's victory over his baser self is a hollow one. The experience renders him lifeless, for we are told that: 'der Mann schien ganz gebrochen zu sein' (S, 429). What he has done in effect is to bow down to the natural, cruel law of life which triumphs in this story. The hunt is wrong but it goes ahead and it brings about the separation of Hanns and Hanna. The abduction of Hanna is also wrong but has to be accepted. The status quo of ruler and ruled is not to be overturned, Hanns will not kill his aristocratic rival, a crime will not be committed by the human protagonist at the heart of the story. Nevertheless the order of the world is felt in all its harshness, as is the futility of fighting it. Once again Stifter makes us feel the price extracted in terms of individual fulfilment, by the moral life, by social rules and conventions. The cost of stability is a high one.

3.6 CONCLUSION

The role of the passages of dialogue and direct speech in the story is a complex one. The overall feel of the narrative suggests a moral tale warning against aberrant behaviour, against seeking one's own happiness, heeding physical beauty and so on. Some of the direct speech supports this view, for example the epilogue, which essentially adjudicates between Hanna and Hanns, condemning the former and praising the latter for his renunciation.

But more often the effect of the direct speech is to blur these simple outlines by highlighting questions which the narrator does not himself pose, for example the rightness of the Hanns/Hanna relationship, which seems doomed from the start, and the value of the grand corporate oneness of the hunt, which results in destruction and despoliation. The inner life (allowed expression in the direct speech and dialogue of the characters and glimpsed by reading between the lines of the narrative) and the outer life (recorded unquestioningly by the narrator) are seen to be in an uneasy balance. And this can bespeak a general disequilibrium between the moral life, social values on the one hand, and the psychological, individuated life on the other.

This theme finds supreme expression in Hanns's speech at the pine tree. His crucial words 'Es muß etwas Verworrenes gewesen sein, um das ich gebeten habe' echo his earlier conversation with Hanna. His moment of renunciation is captured through his direct utterance — which upholds the moral values upon which the story is based. But this speech also reminds us, poignantly, of his extended conversation with Hanna which revealed the tensions in their relationship. The moment of nobility is linked, painfully, in his, and in the reader's mind, with the memory of the girl whom he is renouncing. This ambivalence is at the centre of Stifter and in particular of his two major works, *Der Nachsommer* and *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Mario Vargas Llosa, 'Latin American Fiction and Reality', *TLS*, 30 January 1987, pp. 110–11 (p. 110).
2. See Gunter H. Hertling, 'Adalbert Stifters Jagdallegorie *Der beschriebene Tännling*: Schande durch Schändung', *VASILO*, 29 (1980), 41–65 (p. 64), who describes Hanns's final fate as follows: 'Es ist das traurige Ende eines guten, doch nur zum Teil "geretteten" Menschen, den die Mitmenschen und die Zeit "gebrochen" haben'. See also Luise A. Lenel, 'Symbolism and Style in Flaubert and Stifter: A Comparative Study of *La Légende de St. Julien l'Hospitalier* and *Der beschriebene Tännling*', in *Vistas and Vectors: Essays Honoring the Memory of Helmut Rehder* (Austin, 1979), pp. 142–51 (p. 146), who points out the contrast between the picture of Hanns at the beginning of the story as a king among the woodcutters and the view we have of him at the end, hitched to a cart, pulling along his sister's orphaned children: 'one can hardly imagine a more moving picture of the change in the man'.
3. See Joseph Peter Stern, 'Adalbert Stifters ontologischer Stil', *Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, p. 113: 'Wir bekommen den Eindruck, daß er die eigentliche Geschichte vielleicht gar nicht erzählen, den natürlichen Rahmen nicht stören will, und daß dieser "Rahmen" in einem gewissen Sinn zur eigentlichen Substanz seiner "Erzählung" wird. Von der menschlichen Substanz — von leidenschaftlicher Liebe, von Verrat und einsamem Herzleid — berichtet er nur zögernd und unwillig'.

4. References are taken from Doppler and Frühwald, I, iii, 235–80 (*Journalfassung*) and I, vi, 379–432 (*Studienfassung*). References will be given in brackets after quotations and will take the form J for *Journalfassung* and S for *Studienfassung* plus a page number.
5. For a discussion of the motifs and the links between them and the central story see Karl Hugo Zinck, 'Motive und Motivverknüpfungen in den beiden Fassungen des *beschriebenen Tännlings*: ein Beitrag zu dem Problem der Gestaltung und der Gestalt in der Dichtung von Adalbert Stifter', *VASILO*, 16 (1967), 9–24. He argues that the motifs (the tree, the idea of beauty cursed, and the motif of the healing of blindness) are in the second version 'immer deutlichere Funktionsglieder' (p. 10) in a story where 'jede Einzelheit ist organisches Glied des Ganzen geworden' (p. 19).
6. Both Hertling and Johann Lachinger, 'Verschlüsselte Adelskritik: Adalbert Stifters Erzählung *Der beschriebene Tännling*', in *Londoner Symposium 1983*, pp. 101–20, have shown that the evidence of the story as a whole testifies unambiguously to the wrongness of the hunt. See in particular Lachinger, p. 104: 'Der Dichter zeigt den Einbruch der profanen höfisch-urbanen Lebenswelt des Adels in den in sich geschlossenen religiös strukturierten Natur- und Kulturraum des bäuerlichen Waldlandes und die sich daraus ergebenden Konsequenzen der Störung und Zerstörung für Natur und Menschen dieses Bezirkes'.
7. Eric A. Blackall, *Adalbert Stifter: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, 1948), p. 220.
8. Lenel, pp. 145–46. Johannes Klein, 'Auslegung einer Novelle: Adalbert Stifter: *Der beschriebene Tännling*', *WW* (1952), 206–13 (p. 209), also makes the same point: 'Die Novellenform ist ausgeprägt, doch ihr Wesen verinnerlicht'.
9. Notice how the 'doch' is removed from the previous sentence, thus reducing the naturalness of the girls' speech, and inserted into Hanna's utterance, making her characterization stronger.
10. All references in this paragraph are to the *Studienfassung*, p. 396 (my emphasis).
11. See Jean Louis Bandet, *Adalbert Stifter: introduction à la lecture de ses nouvelles*, p. 65: 'l'auteur rapporte une seule conversation entre ses héros, et leur dialogue, loin de montrer l'union de deux âmes en un tendre tête à tête, révèle à quel point ils sont différents'.
12. See Stern, 'Stifters ontologischer Stil', pp. 118–19: 'Gewiß sind diese kargen Archaismen frei von aller Parodie (wenn sie auch ihrerseits zur Parodie einladen); wir erkennen in ihnen vielmehr eines der sprachlichen Mittel, die Grenzen des Individuellen zu tilgen, selbst auf die Gefahr eines archaisierenden Pathos hin; mit der Sprache seines Zeitalters haben sie jedenfalls nichts zu tun'.
13. See Ingeborg Maschek, 'Stifters Alterserzählungen: eine Stiluntersuchung', p. 127.
14. The best description of this is by Karlheinz Rossbacher, 'Erzählstandpunkt und Personendarstellung bei Adalbert Stifter: die Sicht von außen als Gestaltungsperspektive', *VASILO*, 17 (1968), 47–58, for example his analysis of Hanns's behaviour in the church where he goes to seek spiritual strength and blessing for his murderous intentions: 'Die hier unausgesprochenen Bewußtseinsvorgänge lassen sich bei langsamem Lesen deutlich erschließen . . . Als er den Hut wieder in die Hand nimmt, beginnt er bereits, sich dem zum Handeln notwendigen inneren Zustand wieder zu nähern. Die Bewegungen des Zurückgehens, des Sich-Entfernens vom Altar und des Ergreifens der Axt entsprechen einem Sich-Wappnen. Hanns stellt sich innerlich und äußerlich auf einen Kampf ein' (p. 48). Rossbacher says Stifter's methods of depicting Hanns's inner state are 'Dingliche Beschreibung (Hut, Axt . . .), manuelle Handlungen in Gebärdenform und schließlich die doppelbödig körperliche Ausdrucksbewegung als umfassendstes Gestaltungsmittel' (p. 49).

CHAPTER IV

DER NACHSOMMER: LEGISLATING FOR THE WORLD

> 'The history of the novel is the history of anti-novels.'
>
> Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending*[1]

> 'En fait, la clarté est un attribut purement rhétorique, elle n'est pas une qualité générale du langage, possible dans tous les temps et dans tous les lieux, mais seulement l'appendice idéal d'un certain discours, celui-là même qui est soumis à une intention permanente de persuasion.'
>
> Roland Barthes, *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture*[2]

> 'As between the iron steps of the bridge, in the dialogue, intervals of emptiness open between one speech and the next.'
>
> Italo Calvino, *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller*[3]

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Stifter's novel *Der Nachsommer* has puzzled, infuriated, unsettled and delighted generations of readers since it was first published. It is a very unusual novel for it eschews or makes only limited use of all the customary novelistic techniques for engaging the reader's interest (plot, subplot, climaxes, characterization) and is devoted instead to the extended statement of one central, overriding vision, an imaginary world of willed harmony and order. In this world the problem of human passion and individuality has (supposedly) been overcome and the lesson is taught, at quite extraordinary length, that mankind can live best by submitting to an outer order through a meticulous and quasi-mystical devotion to the true nature of things. As the protagonist Heinrich Drendorf's father says with a 'Zug strenger Genauigkeit' typical of the novel as a whole: 'Jedes Ding und jeder Mensch . . . könne nur Eines sein, dieses aber muß er ganz sein' (VI, i, 3).[4]

The story can be summarized very quickly. Heinrich Drendorf, an exemplary young man engaged in a process of self-education, seeks shelter from an impending storm in the house of an old man, a house which he later comes to

know as the *Rosenhaus*. He visits the house annually for several years, coming to respect and admire the old man, Risach, who completes his education, teaching him above all a respect for the things of the natural world. He gets to know Mathilde, a friend of Risach, who lives nearby, and her daughter Natalie, to whom he eventually becomes engaged. Before they marry Risach tells him the story of his past: many years ago he and Mathilde fell in love when he was tutor to her younger brother. When he finally admitted the affair to Mathilde's parents, his confession met with disapproval because of Mathilde's youth and because they had kept it a secret. The parents asked them to wait. Risach accepted their decision and told Mathilde that they must part, but she was dismayed at his unthinking acquiescence in their demands and broke off the relationship with him altogether, accusing him of betrayal. Years later, after both had married and been widowed, she sought him out and apologized for her behaviour. They continued to live in close association, but they did not marry.

While much early criticism of the novel was concerned with locating the sources of Stifter's composite picture, recent criticism has tended to look more at the form of the novel with a view to identifying the pressures and tensions which hold the picture in place or, at times, threaten to undermine it.[5]

One of the main areas of study has been an analysis of the discourse of the novel. Although the main representative of Stifter's utopian world is Risach, the main spokesman is Heinrich Drendorf. This is because Heinrich writes at a point where he is ready to inherit the *Rosenhaus* and all that it stands for. His education is complete and his marriage to Natalie will unite his family and hers under the paternal authority of Risach: this all-encompassing event is marked by the symbolic flowering of the great cactus, the Cereus peruvianus. But although Heinrich writes of his experiences of the last few years in the first person, his narrative voice lacks almost totally the dimension of hindsight and is restrained and detached from what it recounts.

Both Michael Beddow and Gerald Gillespie have pointed out how absolutely suited this type of narration is to the novel's themes. If Heinrich's narrating consciousness were visibly superior to his past self, this would represent an unacceptable primacy of the self.[6] Nevertheless the story is highly organized, Heinrich's memoir is

> under total control in retrospect . . . Heinrich records his past as agent of the hidden author so that chosen events will appear self-actualizing, spontaneous. Happenings half understood excite our premonition of an order which, however, makes sense only from hindsight, since *Der Nachsommer* is constructed memory in the guise of a direct description of moving life.[7]

Heinrich's reticence as narrator prompts the reader to perceive the connections between events, the patterns of meaning among the repetitions and variations, 'sublime Differenzierungen und Veränderungen . . . die dem Leser, sofern er sie überhaupt rezipiert, einen Fortschritt anzeigen'.[8]

The vision which Heinrich is mediating is that of the author and of his custodian in the novel, Risach. And in the dominating presence of Risach can be seen one of the prime contradictions of the novel, which is that although the didactic thrust is to favour Heinrich and Natalie's brand of almost total self-effacement and obedience, the *Rosenhaus* world is actually a huge assertion of one particular ego, that of Risach, and is kept in place by the use of 'Gewalt'. This can be seen in Risach's management of his garden: 'Doch die Nachsommerwelt beruht auf Gewalt. Denn kein Gegenstand hat mehr eine Gültigkeit für sich, sondern ist nur, was er für den beherrschenden Willen des Gartengestalters ist' (Sorg, p. 105). It is no less true of his influence on the other people in the novel. Heinrich learns only 'was Risach von vornherein bereits gewußt oder gesagt hatte' (Amann, 'Zwei Thesen', p. 178), for the only ideas, and therefore the only real discourse in the novel, are Risach's: 'Letztlich sind alle Sätze des Romans in tautologischer Weise auf den Normen- und Werthorizont der verlautbarten Meinungen Risachs bezogen' (Amann, p. 174). The clarity, the perfection, the order of the *Nachsommer* world are therefore not at all the result of freedom, but rather the opposite: 'Stifter kennzeichnet also die Vollkommenheit und die adäquate Systematik der Nachsommerwelt als eine bestimmte, notwendig auch gewaltsame, umbildende und umdeutende Verwaltung, die unumgehbare Bedingung des Friedens und der Schönheit ist'.[9]

The primary social structure upon which the novel is based is the family. It is the symbol of social order and harmony. When Heinrich has married Natalie, Risach reveals that the family is more than just a method of social organization; it is seen as the basis of all life and as of supreme importance at the present time — for reasons which are not elaborated: 'Die Familie ist es, die unsern Zeiten Noth thut, sie thut mehr Noth, als Kunst und Wissenschaft, als Verkehr, Handel, Aufschwung, Fortschritt, oder wie Alles heißt, was begehrungswerth erscheint. Auf der Familie ruht die Kunst, die Wissenschaft, der menschliche Fortschritt, der Staat' (VIII, iii, 217).

But the family emerges as a problematic image of harmony in the novel, for its seemingly ideal form is something essentially artificial.[10] Risach has no family in the biological sense — his parents die early, his wife is dead, he has no offspring. Yet, as will be shown in the *Rückblick* chapter, the chapter in which Risach tells of his past, his deepest psychological need is to gain the security of family life. In all, as Schäublin has shown, the *Nachsommer* is the 'Erzeugnis einer Einbildungskraft . . ., die in ungewöhlicher Weise vom Bild der Familie okkupiert ist' (p. 86). Heinrich's response to the performance of *King Lear* is totally in terms of the family (p. 89). (And for a symbol of family discord one can hardly think of a more telling choice of literary precedent!) Heinrich and Natalie exchange looks for the first time in the presence of the suffering father, Lear (p. 91). Risach sets himself up as a patriarch, imposes his will on the other characters and acquires an heir in Heinrich, but he does it all 'without risking the

exposure to women which biological fatherhood entails' for 'if we discount his "real" marriage, the story marks him as metaphorically impotent' (Minden, p. 60). Keller sees in the relationships in the novel a central evasion of the problems of human passion:

> Die Wahrheit der Verwandschaftsverhältnisse, die der Held entdeckt, ist die Verknüpfung von Gliedern unabhängig von Sexualität. Der parthenogenetische Bauplan der Großfamilie stellt das Begehren still und unterwirft es der signifikanten, d.h. der personenverknüpfenden Handlung. Der Buchstabe dezentriert die Großfamilienbildung vom Zeugen zum Adoptieren. Ausgeschlossen ist der Versuch, das Begehren als ein Einlösbares im und als Text im Roman vorzuspielen.[11]

The problem of human passion comes to the fore in the *Rückblick* chapter which, because of the intensity of emotion contained within it, is of an importance quite disproportionate to its length: 'die lebendigste Gegenwart ist . . . in der Vergangenheit zu finden, in der Jugend des Freiherrn und Mathildens, deren Versäumnisse nie mehr einzuholen und soviel menschlicher sind als alle stilisierte Menschlichkeit'.[12]

It is my contention that a discussion of the dialogue and of the relationships between the dialogue and the surrounding narrative will shed light on the tensions holding the work together, on the question of balance in the discourse, on the nature of Risach's power and on the psychological failure behind the work. The form of *Der Nachsommer* is a giant artifice, a long cataloguing and celebration of 'die Dinge'. But underlying this is an 'anxiety lest anything should be forgotten'.[13] Things are accorded a tremendous respect and awe, but the reverse side of this is that they are in fact of value only for their place in the overall picture. Anything which does not fit is ruthlessly excluded. This gives a tension to the picture. A similar ambiguity applies to the characters in the work and their speech. Natalie and Heinrich are treated not unlike some of the plants in Risach's garden. They are given optimum conditions within which to develop and the goal is never in doubt. They have to become the perfect heirs to the *Nachsommer* world and they show no signs of failing. In their generation the problem of human passion is overcome, but at the price of forfeiting individuality. The strength with which their success and the success of the whole enterprise is willed is so enormous as to be strangely counterproductive.[14] The dialogues in which the two young people take part show, in their extreme stylization and abstraction, evidence of this pedantic and anxious insistence on completeness and order.

But the real anxiety in the work shows up in the conversations involving Mathilde. The origins of Risach's human failure and the beginning of his imposition of himself on the world in an effort to cover up his faults are revealed in the *Rückblick*. Here too Mathilde's unhappiness and melancholy find their origin, and the pattern of their future relationship is set. And on several occasions when Mathilde speaks in the main part of the novel, her voice, because it gives

expression to unassuaged sadness, is silenced. To study the balance of power within the discourse of the novel is to perceive how, and to some extent why, Stifter's vision was so extraordinarily — perhaps excessively — single-minded.

In *Der Nachsommer* the dialogues involve for the most part no more than two speakers, and certain devices are used to lessen their dramatic potential. The basic principles upon which the dialogues are constructed are as follows. The content is kept extremely simple, each speaker replying directly to the import of the previous speech without usually bringing in new material. When one character has spoken his or her fill, the other steps in and replies. There are no interruptions and, in general, no pauses. Frequently the utterances are in groups of two, four or eight which cease when that section of the subject matter has been exhausted. Nothing is left hanging in the air and everything is treated with equal seriousness. In this way the dialogue is kept as smooth and unruffled as the surrounding narrative. In general Heinrich the narrator steps back and lets the characters speak without commenting himself. His stage directions are usually a basic two words indicating who is speaking and what kind of utterance it is, for example 'sagte sie', 'antwortete er'. He minimizes his role further by putting his stage directions after the first main clause of the speech, or, if the speech is short, at the end. He only comments when a natural break in the dialogue occurs. Here he will step in and describe the scene or the passing of time, filling out with his words the gap between the characters' speech. Thus the stage is filled at any one time either by the characters' direct presentation of themselves or by the narrator's voice: the interplay between the two is kept to a minimum. But the narrator does not leave the stage entirely. Only rarely does he omit the basic stage directions, and his guiding presence can be felt in the organization of the utterances into groups.

The effect of all this patterning is that the dialogue is controlled both internally (in respect of content) and externally (in respect of form). But precisely because the dialogue is so highly patterned, any departure from the norm stands out as being unmistakably disruptive. For all of these rules are, at one stage or another, and to varying degrees and with varying effects, broken. I wish to examine what I consiser to be the two main types of dialogue in the novel. First of all there is the kind where Stifter consciously exploits the tension possible in a dialogue situation in order thereby to reinforce the central idea of the novel. In these passages tension is present but is controlled, manipulated and rerouted into the main body of the text. There is ultimately nothing subversive about the energy felt in these passages, rather it strengthens the edifice of the whole. It gives life to the rules while they give it a suitable form. The rigour with which these passages are handled is a testament to Stifter's skill in writing so consistently sustained a work.

Secondly there are passages of dialogue whose integration into the overall didactic thrust of the novel is not complete, or at least whose relationship to the

main part of the narrative is not so straightforward. That the majority of these occur in the chapter entitled *Der Rückblick*, which contains the story of Risach's past, is not surprising, for this chapter is qualitatively different from the rest of the narrative. But there are a few strange uses of dialogue in the main body of the text as well, and the effect of these is sometimes insistently disturbing. These tend to be cases where the rules are broken.

Apart from these issues of energy and control, there is a further factor to be taken into account. In the main body of the text it very often occurs that Risach's voice is heavily dominant. His is not the voice merely of an individual, for it is so steeped in the values of the novel that it seems to represent the voice of the work as a whole. This inevitably makes any dialogue involving this voice unequal. Nevertheless there is a strangely pedantic to and fro quality to these dialogues too, which means that the subordinate voice is not crowded out but rather is persuaded to join forces with the other voice. Thus harmony is achieved by consent and the weighting is not felt to be oppressive.

In the *Rückblick* chapter the weighting is not at first present: the characters are allowed to speak as individuals. But slowly Risach's voice starts to take on this dominant quality and something new occurs: at the crisis point in his affair with Mathilde, his voice begins to overrule hers. A pattern is set up of apparent harmony, based this time not on consent but on domination. On the several occasions after this where Mathilde tries to voice her feelings, she is not heard. Not surprisingly these examples set up disruptive counter-currents within the even flow of the narrative.

4.2 THE IDEALIZED PRESENT

4.2.1 The education of Heinrich

Two passages of dialogue between Risach and Heinrich will be analyzed first of all. They both depict the two men in their respective roles of mentor and pupil at different stages of their relationship. The passages are also united by the fact that although they may contain tensions and difficulties, these are always worked out or reconciled within the course of the dialogue. Nothing is left unresolved. The voices represented in them (those of Heinrich and the mature Risach) correspond to legitimate tendencies within the text; and the outcome of the dialogues is that Heinrich's voice is absorbed into the larger, all-embracing voice of Risach, which is the voice of the novel.

4.2.1.1 *Heinrich arrives at the 'Rosenhaus'*

The first example is the first passage of dialogue in the novel and depicts the meeting between Risach and Heinrich. Of the two passages under discussion here this one contains the most explicit moment of conflict between the two men,[15] but even here the conflict is not divisive. At this point in the novel the

Rosenhaus and the values it represents have not been introduced either to Heinrich or to the reader. Heinrich has established himself as a modest, intelligent young man and as a steady, confident, if inscrutable narrator. The reader is acquainted only with Heinrich's perspective on life and on the world and has had up to now no cause to question the validity of this perspective. But this passage, by juxtaposing Heinrich's voice with Risach's, shows up weaknesses and faults within Heinrich which were not previously apparent. The scene is crucial, for it sets in motion the gigantic exposition of the *Nachsommer* world which forms the body of the novel: 'Die Differenz der Meinungen ist der Motor, der die ganze Erzählung in Bewegung bringt. Ohne Heinrichs sturre Unkenntnis wäre der "Roman" gar nicht entstanden. Es ist eine Differenz, die nach Übereinstimmung heischt. Solche harte Positionen müssen versöhnt werden' (Lindau, p. 80).

The dialogue is as follows:

Er sah mich einen Augenblick an, da er zu mir herangekommen war, und sagte dann: 'Was wollt Ihr, lieber Herr?'

'Es ist ein Gewitter im Anzuge,' antwortete ich, 'und es wird in Kurzem über diese Gegend kommen. Ich bin ein Wandersmann, wie Ihr an meinem Ränzchen seht, und bitte daher, daß mir in diesem Hause so lange ein Obdach gegeben werde, bis der Regen oder wenigstens der schwerere vorüber ist.'

'Das Gewitter wird nicht zum Ausbruche kommen,' sagte der Mann.

'Es wird keine Stunde dauern, daß es kommt,' entgegnete ich, 'ich bin mit diesen Gebirgen sehr wohl bekannt und verstehe mich auch auf die Wolken und Gewitter derselben ein wenig.'

'Ich bin aber mit dem Platze, auf welchem wir stehen, aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach weit länger bekannt, als Ihr mit dem Gebirge, da ich viel älter bin, als Ihr,' antwortete er, 'ich kenne auch seine Wolken und Gewitter und weiß, daß heute auf dieses Haus, diesen Garten und diese Gegend kein Regen niederfallen wird.'

'Wir wollen nicht lange darüber Meinungen hegen, ob ein Gewitter dieses Haus netzen wird oder nicht,' sagte ich; 'wenn Ihr Anstand nehmet, mir dieses Gitterthor zu öffnen, so habet die Güte, und ruft den Herrn des Hauses herbei.'

'Ich bin der Herr des Hauses.'

Auf dieses Wort sah ich mir den Mann etwas näher an. Sein Angesicht zeigte zwar auch auf ein vorgerücktes Alter; aber es schien mir jünger als die Haare, und gehörte überhaupt zu jenen freundlichen, wohlgefärbten, nicht durch das Fett der vorgerückteren Jahre enstellten Angesichtern, von denen man nie weiß, wie alt sie sind. Hierauf sagte ich: 'Nun muß ich wohl um Verzeihung bitten, daß ich so zudringlich gewesen bin, ohne Weiteres auf die Sitte des Landes zu bauen. Wenn Eure Behauptung, daß kein Gewitter kommen werde, einer Ablehnung gleich sein soll, werde ich mich augenblicklich entfernen. Denkt nicht, daß ich als junger Mann den Regen so scheue; es ist mir zwar nicht so angenehm, durchnäßt zu werden, als trocken zu bleiben, es ist mir aber auch nicht so unangenehm, daß ich deßhalb Jemanden zur Last fallen sollte. Ich bin oft von dem Regen getroffen worden, und es liegt nichts daran, wenn ich auch heute getroffen werde.'

'Das sind eigentlich zwei Fragen,' antwortete der Mann, 'und ich muß auf beide etwas entgegnen. Das Erste ist, daß Ihr in Naturdingen eine Unrichtigkeit gesagt habt, was vielleicht daher kommt, daß Ihr die Verhältnisse dieser Gegend zu wenig kennt oder auf

die Vorkommnisse der Natur nicht genug achtet. Diesen Irrthum mußte ich berichtigen; denn in Sachen der Natur muß auf Wahrheit gesehen werden. Das Zweite ist, daß, wenn Ihr mit oder ohne Gewitter in dieses Haus kommen wollt, und wenn Ihr gesonnen seid, seine Gastfreundschaft anzunehmen, ich sehr gerne willfahren werde. Dieses Haus hat schon manchen Gast gehabt und manchen gerne beherbergt; und wie ich an Euch sehe, wird es auch Euch gerne beherbergen und so lange verpflegen, als Ihr es für nöthig erachten werdet. Darum bitte ich Euch, tretet ein.'

Mit diesen Worten that er einen Druck am Schlosse des Thorflügels, der Flügel öffnete sich, drehte sich mit einer Rolle auf einer halbkreisartigen Eisenschiene und gab mir Raum zum Eintreten.

Ich blieb nun einen Augenblick unentschlossen.

'Wenn das Gewitter nicht kömmt,' sagte ich, 'so habe ich im Grunde keine Ursache, hier einzutreten; denn ich bin nur des anziehenden Gewitters willen von der Landstraße abgewichen und zu diesem Hause herauf gestiegen. Aber verzeiht mir, wenn ich noch einmal die Frage anrege. Ich bin beinahe eine Art Naturforscher und habe mich mehrere Jahre mit Naturdingen, mit Beobachtungen und namentlich mit diesem Gebirge beschäftigt, und meine Erfahrungen sagen mir, daß heute über diese Gegend und dieses Haus ein Gewitter kommen wird.'

'Nun müßt Ihr eigentlich vollends herein gehen,' sagte er, 'jetzt handelt es sich darum, daß wir gemeinschaftlich abwarten, wer von uns Beiden Recht hat. Ich bin zwar kein Naturforscher und kann von mir nicht sagen, daß ich mich mit Naturwissenschaften beschäftigt habe; aber ich habe Manches über diese Gegenstände gelesen, habe während meines Lebens mich bemüht, die Dinge zu beobachten und über das Gelesene und Gesehene nachzudenken. In Folge dieser Bestrebungen habe ich heute die unzweideutigen Zeichen gesehen, daß die Wolken, welche jetzt noch gegen Sonnenuntergang stehen, welche schon einmal gedonnert haben, und von denen Ihr veranlaßt worden seid, zu mir herauf zu steigen, nicht über dieses Haus und überhaupt über keine Gegend einen Regen bringen werden. Sie werden sich vielleicht, wenn die Sonne tiefer kömmt, vertheilen und werden zerstreut am Himmel herum stehen. Abends werden wir etwa einen Wind spüren, und morgen wird gewiß wieder ein schöner Tag sein. Es könnte sich zwar ereignen, daß einige schwere Tropfen fallen, oder ein kleiner Sprühregen nieder geht; aber gewiß nicht auf diesen Hügel.'

'Da die Sache so ist,' erwiederte ich, 'trete ich gerne ein, und harre mit Euch gerne der Entscheidung, auf die ich begierig bin.'

Nach diesen Worten trat ich ein, er schloß das Gitter und sagte, er wolle mein Führer sein. (VI, i, 47–50)

Looking at the form of the dialogue, we can note that the men speak in turn, Heinrich's speeches being longer at first than Risach's, but this pattern being reversed by the end. In general the speeches gain in length during the course of the passage as they move from factual exchange (Risach finding out what Heinrich wants) to a strangely pedantic exchange about whether or not there will be a storm. Stage directions are reduced to the minimal 'sagte ich', 'antwortete er' etc. There are no evaluative comments from Heinrich the narrator, although the sections of dialogue are interspersed with paragraphs of background information about the actions accompanying the conversation. In general the words are presented directly, the orienting phrase telling the reader who is speaking and in what relationship the speech stands to the previous one

(is it a reply or a new statement?) coming after the first clause of the sentence. In all but two cases this opening clause of the speech is a main one.

These formal factors have to do with issues of both form and of content. That the characters speak in turn in well-ordered sentences makes this typical of the ritualistic stylized exchanges commonly found in Stifter. That there are minimal stage directions and that the words spoken are presented directly might be seen to indicate an abdication of textual control on the narrator's part. But in fact it indicates that there is no need for control: braking and cushioning devices are not used precisely because the content of the speeches is already controlled adequately by their structure and by the fact that the sentiments uttered are completely accepted within the novel's overall statement.

As regards the actual content, it should be noted that there is a rudimentary use of psychology in the dialogue which, however, by the end of the passage, is superseded in importance by a presentation of the novel's main themes. Heinrich is at first self-assertive while Risach appears calm and polite but firm. He addresses Heinrich as 'lieber Herr' and asks to know what he wants. Heinrich gives no greeting but states as a matter of fact that a storm is approaching and requests shelter. Heinrich assumes that he is talking to a servant, which accounts for his domineering attitude. As far as he is concerned the only issue at stake is whether or not he can obtain shelter in this house for the duration of the storm. But to his surprise Risach, for the rest of the conversation, focuses not upon this request but on what is, as it were, the background to it, namely the assumption by Heinrich that it is going to rain. Risach first of all simply states, without feeling the need to give any evidence, that it will not rain. His quiet authority shows up Heinrich's lack of composure when the latter 'replies' (Heinrich's speeches have up to now been described as being replies to Risach's statements) that the storm will come soon and claims that he is experienced in such things. The very syntax of their sentences shows up the differences between the two men:

'Das Gewitter wird nicht zum Ausbruche kommen,' sagte der Mann.
'Es wird keine Stunde dauern, daß es kommt,' entgegnete ich.

The first impression is that both men are equally sure that they are right. Yet Risach's words are more quietly self-assured. He acknowledges the presence of the storm clouds, taking the time to name the object of their discussion ('Das Gewitter') and even making it the subject of his sentence. The sentence is a simple, rhythmical statement: 'Das Gewitter wird nicht zum Ausbruche kommen'. The syntax and stress pattern of Heinrich's sentence on the other hand ('Es wird keine Stunde dauern, daß es kommt'), reveal his haste and anxiety: he uses two clauses so that he can gather speed and emphasis for the final 'daß es kommt' while the stress is on the words he deems important: 'keine Stunde dauern' and 'kommt'.

There is a similar use of psychology in the remainder of this first part of the dialogue. When Heinrich forces Risach into elaborating on his credentials as a weather forecaster by stating his own claim to be an expert, it only reveals that Risach's experience is greater: Heinrich may claim to be familar with the weather in that range of mountains but Risach has known the precise area for longer, is older, and claims not only to think but to know for a fact that it will not rain. Faced with this unexpected resistance Heinrich declares the subject closed and changes tack: he now attempts to pull rank on Risach by demanding to see the master of the house. It is even possible to read a touch of irony in the exaggerated use of polite formulae in his speech: 'wenn Ihr Anstand nehmet, mir dieses Gitterthor zu öffnen, so habet die Güte, und ruft den Herrn des Hauses herbei'.

But Risach's next words shock him out of any sense of his own authority. He utters the only words in the passage which stand completely free of the surrounding text. The words 'Ich bin der Herr des Hauses' are not even softened by the normal perfunctory two words of stage direction but hang in the air and occasion a reassessment of the situation on the part both of Heinrich the protagonist and of Heinrich the narrator. The dialogue stops for a few lines while he looks more closely at Risach and his next speech contains an apology, although the formulation of it, 'Nun muß ich wohl um Verzeihung bitten', allows a grudging tone to be heard. His next words back up the impression that he is now on the defensive. He abruptly supposes that Risach's opposition is because he does not want to give him shelter (Risach has in fact not yet replied to his request) and he proudly (and rather ridiculously) tries to pretend that he does not mind getting wet and that he does not really need shelter. In other words Heinrich has done a complete about-turn because of the unexpected behaviour of Risach, and his faults (haste, unwillingness to listen, lack of humility in talking to people of a lower class even if they are older than he) have been exposed.

The centre of gravity in the conversation is now not Heinrich but Risach as he starts to take advantage of Heinrich's confusion to answer the latter's request for shelter. But before he offers his hospitality he puts Heinrich right on a matter of cardinal importance: man's understanding of nature. He has to correct Heinrich's mistake: 'denn in Sachen der Natur muß auf Wahrheit gesehen werden'. Risach is here stating the values upon which the novel is based, and in his next speech he mentions the correct way to achieve this knowledge, namely, 'die Dinge zu beobachten'. In uttering the main credo of the novel, an harmonious relationship with nature and the education of man by a meticulous observation of 'die Dinge', Risach takes this conversation out of the realm of psychological insights and into the heart of the ideology of the Indian Summer.

After Heinrich enters the *Rosenhaus* he is never again characterized through speech to the same degree as he is here. His education proceeds to the point where he becomes the fit person to inherit the *Rosenhaus* and all that goes with it.

But in his last two speeches before entering, the slight characterization so far noted in him is continued. When Risach offers him shelter he is at a loss to know what to do. Although his speech has already betrayed his indecision, this is the first time Heinrich as narrator actually gives voice to it: 'Ich blieb nun einen Augenblick unentschlossen'. This brings into focus the degree to which he is taken aback by Risach's behaviour. And his speech continues to reflect it. The opening part of the sentence he utters ('Wenn das Gewitter nicht kömmt') is the first introductory clause in the whole spoken exchange which is neither a main clause nor a question. He is not stating a case or asking a question but giving voice to his uncertainty. The tone of what follows shows a new-found humility: 'Wenn das Gewitter nicht kömmt. . . so habe ich im Grunde keine Ursache, hier einzutreten'. Another of his good qualities, his curiosity, is also brought to the fore: he asks out of genuine puzzlement what Risach's reasons are for saying that it will not rain. He finally agrees to go in so they can await the outcome of the storm together: 'Da die Sache so ist . . . trete ich gerne ein, und harre mit Euch gerne der Entscheidung, auf die ich begierig bin'. The first clause of this sentence is curiously ambiguous. Is he accepting that Risach is right about the weather; or is he saying they cannot possibly yet know if there will be a storm, so he will go in and they will see who is right; or does he agree to go in precisely because his entering the house does not depend upon the weather but upon Risach's hospitable offer? It is important, not so much to establish an answer to this question, as to recognize the opaqueness of the language (the colour in Heinrich's voice is gradually lost as he assumes the stately language of the *Rosenhaus*): whatever the reasons, Heinrich accepts Risach's invitation.

This is indeed an intriguing piece of dialogue. A psychological reading is possible but must not be overstated. It is valid only insofar as it registers a collision, in slow motion, between the two speakers which results at first in a rebound (Heinrich's confusion) and then in a synthesis (Heinrich enters the house, his voice is absorbed into Risach's).[16] Any tension felt in the passage is easily contained when it is seen in context: Heinrich's faults, which I have perhaps overstated in order to tease them out, are easily overcome by what we already, even at this early stage of the novel, sense to be his reliability as narrator and as character. The *Rosenhaus*, which he encounters here for the first time in the person of Risach, is only superficially alien to him, for it will in fact turn out to be a home from home, an elaboration of everything that was good about Heinrich's own home and family and his own character. The strange pedantry of the discussion which focuses on the background issue (the weather) before turning to the matter at hand, is also typical of what is to come.

4.2.1.2 *Heinrich and Risach discuss the statue*

The second passage concerning the education of Heinrich occurs after he has just achieved a moment of intense insight when he realizes that the marble statue

in the stairway at the *Rosenhaus* is of extraordinary beauty. Brimming over with exhilaration at the excitement of his discovery he seeks out Risach and, unannounced, goes to speak to him:

Er ging in leichten Schuhen mit Sohlen, die noch weicher, als Filz, waren, auf dem geglätteten Pflaster auf und nieder.

Da er mich kommen sah, ging er auf mich zu und blieb vor mir stehen.

'Ich habe die Thür zu dem Marmorgange offen gesehen,' sagte ich, 'man hat mir berichtet, daß Ihr hier oben sein könntet, und da bin ich herauf gegangen, Euch zu suchen.'

'Daran habt Ihr recht gethan,' erwiederte er.

'Warum habt Ihr mir denn nicht gesagt,' sprach ich weiter, 'daß die Bildsäule, welche auf Eurer Marmortreppe steht, so schön ist?'

'Wer hat es Euch denn jetzt gesagt?' fragte er.

'Ich habe es selber gesehen,' antwortete ich.

'Nun dann werdet Ihr es um so sicherer wissen und mit desto größerer Festigkeit glauben,' erwiederte er, 'als wenn Euch Jemand eine Behauptung darüber gesagt hätte.'

'Ich habe nämlich den Glauben, daß das Bildwerk sehr schön sei,' antwortete ich, mich verbessernd.

'Ich theile mit Euch den Glauben, daß das Werk von großer Bedeutung sei,' sagte er.

'Und warum habt Ihr denn nie zu mir darüber gesprochen?' fragte ich.

'Weil ich dachte, daß Ihr es nach einer bestimmten Zeit selber betrachten und für schön erachten werdet,' antwortete er.

'Wenn Ihr mir es früher gesagt hättet, so hätte ich es früher gewußt,' erwiederte ich.

'Jemanden sagen, daß etwas schön sei,' antwortete er, 'heißt nicht immer, Jemanden den Besitz der Schönheit geben. Er kann in vielen Fällen bloß glauben. Gewiß aber verkümmert man dadurch Demjenigen das Besitzen des Schönen, der ohnehin aus eigenem Antriebe darauf gekommen wäre. Dies setzte ich bei Euch voraus, und darum wartete ich sehr gerne auf Euch.'

'Aber was müßt Ihr denn die Zeit her über mich gedacht haben, daß ich diese Bildsäule sehen konnte und über sie geschwiegen habe?' fragte ich.

'Ich habe gedacht, daß Ihr wahrhaftig seid,' sagte er, 'und ich habe Euch höher geachtet, als Die, welche ohne Ueberzeugung von dem Werke reden, oder als Die, welche es darum loben, weil sie hören, daß es von Andern gelobt wird.'

'Und wo habt Ihr denn das herrliche Bildwerk hergenommen?' fragte ich.

'Es stammt aus dem alten Griechenlande,' antwortete er, 'und seine Geschichte ist sonderbar. Es stand viele Jahre in einer Bretterbude bei Cumä in Italien . . .' (VII, ii, 75–76)

This is merely the first one and half pages of a dialogue which covers sixteen pages and consists mainly of the story of the statue and a discussion on the principle of movement in art. As in the previous passage, there is conflict between the two voices, but the energy in Heinrich's voice is quickly rerouted back into the main stream of the novel and the gap remains closed for the remainder of the dialogue. This energy is felt in the unexpected vehemence with which he questions Risach's motives for not telling him of the statue's beauty. No less than four times he challenges his mentor to explain himself. This behaviour is, by this stage in the novel, very unusual in Heinrich. He is the model pupil who listens to and absorbs what Risach says. The contributions he

does make in their conversation invariably show his educability and are never at variance with the things Risach is teaching him.

But this conversation seems different. The patterning devices are still there. They still speak strictly in turn, the stage directions, still minimal, come after the first main section of the speech or at the end of the speech and, by the end of the conversation, Risach is again instructing Heinrich, this time in the history of the statue. But at the beginning the impression is given of a real dialogue between two different sensibilities at odds with each other. Heinrich starts with an introductory comment on his unexpected presence in Risach's work room: he saw the door open, a servant told him that Risach was there so he came and looked for him. That Heinrich does not say what he has to say straight away can be understood in two ways. It could be a concession to the exaggeratedly polite formulae which so often dominate the dialogue in the novel: the conversation cannot be begun without some opening remark of a conventional nature. Alternatively a psychological reading of the passage is possible: Heinrich on this occasion is impetuous, but not so much that he forgets his manners. The sudden confrontation with Risach (made more awkward by the fact that Risach says nothing, thus putting the onus on Heinrich to explain himself) gives him a sudden awareness of the unusualness of his position and shocks him into saying something of an introductory nature before launching his attack.

This psychological reading can be extended into the remainder of the conversation. While Risach remains calm, Heinrich speaks with great intensity. First of all he poses the question which is bothering him: '"Warum habt Ihr mir denn nicht gesagt," sprach ich weiter, "daß die Bildsäule, welche auf Eurer Marmortreppe steht, so schön ist?"'. The colloquial use of 'denn' betrays a note of unprecedented familiarity in Heinrich's opening statement to Risach and the inclusion of the word 'weiter' indicates that this dialogue has an internal momentum springing from Heinrich's mood over and above the purely ritualistic patterning which holds the piece together. Risach turns the question round on him by asking him who has told him of the statue's beauty since he, Risach, did not. When Heinrich says that he saw it for himself, Risach says that he will therefore know it much more surely than if he had merely been told about it. This second part of the conversation, then, Heinrich's question and the answer which turns him back in upon himself, contains the core of the exchange and the key to Risach's educative method. What happens now, if we remain on the psychological plane for the moment, is that Heinrich has to recover his composure and absorb the truth of Risach's words. His next speech shows a realization on his part that he has spoken with unusual directness and has not introduced his topic with the customary amount of background information. He elaborates on the fact that he has seen the statue's beauty: 'Ich habe nämlich den Glauben, daß das Bildwerk sehr schön sei' and follows this with the stage direction 'antwortete ich *mich verbessernd*' (my emphasis). This last comment is

unusual, for normally the relationship of one speech to another is taken to be self-evident and no explanation is felt to be necessary. Heinrich the narrator is demonstrating the process of regaining balance in action and demonstrating also that he is aware of it.

But in the remainder of the conversation his agitation is not reflected in the stage directions at all but only in the actual words spoken. His four remaining questions become increasingly less indignant. The first, 'Und warum habt Ihr denn nie zu mir darüber gesprochen?', is still in the form of a direct question. The second, 'Wenn Ihr mir es früher gesagt hättet, so hätte ich es früher gewußt', has overtones of peevishness and is still uncomprehending. But the third, 'Aber was müßt Ihr denn die Zeit her über mich gedacht haben, daß ich diese Bildsäule sehen konnte, und über sie geschwiegen habe?', shows that he has all of a sudden accepted the rightness of Risach's replies and is merely concerned for how he looks in the eyes of his mentor. In the fourth, his good qualities, his curiosity and eagerness to learn, are again brought to the fore: he asks where Risach acquired the statue. A further motivation can be read into this question: having seen that he has lost the confrontation but still having energy to spare, he turns this energy, which previously was channelled into indignation, into enthusiasm, accepting graciously that Risach is right and refusing to be deterred by it.

When the focus is switched to Risach the psychology in the scene takes second place to the didactism behind it. The dialogue is really a debate about principles. The statue is the crown jewel of Risach's collection, as he says: 'unter allen Kunstgegenständen, die ich habe, ist mir dieser der liebste' (VII, ii, 85). In seeing its beauty without being prompted, Heinrich is therefore demonstrating his maturity and suitability to be the heir to the *Rosenhaus*.[17] While Risach does not mind instructing him about most things, the sensibility required to appreciate beauty is something innate which cannot be taught. All of Risach's teaching up to now has been based on the supposition that this sensibility was latent in Heinrich, for without it his education would be worthless. As he says later: 'Ich habe gar nie gezweifelt, daß Ihr zu dieser Allgemeinheit gelangen werdet, weil schöne Kräfte in Euch sind, die noch auf keinen Afterweg geleitet sind und nach Erfüllung streben'. Indeed Heinrich has exceeded expectations:

> aber ich habe nicht gedacht, daß Dieß so bald geschehen werde, da Ihr noch zu kraftvoll in dem auf seiner Stufe höchst lobenswerthen Streben nach dem Einzelnen begriffen waret. Ich habe geglaubt, irgend ein großes allgemeines menschliches Gefühl, das Euch ergreifen würde, würde Euch auf den Standpunkt führen, auf dem ich Euch jetzt sehe. (VII, ii, 89–90)

Like a modern day Parzival Heinrich is placed in a situation where the normal rules of decorum must for once be suspended and a direct question posed which will unlock a story that would otherwise remain untold. The story here is the story of the statue, the preservation against all odds of a thing of great age and

beauty, and its re-enthronement in a modern setting. Unlike Parzival Heinrich has the maturity to do what is required of him and thus proves himself to be the rightful heir to the *Rosenhaus*. He has the right balance between passivity and activity to be the perfect hero of this novel. The controlled energy in this scene serves to emphasize precisely this. He has passed the test.

Both of these conversations, when Heinrich arrives at the *Rosenhaus* and when he questions Risach about the statue, show in heightened form the characteristics of dialogue as described in Chapter Two. They are based on a binary opposition of the two speakers and make use of the two primary forms which, according to Petsch, this opposition can take. The first is based in large part on a challenge — Heinrich and Risach disagree about an aspect of empirical reality and wait to see who will be proved right. Risach's voice is vindicated. By the time of the second exchange the didactic frame of their relationship has been firmly established. Heinrich is learning about life and art, and Risach holds the answers. The opposition is that of question and answer, pupil and mentor. And as in the former case the resolution is found in the overcoming of Heinrich's problem (before he was wrong, now he is partially unaware) and the absorption of his (weaker) voice into Risach's. In neither of these dialogues does Risach give any ground at all. Heinrich moves towards him. The dynamic of dialogue is employed in the revelation of Risach's ideas. At the end of both dialogues, both Heinrich and the reader are better informed about some aspect of the *Rosenhaus* world.

4.2.2 NATALIE: THE DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN NATALIE AND MATHILDE

In the previous two dialogues the voices heard have been unequally weighted with the result that Heinrich's voice is by the end engulfed in the larger voice of the novel. There is really no contest. This is the case in the majority of dialogues in the novel.

One exception is the strange passage of dialogue between Mathilde and Natalie which occurs just over half way through the book. Here Stifter shows himself to be uncertain as to how to weight each voice. The result is a curiously unresolved dialogue. Heinrich has been talking to Mathilde in the garden with Gustav also present, when Natalie suddenly arrives. She is shocked to find Heinrich at her mother's side and blushes. Heinrich, also 'beinahe erschrocken' greets her. Then Mathilde speaks:

'Mein Kind,' sagte Mathilde, 'es ist kein Uebel, wenn Du in den Umgebungen dieses Hauses herum gehst; aber es ist nicht gut, wenn Du in der heißen Sonne, die gegen Mittag zwar nicht am heißesten ist, aber immerhin schon heiß genug, auf dem Hügel herum gehst, welcher ihr ganz ausgesetzt ist, welcher keinen Baum — außer bei der Felderrast — und keinen Strauch hat, der Schatten bieten könnte. Und Du weißt auch nicht, wie lange Du in der Hitze verweilest, wenn Du Dich in das Herumsehen vertiefest, oder wenn du Blumen pflückest, und in dieser Beschäftigung die Zeit nicht beachtest.'

'Ich habe mich in das Blumenpflücken nicht vertieft,' erwiederte Natalie, 'ich habe die Blumen nur so gelegentlich gelesen, wie sie mir in meinem Dahingehen aufstießen. Die Sonne thut mir nicht so weh, liebe Mutter, wie Du meinst, ich empfinde mich in ihr sehr wohl und sehr frei, ich werde nicht müde, und die Wärme des Körpers stärkt mich eher, als daß sie mich drückt.'

'Du hast auch den Hut an dem Arme getragen,' sagte die Mutter.

'Ja, Das habe ich gethan,' antwortete Natalie, 'aber Du weißt, daß ich dichte Haare habe, auf dieselben legt sich die Sonnenwärme wohlthätig, wohlthätiger, als wenn ich den Hut auf dem Haupte trage, der so heiß macht, und die freie Luft geht angenehm, wenn man das Haupt entblößt hat, an der Stirne und an den Haaren dahin.'

Ich betrachtete Natalie, da sie so sprach . . .

Die Mutter sah Natalien freundlich an, da sie sprach, und sagte dann: 'Der Jugend ist Alles gut, der Jugend schlägt Alles zum Gedeihen aus, sie wird wohl auch empfinden, was ihr Noth thut, wie das Alter empfindet, was es bedarf — Ruhe und Stille — und unser Freund sagt ja auch, man soll der Natur ihr Wort reden lassen; darum magst Du gehen, wie Du fühlest, daß Du es bedarfst, Natalie, Du wirst kein Unrecht begehen, wie Du es ja nie thust, Du wirst keine Maßregel außer Acht lassen, die wir Dir gesagt haben, und Du wirst dich in Deine Gedanken nicht so vertiefen, daß Du Deinen Körper vergäßest.'

'Das werde ich nicht thun, Mutter,' entgegnete Natalie, 'aber lasse mich gehen, es ist ein Wunsch in mir, so zu verfahren. Ich werde ihn mäßigen, wie ich kann; ich thue es um Deinetwillen, Mutter, daß Du Dich nicht beunruhigest. Ich möchte auf dem Felderhügel herum gehen, dann auch in dem Thale und in dem Walde, ich möchte auch in dem Lande gehen, und Alles darin beschauen und betrachten. Und die Ruhe schließt dann so schön das Gemüth und den Willen ab.'

Daß Natalie doch durch das Wandeln in der heißen Sonne unmittelbar vor der Mittagszeit sich erhitzt habe, zeigte ihr Angesicht. Dasselbe behielt die Röthe, welche es nach dem ersten Erblassen erhalten hatte, und verlor sie nur in geringem Maße, während sie an dem Tische saß, was doch eine geraume Zeit dauerte. Es blühte dieses Roth, wie ein sanftes Licht, auf ihren Wangen und verschönerte sie, gleichsam wie ein klarer Schimmer. (VII, ii, 210–13)

This passage is unusual in that the narrative is uncertain about which voice to back and wavers between the two. This means that the outcome cannot be predicted and the result is a kind of compromise where each voice goes out of its way to accommodate the other. Mathilde starts with a rebuke: 'in [der Mittagsstunde] solltest Du nicht so weit gehen' (VII, ii, 209), which sets the tone for her subsequent speeches: she is alarmed and annoyed by Natalie's rash behaviour. Her next two speeches are exploratory questions about what Natalie has been doing, to which Natalie replies animatedly. Mathilde's fourth speech expands upon the rebuke in her first. But this meets with opposition in Natalie who begins by directly contradicting her: 'Ich habe mich in das Blumenpflücken nicht vertieft' and continues by appealing against the strictness with which her mother seeks to restrict her movements: 'Die Sonne thut mir nicht so weh, liebe Mutter, wie Du meinst, ich empfinde mich in ihr sehr wohl und sehr frei, ich werde nicht müde, und die Wärme des Körpers stärkt mich eher, als daß sie mich drückt'. This speech sounds reasonable enough until seen for what it is: an appeal against parental authority and an assertion of the individual's right to

self-determination. As such it is unprecedented in the novel, for as Michael Beddow has argued, the central thesis of the novel is the 'necessity of submitting to an order external to the self'. This necessity may be seen in relation to all spheres, whether they be gardening, art, even political life, but the 'most extensive and emphatic portrayal' (Beddow, p. 169) of it is in the domain of personal relationships where the order is expressed in parental judgements. So if the thematic of the novel is consistent throughout (and it is a remarkably consistent novel), then Natalie's defiance here and in her next speech where she insists that no harm can come of her not wearing a hat, should logically be seen as the ultimate sin.

Clearly however we are not asked to judge Natalie's behaviour in this light. The narrative here allows her to assert herself and to get away with it, for Mathilde repents of her strictness and in a very strange speech proposes a *modus vivendi*. She acknowledges the innate ability of youth to know what is best for it (again an extraordinary attitude when seen against the background of the *Rückblick* section where youth is led astray by its passions). Even Risach, she claims, says that 'man soll der Natur ihr Wort reden lassen' and for this reason she tells Natalie that she may do as she pleases. The right of the individual to determine his or her own behaviour by doing what they feel to be right, is upheld. But then Mathilde adds her condition, namely that Natalie should, after all, obey her parents' wishes: 'Du wirst kein Unrecht begehen, wie Du es ja nie thust, Du wirst keine Maßregel außer Acht lassen, die wir Dir gesagt haben, und Du wirst Dich in Deine Gedanken nicht so vertiefen, daß Du Deinen Körper vergäßest'. This is contradictory: Natalie is to do as she wants, but also as her parents want (and in her next speech she promises to do just this), but the problem at hand is not solved, namely what to do when the two things conflict, as they have done in this case. Mathilde seems to present a compromise but she in fact only glosses over the issue, which is central not only to this novel but also to the whole *Bildungsroman* tradition: whether the individual should be true to him or herself or should submit to an external order. Elsewhere in the novel Stifter's reply is unequivocally the latter. Here he seems undecided.

One solution would be to say that Natalie is not an individual but is in fact the perfect embodiment of natural laws of harmony. In letting her decide what is best for her, Mathilde is actually watching nature in action. There is no danger of Natalie being overruled by her passions for they are well under control, Natalie, like the flowers and plants in Risach's garden, having been raised under optimum conditions. Natalie is the fruit of the *Rosenhaus*, from which passion has been banished, she has been formed by the mature love of Risach and Mathilde. This is not meant in a physical sense (Natalie is not Risach's daughter) but in a spiritual and aesthetic one. Within the overall statement of the novel Heinrich and Natalie represent a distilled essence of pure, ideal existence from which the impurities of Risach and Mathilde's early love have been removed.

But if this is the case there should be no need for this conversation to take place. If Nathalie is an ideal figure, then the idea of parental guidance as the ultimate source of authority becomes a rule which still stands, but which does not need to be tested. The only people who now need to assert it are not the parents but the children, which of course Heinrich and Natalie do when they declare their love for each other.[18] The old must respect the young, as well as vice versa (as Risach says, 'man soll der Natur ihr Wort reden lassen'). Why then does Mathilde seek to assert her authority before backing down, if not because she has genuine cause for alarm at Natalie's behaviour? What I wish to suggest is that Stifter is here uncertain about whether or not to represent Natalie as a totally idealized figure. When it comes to her relationship with Heinrich she is idealized: 'The lovers Heinrich and Natalie never voice possessive desire, or appreciation of the other's unique personality, but adore each other as manifestations of a general ideal'.[19] But elsewhere there are hints of a wayward individualism in Natalie. Heinrich unwittingly gives credence to this idea when he continues the passage with a description of her. It seems that she is indeed overheated as a result of her adventures, for it takes a considerable amount of time for her face to recover its usual colour:

> Daß Natalie doch durch das Wandeln in der heißen Sonne unmittelbar vor der Mittagszeit sich erhitzt habe, zeigte ihr Angesicht. Dasselbe behielt die Röthe, welche es nach dem ersten Erblassen erhalten hatte, und verlor sie nur in geringem Maße, während sie an dem Tische saß, was doch eine geraume Zeit dauerte.

For Heinrich her colour only increases her beauty, but in general his description does seem to vindicate Mathilde's original fear that Natalie may have done herself harm.

The irresolution in this passage is interesting because it shows the meeting of two conflicting principles upon which the novel is based. There is the idea of classical beauty and proportion, as represented by Natalie (her likeness to the statue is crucial here) which is merged with Stifter's respect for the inherent integrity of 'die Dinge'. But there is also the heavy paternalism which underlies the ethos of the *Rosenhaus*, mingled with the wider idea that the individual must find his or her place in the world by submitting to an outside order. Natalie is at one and the same time a symbol of natural integrity and, within the didactic sphere of the novel, a dutiful daughter.

4.2.3 Love: Heinrich and Natalie declare their love

The scenes of dialogue between Heinrich and Natalie are remarkable for the lack of tension they demonstrate. Although they talk at length on two separate occasions, the dynamic of their discussion is prolonged purely because they are revealing to each other how like-minded they are and to the reader how undifferentiated are their voices. Their speech is formal and stylized, especially

when they are expressing their love for each other, and the only concession to the demands of realism in the scenes is a simple use of psychology — both are shy and embarrassed on first meeting and then overjoyed to find their feelings reciprocated. But it does require an extremely attentive reading to distinguish the subtle shades of feeling behind the astonishing formal control.

The scene which has been described as 'die vielleicht seltsamste Liebesszene deutscher Erzählprosa',[20] the scene where they discover their love to be mutual, begins with a typically tortuous depiction of their shared embarrassment when Heinrich comes upon Natalie unexpectedly:

> Als ich eingetreten war, sah ich Natalien auf dem Bänklein sitzen. Sie war sehr erschrocken und stand auf. Ich war auch erschrocken; dennoch sah ich in ihr Angesicht. In demselben war ein Schwanken zwischen Roth und Blaß, und ihre Augen waren auf mich gerichtet.
>
> Ich sagte: 'Mein Fräulein, Ihr werdet mir es glauben, wenn ich Euch sage, daß ich von dem Laubgange an der linken Seite dieser Wand gegen die Grotte gekommen bind und Euch nicht habe sehen können, sonst wäre ich nicht eingetreten, und hätte Euch nicht gestört.'
>
> Sie antwortete nichts und sah mich noch immer an.
>
> Ich sagte wieder: 'Da ich Euch nun einmal beunruhigt habe, wenn auch gegen meinen Willen, so werdet Ihr mir es wohl gütig verzeihen, und ich werde mich sogleich entfernen.'
>
> 'Ach nein, nein,' sagte sie.
>
> Da ich schwankte und die Bedeutung der Worte nicht erkannte, fragte ich: 'Zürnet Ihr mir, Natalie?'
>
> 'Nein, ich zürne Euch nicht,' antwortete sie und richtete die Augen, die sie eben nieder geschlagen hatte, wieder auf mich.
>
> 'Ihr seid auf diesen Platz gegangen, um allein zu sein,' sagte ich, 'also muß ich Euch verlassen.'
>
> 'Wenn Ihr mich nicht aus Absicht meidet, so ist es nicht ein Müssen, daß Ihr mich verlasset,' antwortete sie.
>
> 'Wenn es nicht eine Pflicht ist, Euch zu verlassen,' erwiederte ich, 'so müßt Ihr Euren Platz wieder einnehmen, von dem ich Euch verscheucht habe. Thut es, Natalie, setzt Euch auf Eure frühere Stelle nieder.' (VII, ii, 273–74)

The indirectness with which they speak does not hide altogether the basic facts of their situation, but renders it almost comic. Heinrich takes refuge from his shock in exaggeratedly formal language, offering to withdraw and leave her alone. Natalie's initial inarticulateness (she does not speak when the onus is on her to reply the first time, and the second time all she can say is 'Ach nein, nein') he finds difficult to interpret, but it does break through the barrier of formality, for in his next speech Heinrich utters a brief and direct question which betrays his anxiety: 'Zürnet Ihr mir, Natalie?' (in his opening speech he had addressed her formally as 'Mein Fräulein'). But when she has replied he becomes formal again, offering to withdraw. Her reply demonstrates that she wishes him to stay, but she cannot utter this desire directly but only in the most roundabout way: 'Wenn Ihr mich nicht aus Absicht meidet, so ist es nicht ein Müssen, daß

Ihr mich verlasset'. Heinrich answers in a similar vein, and they find themselves, to their surprise, their embarrassment, but also to their secret delight, in conversation.

This dialogue is typical of many in the novel because the simple psychology (here the delicacy of the two characters' respect and feeling for each other) is given formal expression in a passage so stylized that it becomes almost abstract.

Having overcome their initial embarrassment and established a mutually acceptable basis upon which they may converse, the couple proceed to talk in a way which is at once impersonal and an expression of their deepest being. For they talk, not about themselves but about their surroundings, about nature and some of the components of nature: stone, precious stones, water. They given expression in fact to their complete integration into and oneness with Risach's world, their complete lack of individuality. An extract from this will suffice to give a feel of the dialogue:

In unserem Schweigen sahen wir, gleichsam wie durch Verabredung, gegen das rieselnde Wasser.

Endlich sagte sie: 'Wir haben von dem Angenehmen dieses Ortes gesprochen! und sind von dem edlen Steine des Marmors auf die Edelsteine gekommen; aber eines Dinges wäre noch Erwähnung zu thun, das diesen Ort ganz besonders auszeichnet.'

'Welches Dinges?'

'Des Wassers. Nicht bloß, daß dieses Wasser vor vielen, die ich kenne, gut zur Erquickung gegen den Durst ist, so hat sein Spielen und sein Fließen gerade an dieser Stelle und durch diese Vorrichtungen etwas Besänftigendes und etwas Beachtungswerthes.'

'Ich fühle, wie Ihr,' antwortete ich, 'und wie oft habe ich dem schönen Glänzen und dem schattenden Dunkel dieses lebendigen, flüchtigen Körpers an dieser Stelle zugesehen, eines Körpers, der, wie die Luft, wohl viel bewunderungswürdiger wäre, als es die Menschen zu erkennen scheinen.'

'Ich halte auch das Wasser und die Luft für bewunderungswürdig,' entgegnete sie, 'die Menschen achten nur so wenig auf Beides, weil sie überall von ihnen umgeben sind. Das Wasser erscheint mir als das bewegte Leben des Erdkörpers, wie die Luft sein ungeheurer Odem ist.'

'Wie richtig sprecht Ihr,' sagte ich, . . . (VII, ii, 279–80)

The dynamics of interchange are present in the fact that the couple can be seen to be relating to one another — Natalie makes a statement, Heinrich questions her, she elaborates, he agrees and elaborates further, she agrees and adds a comment, he agrees and elaborates further. But if the outward signs of their interchange were removed for a moment it would be seen that they speak, not as two differentiated individuals, but with one voice, the voice of the novel. Lindau is right when she says that Heinrich and Natalie do not really converse with each other: 'es ist vielmehr ein "Gesang zu zweien" über die Schönheit der Welt. Wer welchen Part singt, spielt keine Rolle; die beiden Gestalten wären auswechselbar' (Lindau, p. 78). Language for them is not problematic but extremely simple, for it gives complete expression to reality: 'und so ist denn beider Wesen

in den Dingen eins geworden, ehe noch ihr Mund es ausspricht'.[21] For Staiger this makes their dialogue of unique purity and beauty. He describes this conversation as 'gewiß das makelloseste aller deutschen Prosa . . ., klar wie Aquamarin, in einer so unsäglich tiefen und einfachen Weise schön, daß die ganze Welt in seiner Schönheit auszuruhen scheint' (p. 193). Others, notably Glaser, are irritated by the formality. Speaking of Heinrich and Natalie's language he says that the reality of love escapes, 'da deren mächtigstes Moment, ihre körperhafte Sinnlichkeit, verdunstet ist in körperlose Anständigkeit. Hohl schleppern sich die Formeln, in denen ausgelaugte Liebe mit prüder Pracht renommiert'.[22] Wildbolz is, I feel, nearer the mark when he remarks that the language used by the couple is, in its formality and use of repetition, extremely strange but is understandable, and indeed is only understandable, when viewed within the rhythm of the whole work (pp. 112–13). The dialogue ends as follows:

'O meine geliebte, meine theure, ewig mir gehörende Natalie!'

'Mein einziger, mein unvergeßlicher Freund!'

Ich war von Empfindung überwältigt, ich zog sie näher an mich und neigte mein Angesicht zu ihrem. Sie wendete ihr Haupt herüber und gab mit Güte ihre schönen Lippen meinem Munde, um den Kuß zu empfangen, den ich bot.

'Ewig für Dich allein,' sagte ich.

'Ewig für Dich allein,' sagte sie leise.

Schon als ich die süßen Lippen an meinen fühlte, war mir, als sei ein Zittern in ihr, und als fließen ihre Thränen wieder.

Da ich mein Haupt weg wendete und in ihr Angesicht schaute, sah ich die Thränen in ihren Augen. (VII, ii, 287–88)

This passage, if read out of context, might remind one of the worst Mills and Boon story. Once could object that the author had no concept of character but wrote only of mood in a way that excluded all life in its generality. People simply do not talk in such a formal way at emotionally intense moments. When seen within the context of the work, however, the dialogue is no less extraordinary but is at least more understandable. Heinrich and Natalie's voices are not differentiated because Stifter is attempting, through their dialogue, to depict pure love, a love which is as fully legitimate as it is free from the guilt associated with human passion, a love which is as perfectly expressible through language as it is through gesture, the kind of love, in other words, which has eluded so many of Stifter's other, more real but less fortunate, characters.

In one sense, the attempt fails of course. Such an exchange must be considered in context, and the context of Heinrich and Natalie's love, the artificiality of the willed utopia, makes the attempt ring hollow. They may give expression to pure love, but without a recognizably real context, and without recognizably real voices with which to speak, that expression counts for nothing.

4.3 THE FLAWED PAST

4.3.1 Symptoms

So much for the occasions where tension in dialogue is used by Stifter to strengthen the didactic edifice of his novel. But there are a number of occasions where, in the main section of the narrative, an oblique reference is made to the past. These occur well before the *Rückblick* chapter which is sixteenth out of seventeen chapters. The reader therefore has no knowledge of the story of Risach and Mathilde's youth and can only guess what is meant when the text hints at past events. No hint is given by Heinrich the narrator because he writes without invoking the dimension of hindsight. These references therefore have an unsettling effect.

4.3.1.1 *The parting scene*

The first hint of a radical disturbance occurs in a dialogue between Risach and Mathilde. It is Heinrich's third visit to the *Rosenhaus* and Mathilde and Natalie are taking their leave. The leave-taking is performed with the utmost ceremony which, however, does not succeed in sapping the emotional content of the scene. This breaks through at the end and is felt in a clash of wills between Risach and Mathilde. The passage reads as follows:

Nach dem Frühmale, als die Frauen schon die Reisehüte aufhatten, sagte Mathilde zu meinem Gastfreunde: 'Ich danke Dir, Gustav, lebe wohl und komme bald in den Sternenhof.'

'Lebe wohl, Mathilde,' sagte mein Gastfreund.

Die zwei alten Leute küßten sich wieder auf die Lippen, wie sie es bei der Ankunft Mathildens gethan hatten.

'Lebe wohl, Natalie,' sagte er dann zu dem Mädchen.

Dasselbe erwiederte nur leise die Worte: 'Dank für alle Güte.'

Mathilde sagte zu dem Knaben: 'Sei folgsam, und nimm Dir Deinen Ziehvater zum Vorbilde!'

Der Knabe küßte ihr die Hand.

Dann, zu mir gewendet, sprach sie: 'Habet Dank für die freundlichen Stunden, die Ihr uns in diesem Hause gewidmet habt. Der Besitzer wird Euch für Euren Besuch wohl schon danken. Bleibt meinem Knaben gut, wie Ihr es bisher gewesen seid, und laßt Euch seine Anhänglichkeit nicht leid thun. Wenn es Eure schöne Wissenschaft zuläßt, so seid unter Denen, die von diesem Hause aus den Sternenhof besuchen werden. Eure Ankunft wird dort sehr willkommen sein.'

'Den Dank muß wohl ich zurück geben für alle die Güte, welche mir von Euch und von dem Besitzer dieses Hauses zu Theil geworden ist,' erwiederte ich. 'Wenn Gustav einige Zuneigung zu mir hat, so ist wohl die Güte seines Herzens die Ursache, und wenn Ihr mich von dem Sternenhofe nicht zurück weiset, so werde ich gewiß unter den Besuchenden sein.'

Ich empfand, daß ich mich auch von Natalien verabschieden sollte; ich vermochte aber nicht, etwas zu sagen, und verbeugte mich nur stumm. Sie erwiederte diese Verbeugung ebenfalls stumm.

Hierauf verließ man das Haus und ging auf den Sandplatz hinaus. Die braunen Pferde standen mit dem Wagen schon vor dem Gitter. Die Hausdienerschaft war herbei gekommen, Eustach mit seinen Arbeitern stand da, der Gärtner mit seinen Leuten und seiner Frau und der Meier mit dem Großknechte aus dem Meierhofe waren ebenfalls gekommen.

'Ich danke Euch recht schön, lieben Leute,' sagte Mathilde, 'ich danke Euch für Eure Freundschaft und Güte, seid für Euren Herrn treu und gut. Du, Katharina, sehe auf ihn und Gustav, daß Keinem ein Ungemach zustößt.'

'Ich weiß, ich weiß,' fuhr sie fort, als sie sah, daß Katharina reden wollte, 'du thust Alles, was in Deinen Kräften ist, und noch mehr, als in Deinen Kräften ist; aber es liegt schon so in dem Menschen, daß er um Erfüllung seiner Herzenswünsche bittet, wenn er auch weiß, daß sie ohnehin erfüllt werden, ja daß sie schon erfüllt worden sind.'

'Kommt recht gut nach Hause,' sagte Katharina, indem sie Mathilden die Hand küßte und sich mit dem Zipfel ihrer Schürze die Augen trocknete.

Alle drängten sich herzu und nahmen Abschied. Mathilde hatte für ein Jedes liebe Worte. Auch von Natalien beurlaubte man sich, die gleichfalls freundlich dankte.

'Eustach, vergeßt den Sternenhof nicht ganz,' sagte Mathilde zu diesem gewendet, 'besucht uns mit den Anderen. Ich will nicht sagen, daß Euch auch die Dinge dort nothwendig haben könnten, Ihr sollt unsertwegen kommen.'

'Ich werde kommen, hochverehrte Frau,' erwiederte Eustach.

Nun sprach sie noch einige Worte zu dem Gärtner und seiner Frau und zu dem Meier, worauf die Leute ein wenig zurück traten.

'Sei gut, mein Kind,' sagte sie zu Gustav, indem sie ihm ein Kreuz mit Daumen und Zeigefinger auf die Stirne machte und ihn auf dieselbe küßte. Der Knabe hielt ihre Hand fest umschlungen und küßte sie. Ich sah in seinen großen schwarzen Augen, die in Thränen schwammen, daß er sich gerne an ihren Hals würfe; aber die Scham, die einen Bestandtheil seines Wesens machte, mochte ihn zurück halten.

'Bleib lieb, Natalie,' sagte mein Gastfreund.

Das Mädchen hätte bald die dargereichte Hand geküßt, wenn er es zugelassen hätte.

'Theurer Gustav, habe noch einmal Dank,' sagte Mathilde zu meinem Gastfreunde. Sie hatte noch mehr sagen wollen; aber es brachen Thränen aus ihren Augen. Sie nahm ein weißes feines Tuch und drückte es fest gegen diese Augen, aus denen sie heftig weinte.

Mein Gastfreund stand da und hielt die Augen ruhig; aber es fielen Thränen aus denselben herab.

'Reise recht glücklich, Mathilde,' sagte er endlich, 'und wenn bei Deinem Aufenthalte bei uns etwas gefehlt hat, so rechne es nicht unserer Schuld an.'

Sie that das Tuch von den Augen, die noch fort weinten, deutete auf Gustav und sagte: 'Meine größte Schuld steht da, eine Schuld, welche ich wohl nie werde tilgen können.'

'Sie ist nicht auf Tilgung entstanden,' erwiederte mein Gastfreund. 'Rede nicht davon, Mathilde, wenn etwas Gutes geschieht, so geschieht es recht gerne.'

Sie hielten sich noch einen Augenblick bei den Händen, während ein leichtes Morgenlüftchen einige Blätter der abgeblühten Rosen zu ihren Füßen wehte.

Dann führte er sie zu dem Wagen, sie stieg ein, und Natalie folgte ihr. (VI, i, 299–302)

For the first two thirds of the passage the patterning is very tightly controlled. The main speaker is Mathilde, for it is she who is leaving and she is superior in age and status to Natalie, and therefore takes the lead. Heinrich plays a very minor role. As narrator he does not offer any comment on what is said and as a

protagonist in the scene he speaks only when spoken to. Although there are many people present (all the servants are there) the attention of the narrative is focused at any one time exclusively on one pair of speakers and the order of speakers forms a rigid pattern. Risach talks to both of the women leaving, firstly to Mathilde then to Natalie, and at the end to each of them again but in reverse order. Mathilde likewise talks to all the men and to the servants, beginning with the most important (Risach), then the next most important (her son, Gustav), then moving on to Heinrich, and finally to the servants. During the second round of exchanges she again talks to Gustav, and then finally to Risach. The patterning thus gives an emphasis to the final exchange between Risach and Mathilde.

All of the exchanges except the final one are in the form of a simple statement followed by a counter-statement or gesture. In each case the counter-statement or gesture (on one occasion there is both) is felt to be conclusive of that particular section of the discourse. The ball has, as it were, been returned over the net and the point settled. Thus in the first exchange Risach and Mathilde say goodbye and seal that particular section with a kiss. The narrator earths any stray emotion there could be in this gesture by comparing it with a parallel occasion: the couple kissed similarly when Mathilde arrived. Risach then says goodbye to Natalie, who thanks him, and Mathilde tells her son to be good and to follow the example of Risach. This is acknowledged with a kiss. Mathilde then exchanges pleasantries with Heinrich. The next exchange is a silent one: from mutual embarrassment Heinrich and Natalie are unable to speak but say goodbye by means of a bow.

These exchanges all take place in the privacy of the house. The family then leaves the house and goes out to where the servants are waiting. It is now, in the more public setting, that the emotion begins to break through, but this does not happen straight away. Mathilde speaks to Eustach who replies courteously, and to the gardener and the steward. She has now taken leave of everybody, from the master of the house down to the family retainers.

It is in the final three exchanges that the underground emotion comes to the surface. It shows first of all in the young brother and sister Gustav and Natalie, and is manifested in both instances not by a speech or a gesture, but by the deliberate avoidance of a gesture which would have brought emotion dangerously close to the surface. Mathilde speaks to Gustav, makes the sign of the cross over him and kisses him. The boy kisses her hand but holds back from doing what he would dearly like to do: throw his arms around her neck. Likewise Natalie would like to kiss Risach's hand but this gesture is denied her. The idea of control and of emotion too strong to express is thus thematized by Heinrich the narrator. He here departs from his normal practice of describing only what he or any observer could see, and describes what he senses.

In the final exchange the patterning so far elaborated is relaxed somewhat as the tension breaks through. Risach and Mathilde do not merely exchange

formal greetings again in two well-controlled utterances, instead they have a conversation, a dialogue. Each speaks twice. The speeches have real rather than purely functional (that is: valedictory) content; the relationship of each speech to the previous and subsequent ones is no longer fixed but precarious, unbalanced. With the patterning weakened (but not gone: they still speak in turn), new possibilities are opened up. Mathilde starts the exchange by thanking her host again but is unable to continue with what she wanted to say, for she bursts into tears. An involuntary gesture replaces a formal speech and is far more eloquent. With the next sentence the narrative attempts to restore order by showing Risach in a characteristically controlled pose: 'Mein Gastfreund stand da, und hielt die Augen ruhig'. But the second part of the sentence betrays his equal lack of composure: 'aber es fielen Thränen aus denselben herab'. The conscious action (holding his eyes steady) is overridden by the reflex one, the falling of the tears.

When Risach finally manages to speak ('sagte er endlich'), he starts as though he were going to utter another formulaic speech: 'Reise recht glücklich, Mathilde'. But then he says something extremely ambiguous: 'und wenn bei Deinem Aufenthalte bei uns etwas gefehlt hat, so rechne es nicht unserer Schuld an'. The ambiguity lies in the use of the words 'unser' and 'Schuld'. He could be saying politely that he hopes she has had a pleasant stay and that she must not blame him or the members of his household if there was anything which displeased her. He could simply be being polite. The 'unser' would then refer to Risach and his servants. The choice of the word 'Schuld' would merely be an exaggeration for the sake of politeness. But various factors suggest that 'unsere Schuld' could refer to something quite different. Risach uses the word 'unser' frequently, a fact which puzzles Heinrich at first. At the end of the *Rückblick* chapter he realizes that Risach uses it to describe himself and Mathilde and the children, thinking of them as a social unit, a quasi-family: 'Auch begriff ich jetzt, weshalb er meistens, wenn er von seinem Besitze sprach, das Wort "unser" gebrauchte. Er bezog es schon auf Mathilden und ihre Kinder' (VIII, iii, 177). Heinrich himself feels this sense of completeness when the women are present, in particular on one occasion when Mathilde is pouring soup at the table: 'Mich erfüllte Das mit großer Behaglichkeit. Es war mir, als wenn Das immer bisher gefehlt hätte. Es war nun etwas, wie eine Familie, in dieses Haus gekommen' (VI, i, 269). Risach may therefore be referring to his and Mathilde's specific guilt in the past (the details of which only become clear in the *Rückblick* chapter) and saying that she must not let it interfere with the present.

His intention cannot be ascertained: he remains inscrutable. But what we do know is the effect his words have on Mathilde and the meaning she ascribes to them. She immediately takes the 'unser' to include her, and connects the word 'Schuld' with Gustav: 'Meine größte Schuld steht da, eine Schuld, welche ich wohl nie werde tilgen können'. A deep chasm of pain and personal anguish has

opened up underneath this ostensibly controlled leave-taking. The emotion in the older couple on parting is, we suddenly realize, to be seen in a much wider context than the one so far available to us, there is a whole other plot of which at this stage only the older couple is aware. And though they may be united by their common memories, they are divided in their reading of those memories. Mathilde is, literally, inconsolable. Her guilt has a physical manifestation in the form of her son, Gustav, and can never be redeemed. She does not explain why Gustav should represent her greatest guilt (because he is the result of a marriage she should never have had? because he should have been Risach's son?). What is important is her conviction of the ineradicability of her guilt.

But Risach feels differently: 'Sie ist nicht auf Tilgung entstanden', he says, 'Rede nicht davon, Mathilde, wenn etwas Gutes geschieht, so geschieht es recht gerne'. The first sentence is obscure. In grammatical terms, the meaning is unclear, but read according to the emotional context, a guess can be made as to Stifter's intention. Risach picks up the word 'tilgen' and the word 'Schuld' and says that this guilt (Mathilde's marriage and the birth of Gustav) did not occur as a result of an attempt at 'Tilgung'. In other words, her marriage was valid, was not a substitute for what might have been between them, and she should not blame herself for marrying. It would be unwise to speculate further as to the precise motivation here. Suffice it to say that his tone is comforting and persuasive. His advice is to close the subject, not to talk about it any more, not to dwell in the past but to dwell positively in the present.

Risach has the last word and the voice of the narrator takes over: 'Sie hielten sich noch einen Augenblick bei den Händen, während ein leichtes Morgenlüftchen einige Blätter der abgeblühten Rosen zu ihren Füßen wehte'. Heinrich gives us a visual picture of the couple which is rich in symbolism: the gesture implies both valediction and togetherness ('sie *hielten* sich bei den Händen') and they are surrounded by the bittersweet symbols of their love: the withered rose petals.

The extraordinary power of the conversation springs from the delicate balance between the patterning and the emotion which is almost, but not quite, repressed. There are, in effect, only two voices heard: a legitimate and an illegitimate one, namely that of Risach and of the other characters, which is the voice of the novel, and, in her last two speeches, the individualized voice of Mathilde, which stands alone. Her voice is unconfident (she cannot articulate the cause of her grief) yet full of conviction: she speaks in absolute terms. It is a voice full of guilt. It makes itself heard, yet it is easily quashed. It is the voice of a woman in a man's world, a world not constructed by her, who tries to talk of herself and of her difficulties in fitting in with the established order of things, only to be told, gently yet firmly, to be quiet. For Risach does not answer her as an equal but from above. He is both superior ('Sie ist nicht auf Tilgung entstanden'), making light of her fears, and authoritarian ('Rede nicht davon'),

declaring the subject closed. Since he cannot absorb her voice into his own, as he does with Heinrich's, he silences it. The weight of experience, which is strongly felt in the final exchange, is left unexplored and, at this stage, unexplained, and a quick return is made to the comfortable world of the *Rosenhaus* where pain is dealt with indirectly (the roses) if at all, and where the only voice heard can be relied upon to speak with clarity and order.

4.3.1.2 *'Es ist nicht abgeblüht, es hat nur eine andere Gestalt'*

Mathilde's unhappiness is also expressed on another occasion in the main body of the novel. Heinrich overhears a snippet of conversation between Risach and Mathilde which is essentially similar to the scene which I have just considered — but in microcosmic form. Heinrich is working in a room near the window when he becomes aware of someone standing outside in the garden. He cannot see who it is because of the thick foliage, but he can hear their voices.

> In diesem Augenblicke ertönte durch das geöffnete Fenster klar und deutlich Mathildens Stimme, die sagte: 'Wie diese Rosen abgeblüht sind, so ist unser Glück abgeblüht.'
>
> Ihr antwortete die Stimme meines Gastfreundes, welche sagte: 'Es ist nicht abgeblüht, es hat nur eine andere Gestalt.' (VII, ii, 126–27)

Heinrich moves away from the window in order not to hear any more.

What he has heard are two contradictory statements uttered by two disembodied voices. Both assert a proposition, and the second is a direct contradiction of the first. As in the previous scene Mathilde voices her melancholy with an analogy from the physical world. Whereas before she used metonymy (Gustav as symbol of her guilt), this time she uses a simile (their love has faded like the roses). And as in the previous example Risach picks up Mathilde's analogy and alters it to suit his own purpose. He does not deny that the appearance of things has changed ('es hat nur eine andere Gestalt') but he does deny categorically that it has been a change for the worse ('Es ist nicht abgeblüht'). And his speech as a whole, again as in the previous example, stands in a position of dominance over that of Mathilde: he has the last word. But nevertheless in one sense Mathilde's speech has more weight because it is the primary utterance to which his is a response. His is in answer to, and understandable only in reference to, hers.

Taken together with the previous example this mini-dialogue shows the structure of the present relationship between Risach and Mathilde which arises from their differing views of the past. Mathilde views the past with regret and guilt. This attitude means that she is not at ease in her present environment. Risach on the other hand does not like to talk of the past and is able to rejoice in the present. He tries to persuade her that she is wrong, that the present is different from but (almost?) as good as the past. But he does not succeed in changing her point of view. To invoke Searle's terms, Mathilde's voice is

essentially assertive while Risach's is perlocutionary,[23] persuasive. She speaks to give voice to her feelings, he seeks, by speaking, to produce an effect in her. It is important to Risach that Mathilde should think as he does. One gets the impression that his position cannot be completely stable until he has won over her dissenting voice.

These passages, the parting scene and the snippet of conversation overheard by Heinrich, fulfil a vital role within the story. They are set firmly in the world of the *Rosenhaus*, in the main part of the novel. Yet they refer directly back to the events of Risach and Mathilde's youth. They thus link past and present and in fact they are the only direct links between the two narrative times to be found outside the confines of the *Rückblick* chapter. The events in the *Rückblick* chapter are narrated by Risach. They are seen and judged from his present point of view. But these two passages are related by an uncomprehending narrator to an uncomprehending reader. Heinrich repeats what he has heard without putting it into an interpretative framework. The reader is free to make what he or she likes of it. On first reading these passages will merely puzzle or perhaps disconcert. But after the *Rückblick* chapter has been read they take on a new importance. The events in the *Rückblick* chapter show the developments which led to the present relationship of Risach and Mathilde. They also provide the key to the relationship, namely the reason why Mathilde's assent to the world of the *Rosenhaus* is necessary for the complete validation of that world, and also why her assent is not freely given.

4.3.2. Causes

I have been arguing thus far that each conversation in the novel may be seen in terms of an interchange in which in most cases the dice are loaded. The one exception, the conversation between Mathilde and Natalie, stands out precisely because the narrative vacillates between the two voices. Normally one voice, that of Risach and of the novel, dominates to such an extent that counter voices are either absorbed (in the case of Heinrich) or overruled (in the case of Mathilde) or simply do not exist (Heinrich and Natalie discover how alike they are). The norm is for dialogue in which harmony is obtained through the balancing of voices with full consent of the subordinate voice where there is one. But the examples involving Mathilde are disturbing because her voice is suppressed; her questions, unlike Heinrich's, go unanswered, and point to an undercurrent of pain and vulnerability which is, as yet, unexplained. The opaque dialogue only hints at meanings, and the narrative gives us no clues.

The passages of dialogue in the *Rückblick* chapter are quite different, mainly because we now hear not the spokesman of the *Nachsommer* world, but the voice of Risach as a young man, who is no longer, or rather, in terms of chronology, not yet, backed up by the full weight of the narrative. There is therefore more room for characterization in the *Rückblick* chapter because where dialogues

occur, we now have two individuated voices instead of one individuated voice versus the voice of the novel.

Nevertheless Risach dominates this section of the story as well, but in a different way: he is the recollecting narrator. This has several consequences. It means that once again Mathilde's thoughts and feelings are related only insofar as she reveals them in actions and speech. It also means that the chapter functions as a vindication of the *Nachsommer* world by providing a negative example.[24] The potential disturbance of the chapter is minimized by placing it right at the end of the novel where it merely serves to fill in the gaps in Heinrich's and the reader's knowledge. But even so its importance cannot be overstated. It contains the details of the quarrel which drove Risach and Mathilde apart and of their meeting again after many years and subsequent life together in a union which is close to, but vitally different from, marriage. The *Rosenhaus*, the ideology of the novel, the character of Risach as we find him when Heinrich first meets him, the position of Mathilde in the world of the Indian Summer, all have developed out of the events that are reported in the *Rückblick* chapter. And it is Risach's perspective through which the reader is invited to view these events. Risach's aim in telling Heinrich the details of his youth is to explain what happened so that Heinrich is aware of the legacy he is about to inherit. And the situation, according to Risach, is that, for reasons outside his control, the relationship with Mathilde went wrong, but their present life, which is built upon the same precept which governed his life then (respect for the natural order in things) is 'gleichsam einen Nachsommer ohne vorhergegangenen Sommer' (VIII, iii, 172). The union of Heinrich and Natalie will complete the unity of the scene, being the example of perfect youthful love. With the information in the *Rückblick* chapter made known to Heinrich, Risach's statement will be complete. Past, present, and future will be mastered.

Nevertheless the *Rückblick* chapter is not wholly successful as a cautionary example because it deals with the problem of human passion in a way which indicates that the problem may not have been faced, but rather repressed.

4.3.2.1 *Risach's childhood*

Risach's earliest memories are characterized by a feeling of absolute security, absolute oneness with and knowledge of his surroundings:

> Als ich ein Knabe von zehn Jahren war, kannte ich alle Bäume und Gesträuche der Gegend und konnte sie nennen, ich kannte die vorzüglichsten Pflanzen und Gesteine, ich kannte alle Wege, wußte, wohin sie führten, und war in allen benachbarten Orten schon gewesen, die sie berühren. Ich kannte alle Hunde von Dallkreuz, wußte, welche Farben sie hatten, wie sie hießen, und wem sie gehörten. Ich liebte die Wiesen, die Felder, die Gesträuche, unser Haus außerordentlich, und unsere Kirchenglocken däuchten mir das Lieblichste und Anmuthigste, was es nur auf Erden geben kann. Meine Eltern lebten in Frieden und Eintracht. (VIII, iii, 89)

He describes a world free of tensions and doubts and fears, a world dominated by objects which are totally familiar, the names of which he recites lovingly in an almost litanesque fashion. Everything has a place, a name, attributes. Everything can be said to exist in its own right ('die Wiesen, die Felder, die Gesträuche') and in relation to other things from which it can be distinguished ('Ich kannte alle Hunde von Dallkreuz, wußte, welche Farben sie hatten, wie sie hießen, und wem sie gehörten'). He describes a world, in other words, very much like that of the later *Rosenhaus*, except that it is an unconscious idyll, rather than the willed and meticulously constructed utopia of the *Rosenhaus*. But both are based on respect for 'die Dinge'.

But this early idyll cannot be prolonged indefinitely, and his subsequent years are characterized by an attempt to recover a sense of security.[25] His family is vulnerable when misfortune strikes. His father has no relatives, his mother one estranged brother, so when his father dies early and his mother as a result faces financial problems, Risach goes to town to find work. He finds leaving his birthplace a wrench: 'Ich mußte im Herbste das geliebte Haus, das geliebte Thal und die geliebten Angehörigen verlassen' (VIII, iii, 90). He finds the town 'niederdrückend' and 'nichts, als ein Wald' (VIII, iii, 95). When he gets a job as tutor to the sisters of a friend he is pleased because he finds there 'eine Gattung Familienumgang' (VIII, iii, 97). He is not over-enthusiastic when his sister marries, thinking her husband not good enough for her, but he becomes reconciled to the fact when his mother dies. The death of his mother makes him withdraw into himself and avoid people, 'weil sie immer von meinem Verluste redeten und mit den Worten in ihm stets wühlten' (p. 103). When his sister also dies and he is offered another job as tutor to Mathilde's brother he accepts because 'In der Verödung, in der ich mich befand, hatte die Aussicht auf ein Familienleben eine Art Anziehung für mich' (p. 105). When talking to Mathilde's father he stresses the importance to him of family life: 'Die erste Familie [his own] ist mir, wie jedem Menschen, unvergeßlich, und die zweite [that of his friend where he was tutor for a while] ist es mir auch' (p. 112). Life in Mathilde's house seems to fulfil his desire for a sense of belonging: 'Ich lebte mich immer mehr in das Haus ein und fühlte mich mit jedem Tage wohler' (p. 120); 'Ich wurde nach und nach zur Familie gerechnet' (p. 122); 'War mir das Leben im vergangenen Jahre in dieser Familie angenehm gewesen, so war es mir in diesem noch angenehmer. Wir gewöhnten uns immer mehr an einander, und mir war zuweilen, als hätte ich wieder eine unzerstörbare Heimath' (p. 127). This last phrase is logically inconsistent. He is trying to regain what he in fact never had, a home environment which is indestructible. Another hint of his basic insecurity comes when he relates that Mathilde's father was good to him and used to show him things and talk about topics, 'die bewiesen, daß er mich auch achte' (p. 127). His pleasure in the older man's approbation is natural enough, but 'beweisen' is a strangely loaded word to employ.

So it would be no exaggeration to say that in Mathilde's family Risach is seeking the security he lost all too early in his own.[26] His aim is total integration. Mathilde's mother hints at the danger of this later when she tells Risach that had things not developed into a crisis, she and her husband were thinking anyway of sending him away for the good of his own career:

Wir verdanken Euch sehr viel. Unser Alfred und auch Mathilde reiften an Euch sehr schön empor. Aber eben deßhalb hätten wir es nicht über unser Gewissen bringen können, Euch länger zu unserem Vortheile von Eurer Zukunft abzuhalten, und mein Gatte hatte sich vorgenommen, mit Euch über diese Sache zu sprechen. (VIII, iii, 147)

4.3.2.2 *Risach and Mathilde reveal their love*

The passage where Risach and Mathilde reveal their love for each other again shows up Risach's insecurity. His words reveal more than merely the strength of his new-found passion. Mathilde takes the initiative in the conversation but once their feelings are brought out into the open the intensity of emotion is equal in both of them. The passage moves with great speed. As always there are controlling devices (the speech is formal, there is repetition) but the effect is not always one of control:

Ich sagte zu Mathilden, daß der Sommer nun bald zu Ende sei, daß die Tage mit immer größerer Schnelligkeit kürzer werden, daß bald die Abende kühl sein würden, daß dann dieses Laub sich gelb färben, daß man die Trauben ablesen und endlich in die Stadt zurück kehren würde.

Sie fragte mich, ob ich denn nicht gerne in die Stadt gehe.

Ich sagte, daß ich nicht gerne gehe, daß es hier gar so schön sei, und daß es mir vorkomme, in der Stadt werde Alles anders werden.

'Es ist wirklich sehr schön,' antwortete sie, 'hier sind wir Alle viel mehr beisammen, in der Stadt kommen Fremde dazwischen, man wird getrennt, und es ist, als wäre man in eine andere Ortschaft gereis't. Es ist doch das größte Glück, Jemanden recht zu lieben.'

'Ich habe keinen Vater, keine Mutter und keine Geschwister mehr,' erwiederte ich, 'und ich weiß daher nicht, wie es ist.'

'Man liebt den Vater, die Mutter, die Geschwister,' sagte sie, 'und andere Leute.'

'Mathilde, liebst Du denn auch mich?' erwiederte ich.

Ich hatte sie nie du genannt, ich wußte auch nicht, wie mir die Worte in den Mund kamen, es war, als wären sie mir durch eine fremde Macht hinein gelegt worden. Kaum hatte ich sie gesagt, so rief sie: 'Gustav, Gustav, so außerordentlich, wie es gar nicht auszusprechen ist.'

Mir brachen die heftigsten Thränen hervor.

Da flog sie auf mich zu, drückte die sanften Lippen auf meinen Mund und schlang die jungen Arme um meinen Nacken. Ich umfaßte sie auch und drückte die schlanke Gestalt so heftig an mich, daß ich meinte, sie nicht los lassen zu können. Sie zitterte in meinen Armen und seufzte.

Von jetzt an war mir in der ganzen Welt nichts theurer, als dieses süße Kind.

Als wir uns losgelassen hatten, als sie vor mir stand, erglühend in unsäglicher Scham, gestreift von den Lichtern und Schatten des Weinlaubes, und als sich, da sie den süßen Athem zog, ihr Busen hob und senkte: war ich, wie bezaubert, kein Kind stand mehr vor

mir, sondern eine vollendete Jungfrau, der ich Ehrfurcht schuldig war. Ich fühlte mich beklommen.

Nach einer Weile sagte ich: 'Theure, theure Mathilde.'

'Mein theurer, theurer Gustav,' antwortete sie.

Ich reichte ihr die Hand, und sagte: 'Auf immer Mathilde.'

'Auf ewig,' antwortete sie, indem sie meine Hand faßte.

In diesem Augenblicke kam Alfred auf uns herzu. Er bemerkte nichts. Wir gingen schweigend neben ihm in dem Gange dahin. (VIII, iii, 129–31)

Risach makes some general remarks about the forthcoming return to town. He uses the impersonal form 'man'. Mathilde responds by asking him if he means that he does not want to return to town. Possibly hearing reluctance in his tone she forces the move from the general (the movements of the family) to the particular (his feelings) and causes an admission on his part of a sense of melancholy and vague foreboding: he would prefer to stay in the countryside and feels that things will somehow change in the town. The conversation has until now been reported in indirect speech, but Mathilde's next utterance is given in direct speech. Her speech is in two parts, each of which has one sentence. The first picks up Risach's sense of unease and elaborates on it, again giving it a specificity he declines to give: she attributes the pleasantness of life in the country to the fact that the family spends more time in close association, whereas in the town they live a more decentred, dispersed life. The second sentence is shorter and again shows a narrowing of focus onto what she feels to be the key to the issue they are discussing, namely that the greatest happiness comes from loving somebody. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Mathilde is forcing the issue, that she is fully conscious of her love for Risach and is seeking to engender a similar awareness in him.

But Risach's next words show him reacting not as she, Mathilde, expects, but as we, the reader, with our familiarity with Risach as narrator, might expect. In Mathilde's speech, 'Es ist doch das größte Glück, Jemanden recht zu lieben', she does not, it seems, refer to family love in a general sense, but to the act of loving one person. She is talking about conscious, focused, directed love rather than about the general sense of well-being and security which springs from being part of a happy family. But Risach reads the latter meaning into her words when he says, 'Ich habe keinen Vater, keine Mutter und keine Geschwister mehr . . . und ich weiß daher nicht, wie es ist'. In this speech Risach assumes that love is a family thing from which he is excluded. It may be that he concentrates on family love because he does not dare think that Mathilde might be hinting at her love for him. He is elaborating on what he thinks she means. Or perhaps the possibility of sexual love has not occurred to him. But in any case he defines the meaning of Mathilde's remark in terms of that sense of lack which is at the heart of his life, the lack of a secure family life. The repetition ('keinen Vater, keine Mutter und keine Geschwister') which is

meant to banish emotion paradoxically heightens it. So in both the content and the form of his speech Risach gives expression to his loneliness. Now, as shown above, there have been many attempts so far in this chapter to convince the reader and himself that he has found in Mathilde's family the security he lacked. But here, at the first opportunity he has to vent his feelings in speech, he harps not on his integration, but on his unhealed sense of loss and isolation. He has not found the anchorage that he was looking for.

Mathilde, undeterred, echoes the stylization ('Man liebt den Vater, die Mutter, die Geschwister') but adds an extra phrase which stands out because of the contrast with the preceding repetition 'und andere Leute'. Once more she leads Risach into making an involuntary statement which reveals his previously hidden subconscious feelings: 'Mathilde, liebst Du denn auch mich?'.

So in the remarkably short space of a few lines the conversation has turned from one so indistinguishable from the tone of the narrative that it is not even reported in direct speech, to an unpremeditated declaration of love from a character who surprises nobody so much as himself. He has never been on 'du' terms with Mathilde and is at a loss to explain his behaviour: 'ich wußte auch nicht, wie mir die Worte in den Mund kamen, es war, als wären sie mir durch eine fremde Macht hinein gelegt worden'. But he does not have time to ponder on the source of the 'fremde Macht', for Mathilde's reply follows on quickly: 'Gustav, Gustav, so außerordentlich, wie es gar nicht auszusprechen ist' and he (again under the grip of the alien power) bursts into tears. Mathilde, characteristically, takes the initiative in the embrace which follows.

Risach the narrator then adds a comment which puts the particular moment (the declaration of love) into a larger context (the course of his life since then) when he says 'Von jetzt an war mir in der ganzen Welt nichts theurer, als dieses süße Kind'. It is a distancing device in that it withdraws from an intimate moment, but it adds to the emotional weight of the scene by opening it up to the passing of time: the relationship begun at that moment has endured to the present time of the novel.

In the next paragraph Mathilde again forces an appreciation in Risach of something of which he was previously unaware, but this time she does it by her physical presence rather than through dialogue: he suddenly sees her as a woman. The description is unusually sensual ('als sie vor mir stand, erglühend in unsäglicher Scham'), even Dionysian ('gestreift von den Lichtern und Schatten des Weinlaubes') and Risach describes himself as 'wie bezaubert' and 'beklommen'.

The episode concludes with a vow to eternal love from both lovers which is given in a highly ceremonial form. Risach starts by saying 'Theure, theure Mathilde'. Mathilde replies directly, picking up his words, changing the name and adding 'mein': '"Mein theurer, theurer Gustav," antwortete sie'. Risach replies with a gesture — he holds out his hand — and another speech in which he

gives his pledge: 'Auf immer Mathilde'. She replies, repeating the sentiment but not the actual words: '"Auf ewig," antwortete sie'. The word she uses is more emotive, more poetic, and the fact that she does not follow it with his name means that it is allowed to echo. It is the seal on a large unconditional vow, which encompasses more than just the lives of two individuals. She finishes by giving the counter movement to his gesture: she takes his hand. The passage is beautifully balanced. Speech is matched by speech, repetition by repetition, name by name, gesture by gesture. It is like a dance. The question is whether all these stylization techniques sap or heighten the emotional content of the scene. I would argue the latter case because of the content: the exchange is preceded by a scene remarkable for the lack of narrative control and it is an attempt by the narrative to regain its authority, to claim as its own this emotion which has just invaded the scene. Moreover, the lovers are interrupted by Alfred: 'In diesem Augenblicke kam Alfred auf uns herzu. Er bemerkte nichts. Wir gingen schweigend neben ihm in dem Gange dahin'. Alfred is an intruder into their private world, in his presence they have nothing to say. He has interrupted a moment of extreme tension.

So this scene contains far more than a simple declaration of love. It also contains the germ of their future confrontation, for it tells the reader more than the protagonists know of their own situation. Mathilde is passionate and impetuous. She is also unaware of Risach's true state of mind. Risach is conscious of his closeness to and exclusion from Mathilde's family, of which he desperately wants to be a part. He thinks of love as something he cannot have because he has no family. When therefore Mathilde holds out the opportunity of loving her, it is for him indistinguishable from loving and becoming part of her family. When he realizes that he is also sexually attracted to Mathilde, his joy is complete: all his needs, childish and adult, have been satisfied in one fell swoop. Both therefore seal their bliss with a vow to everlasting love, but they are far from united in their minds. Mathilde is blissful because she is in love, Risach is blissful because he is in love and has found again (or has he?) his 'unzerstörbare Heimath' (VIII, iii, 127).

4.3.2.3 *The secret*

For a period of about nine months to a year (from late summer one year to the time when the roses bloom the next), Risach and Mathilde keep their love secret. The narrative condemns this behaviour implicitly in a number of ways. Their early encounters are characterized by the word 'Zauber'. This concept is of dubious value within the context of the Indian Summer, as it is concerned with something essentially private: 'Es war zauberhaft, ein süßes Geheimniß mit einander zu haben, sich seiner bewußt zu sein und es als Glut im Herzen zu hegen. Ich trug es entzückt in meine Wohnung' (VIII, iii, 133). The couple play games and give each other signs which only they can understand. At one point

this involves gross neglect of the rule of respect for all natural things: 'Sie gab mir ein grünes Rosenblatt, ich knickte einen zarten Zweig, was eigentlich nicht erlaubt war, und gab ihr den Zweig' (p. 134). The breaking of the rule is narrated casually, without remorse. Their feeling for each other is very deep, but actually becomes deeper because of the secret: 'Und je tiefer sich das Gefühl verbergen mußte, desto gewaltiger war es, desto drängender loderte es in dem Innern' (p. 136).

They move to town for the winter and Risach finds it harder to spend time with Mathilde, but nevertheless he says 'ich erschien mir reich, um Vieles reicher, als die Besitzer all der Häuser, der Palläste und des Glanzes der ungeheuren Stadt' (p. 138). One incident in particular shows the wrongness of their position. Risach is leaving the house to visit a friend when he encounters Mathilde on the steps. Mathilde's mother is waiting outside in a carriage. The lovers exchange words and a kiss secretly, Mathilde goes inside while Risach goes out and sees Mathilde's mother sitting 'freundlich' in the carriage and looking at him (pp. 139–40). There are several warning signs here. After the incident Risach changes his plan and does not visit his friend. The meeting has soured his mood for his normal activities. The adverb 'freundlich', frequently used to depict warmth and openness, now becomes threatening because it indicates that Mathilde's mother is naively innocent of what is going on. The words the couple exchange also betray Risach's deep anxiety. The passage is preceded by half a page describing Mathilde's indifference to all the other young men she meets and her continuing love for Risach. It seems he is totally confident of her. But when they meet, his words show instead his insecurity, his lack of confidence, his fear that something or someone will drive them apart: 'O Mathilde, Mathilde, Du himmelvolles Wesen, Alle streben sie nach Dir, wie wird Das werden, o, wie wird Das werden?!'. The passage is followed by what sounds like a normal, level piece of narration: 'Mit Alfred betrieb ich Das, was er zu lernen hatte, immer eifriger, ich war immer sorgsamer, daß er es gut inne habe, und legte, wo ich konnte, wie früher und in noch größerem Maße selber Hand an'. But with regard to what we have just heard, a second reading becomes possible. He may be expending more energy and enthusiasm on teaching Alfred in order to cover up his guilt at the secret relationship with Mathilde.

The illicit thrill of that secret relationship strikes them most forcefully when they are in the *Weinlaubengang*, the place where they first declared their love: 'Er war ein Heiligenthum geworden, seine Zweige sahen uns vertraut an, seine Blätter wurden unsere Zeugen, und durch seine Verschlingungen bebte manches tiefe Wort und wehte mancher Hauch der unergründlichsten Glückseligkeit' (VIII, iii, 141). This Dionysian place, the setting for their love, contrasts strongly with the place where Heinrich and Natalie come together: the grotto with the *Brunnennymphe* with its overtones of classical harmony.

All this is not to say that Risach is consciously guilty during the whole period of his secret affair with Mathilde. As soon as he becomes aware that Mathilde's parents do not approve he is genuinely shocked. But where his dishonesty lies is in the refusal of his conscious mind to see what he is doing. He deceives not only Mathilde's parents, he also deceives himself and, of course, Mathilde. For what he is doing is luxuriating in the bliss of what he thinks is an 'unzerstörbare Heimath' and the love of Mathilde. He thinks he has found the absolute security he has been searching for all his life, but he refuses to see that the bases of this security are unsound: a family which is not his own and the love of a girl which is not his to have without parental approval. His deep anxiety that this is all too good to be true means that he does not allow himself to question, for the period of nine months or more, whether his actions are justified. He has too much to lose.

4.3.2.4 *The confession*

When Risach is describing his life and political career to Heinrich in the chapter before *Der Rückblick* he describes one of his two main faults as a kind of stubbornness. This he says, did not, however, stop him doing his duty at great personal cost on one occasion:

> Das hinderte aber nicht, daß ich dort, wo mir ein Fremdes, durch Gründe und hohe Triebfedern unterstützt, gegeben wurde, dasselbe als mein Eigenes aufnahm und mit der tiefsten Begeisterung durchführte. Das habe ich einmal in meinem Leben gegen meine stärkste Neigung, die ich hatte, gethan, um der Ehre und der Pflicht zu genügen. Ich werde es Euch später erzählen. (VIII, iii, 76)

The incident he is referring to is clearly his renouncing of Mathilde in accordance with the wishes of Mathilde's parents, to whom he finally confessed. His analysis of what happened is that he took up the instructions of her parents which, although completely alien to him ('ein Fremdes') he recognized to be worthy ('durch Gründe und hohe Triebfedern unterstützt') and carried them out 'mit der tiefsten Begeisterung', even though this was against his strongest impulse, his love for Mathilde. In other words he sees the conversation with Mathilde's mother as a test of his sense of duty, a test which he passed even though the cost was high. It was a decision made against his own nature and his own self-interest, a correct decision because it involved submitting the self to a higher authority.

But this does not tally with what we know of Risach already or with his conversation with Mathilde's mother when we examine it closely. Mathilde's mother speaks at length, telling Risach that he must break off his relationship with Mathilde and why. She finishes on a conciliatory, soothing note:

> 'Wir waren Euch Alle sehr zugethan, Ihr werdet wieder Neigung und Anhänglichkeit finden, Ihr werdet ruhiger werden, und Alles wird sich zum Guten wenden.'
>
> Sie hatte ausgesprochen, legte ihre schöne freundliche Hand auf den Tisch und sah mich an.

'Ihr seid ja so blaß, wie eine getünchte Wand,' sagte sie nach einem Weilchen.

In meine Augen drangen einzelne Thränen, und ich antwortete: 'Jetzt bin ich ganz allein. Mein Vater, meine Mutter, meine Schwester sind gestorben.' Mehr konnte ich nicht sagen, meine Lippen bebten vor unsäglichem Schmerz.

Sie stand auf, legte ihre Hand auf meinen Scheitel und sagte unter Thränen mit ihrer lieblichen Stimme: 'Gustav, mein Sohn! Du bist es ja immer gewesen, und ich kann einen besseren nicht wünschen. Geht jetzt Beide den Weg Eurer Ausbildung, und wenn dann einst Euer gereiftes Wesen Dasselbe sagt, was jetzt das wallende Herz sagt, dann kommt Beide, wir werden Euch segnen. Stört aber durch Fortspinnen, Steigern und vielleicht Abarten Eurer jetzigen heftigen Gefühle nicht die Euch so nöthige letzte Entwicklung.'

Es war das erste Mal gewesen, daß sie mich du genannt hatte.

Sie verließ mich und ging einige Schritte im Zimmer hin und wieder.

'Verhrte Frau,' sagte ich nach einer Weile, 'es ist nicht nöthig, daß ich Euch morgen oder in diesen Tagen antworte; ich kann es jetzt sogleich. Was Ihr mir an Gründen gesagt habt, wird sehr richtig sein, ich glaube, daß es wirklich so ist, wie Ihr sagt; allein mein ganzes Innere kämpft dagegen, und wenn das Gesagte noch so wahr ist, so vermag ich es nicht zu fassen. Erlaubt, daß eine Zeit hierüber vergehe, und daß ich dann noch einmal durchdenke, was ich jetzt nicht denken kann. Aber Eins ist es, was ich fasse. Ein Kind darf seinen Eltern nicht ungehorsam sein, wenn es nicht auf ewig mit ihnen brechen, wenn es nicht die Eltern oder sich selbst verwerfen soll. Mathilde kann ihre guten Eltern nicht verwerfen, und sie ist selber so gut, daß sie auch sich nicht verwerfen kann. Ihre Eltern verlangen, daß sie jetzt das geschlossene Band auflösen möge, und sie wird folgen. Ich will es nicht versuchen, durch Bitten das Gebot der Eltern wenden zu wollen. Die Gründe, welche Ihr mir gesagt habt, und welche in mein Wesen nicht eindringen wollen, werden in dem Eurigen fest haften, sonst hättet Ihr mir sie nicht so nachdrücklich gesagt, hättet sie mir nicht mit solcher Güte und zuletzt nicht mit Thränen gesagt. Ihr werdet davon nicht lassen können. Wir haben uns nicht vorzustellen vermocht, daß Das, was für uns ein so hohes Glück war, für die Eltern ein Unheil sein wird. Ihr habt es mir mit Eurer tiefsten Ueberzeugung gesagt. Selbst wenn Ihr irrtet, selbst wenn unsere Bitten Euch zu erweichen vermöchten, so würde Euer freudiger Wille, Euer Herz und Euer Segen mit dem Bund nicht sein, und ein Bund ohne der Freude der Eltern, ein Bund mit der Trauer von Vater und Mutter müßte auch ein Bund der Trauer sein, er wäre ein ewiger Stachel, und Euer ernstes oder bekümmertes Antlitz würde ein unvertilgbarer Vorwurf sein. Darum ist der Bund, und wäre er der berechtigteste, aus, er ist aus auf so lange, als die Eltern ihm nicht beistimmen können. Eure ungehorsame Tochter würde ich nicht so unaussprechlich lieben können, wie ich sie jetzt liebe, Eure gehorsame werde ich ehren und mit tiefster Seele, wie fern ich auch sein mag, lieben, so lange ich lebe. Wir werden daher das Band lösen, wie schmerzhaft die Lösung auch sein mag. — O Mutter, Mutter! — laßt Euch diesen Namen zum ersten und vielleicht auch zum letzten Male geben — der Schmerz ist so groß, daß ihn keine Zunge aussprechen kann, und daß ich mir seine Größe nie vorzustellen vermocht habe.'

'Ich erkenne es,' antwortete sie, 'und darum ist ja der Kummer, den ich und mein Gatte empfinden, so groß, daß wir unserem theuren Kinde und Euch, den wir auch lieben, die Seelenkränkung nicht ersparen können.'

'Ich werde morgen Mathilden sagen,' erwiederte ich, 'daß sie ihrem Vater und ihrer Mutter gehorchen müsse. Heute erlaubt mir, verehrte Frau, daß ich meine Gedanken etwas ordne — und daß ich auch noch andere Dinge ordne, die Noth thun.'

Die Thränen waren mir wieder in die Augen getreten.

'Sammelt Euch, lieber Gustav,' sagte sie, 'und thut, was Ihr für gut haltet, sprecht mit Mathilden oder sprecht auch nicht, ich schreibe Euch nichts vor. Es wird eine Zeit

kommen, in der Ihr einsehen werdet, daß ich Euch nicht so unrecht thue, als Ihr jetzt vielleicht glauben mögt.'

Ich küßte ihr die Hand, die sie mir gütig gab, und verließ das Zimmer. (VIII, iii, 147–50)

There is an interesting contrast between Risach the narrator and Risach the protagonist. The former is very much in control. He reports the woman's movements coolly and impassively and with distance: 'Sie hatte ausgesprochen, legte ihre schöne freundliche Hand auf den Tisch und sah mich an'. But Risach the protagonist is not so calm. Because of the intensity of his emotion he breaks the rules of discourse which run throughout the novel: he does not speak in turn. Mathilde's mother has spoken her fill, but by not saying anything Risach forces her to speak again. The fact that there is a rule (characters speak in turn) makes any departure from that rule immediately apparent. What she says when thus forced to speak again is something strikingly different in both tone and content from what she has been saying. She uses a homely metaphor to describe Risach's appearance, comparing him to a whitewashed wall. She has descended from the tone of an elevated argument, which does show her fondness for Risach, but which is nevertheless controlled, to a tone of deep human sympathy for someone who is undergoing a crisis in which he is beyond help. And it is on the human rather than the moral plane that Risach is able to respond, firstly with tears and then with an expression of his innermost feelings. His reaction is not one of sorrow for the loss of Mathilde or of guilt for his wrongdoing, but one of self pity: 'Jetzt bin ich ganz allein. Mein Vater, meine Mutter, meine Schwester sind gestorben'. As Michael Beddow points out, his reaction 'is not primarily that of a disappointed lover . . . His chief cause of distress is not so much the separation from Mathilde itself as the breaking of the quasi-familial relationship with the Maklodens which he so greatly values'.[27] He is alone again. At this vital crisis point in his life Risach does not see his own guilt, he cannot grasp the reasons behind the parental decision: 'ich glaube, daß es wirklich so ist, wie Ihr sagt; allein mein ganzes Innere kämpft dagegen, und wenn das Gesagte noch so wahr ist, so vermag ich es nicht zu fassen'. What he does see is his own predicament. Whereas before he felt rich ('ich erschien mir reich'), he now feels inconsolably desolate, he sees as catastrophic what in fact is only a set-back: the Maklodens have nothing against the relationship in principle, they merely feel that the bond has been formed too soon and should not have been kept a secret. From having everything, Risach now wrongly feels he has nothing.

When put to the test, then, the two impulses in Risach, his love for Mathilde and his need for security, his need to be part of a larger order, are revealed to be unequal in weight. It is the lack of fulfilment of the latter impulse which breaks him. And what Risach feels to be his greatest victory over himself (submitting to the will of the Maklodens at the cost of his relationship with Mathilde) is in fact born of his greatest weakness (his excessive desire for stability). His desire to

belong, his respect for authority, his acceptance of the decision of Mathilde's parents, all issue from his deep need to recover the 'unzerstörbare Heimath' of his childhood and his equally deep fear that this cannot be done. The veto of Mathilde's parents, who have come to take the place of his own parents in his appreciation of things, is absolute. Though there is deep anguish in Risach, and evidence of a real struggle in understanding the wishes of the parents ('ich glaube, daß es wirklich so ist, wie Ihr sagt; allein mein ganzes Innere kämpft dagegen'), there is no indication that he hesitates even for a moment over what to do: 'Aber Eins ist es, was ich fasse. Ein Kind darf seinen Eltern nicht ungehorsam sein'. The people he regards as his parents have, in his eyes, rejected him. The consequent expulsion from the family means desolation.

4.3.2.5 *The quarrel*

Having thus instinctively sided with the system of order and authority Risach finds it natural that he should take over the task of telling Mathilde the outcome of her parents' decision. But in doing this he puts himself above Mathilde. As he says to her mother, he will tell her 'what she must do'. And it is this unthinkingly authoritarian attitude in Risach which Mathilde so violently rejects. Risach speaks to her the next day and tells her 'was ihre Eltern meinen, und daß sie den Wunsch hegen, daß wir wenigstens für die jetzige Zeit unser Band auflösen mögen'. He continues:

> Ich ging auf die Gründe, welche die Mutter angegeben hatte, nicht ein und legte Mathilden nur dar, daß sie zu gehorchen habe, und daß unter Ungehorsam unser Bund nicht bestehen könne.
>
> Als ich geendet hatte, war sie im höchsten Maße erstaunt.
>
> 'Ich bitte Dich, wiederhole mir nur in Kurzem, was Du gesprochen hast, und was wir thun sollen,' sagte sie.
>
> 'Du mußt den Willen Deiner Eltern thun, und das Band mit mir lösen,' antwortete ich.
>
> 'Und Das schlägst Du vor, und Das hast Du der Mutter versprochen, bei mir auszuwirken?' fragte sie.
>
> 'Mathilde, nicht auszuwirken,' antwortete ich, 'wir müssen gehorchen; denn der Wille der Eltern ist das Gesetz der Kinder.'
>
> 'Ich muß gehorchen,' rief sie, indem sie von der Bank aufsprang, 'und ich werde auch gehorchen; aber Du mußt nicht gehorchen, Deine Eltern sind sie nicht. Du mußtest nicht hierher kommen und den Auftrag übernehmen, mit mir das Band der Liebe, das wir geschlossen hatten, aufzulösen. Du mußtest sagen: "Frau, Eure Tochter wird Euch gehorsam sein, sagt Ihr nur Euren Willen; aber ich bin nicht verbunden, Eure Vorschriften zu befolgen, ich werde Euer Kind lieben, so lange ein Blutstropfen in mir ist, ich werde mit aller Kraft streben, einst in ihren Besitz zu gelangen. Und da sie Euch gehorsam ist, so wird sie mit mir nicht mehr sprechen, sie wird mich nicht mehr ansehen, ich werde weit von hier fort gehen; aber lieben werde ich sie doch, so lange dieses Leben währt und das künftige, ich werde nie einer andern ein Theilchen von Neigung schenken und werde nie von ihr lassen." So hättest Du sprechen sollen, und wenn Du von unserm Schlosse fort gegangen wärest, so hätte ich gewußt, daß Du so gesprochen hast, und tausend Millionen Ketten hätten mich nicht von Dir gerissen, und jubelnd hätte ich einst

in Erfüllung gebracht, was Dir dieses stürmische Herz gegeben. Du hast den Bund aufgelöset, ehe Du mit mir hieher gegangen bist, ehe Du mich zu dieser Bank geführt hast, die ich Dir gutwillig folgte, weil ich nicht wußte, was Du gethan hast. Wenn jetzt auch der Vater und die Mutter kämen und sagten: "Nehmet Euch, besitzet Euch in Ewigkeit," so wäre doch Alles aus. Du hast die Treue gebrochen, die ich fester gewähnt habe, als die Säulen der Welt und die Sterne an dem Baue des Himmels.'

'Mathilde,' sagte ich, 'was ich jetzt thue, ist unendlich schwerer, als was Du verlangtest.'

'Schwer oder nicht schwer, von Dem ist hier nicht die Rede,' antwortete sie, 'von Dem, was sein muß, ist die Rede, von Dem, dessen Gegentheil ich für unmöglich hielt. Gustav, Gustav, Gustav, wie konntest Du Das tun?'

Sie ging einige Schritte von mir weg, kniete, gegen die Rosen, die an dem Gartenhause blühten, gewendet, in das Gras nieder, schlug die beiden Hände zusammen und rief unter strömenden Thränen: 'Hört es, Ihr tausend Blumen, die herab schauten, als er diese Lippen küßte, höre es Du, Weinlaub, das den flüsternden Schwur der ewigen Treue vernommen hat, ich habe ihn geliebt, wie es mit keiner Zunge in keiner Sprache ausgesprochen werden kann. Dieses Herz ist jung an Jahren, aber es ist reich an Großmuth; Alles, was in ihm lebte, habe ich dem Geliebten hingegeben, es war kein Gedanke in mir, als er, das ganze künftige Leben, das noch viele Jahre umfassen konnte, hätte ich, wie einen Hauch, für ihn hingeopfert, jeden Tropfen Blut hätte ich langsam aus den Adern fließen und jede Faser aus dem Leibe ziehen lassen — und ich hätte gejauchzt dazu. Ich habe gemeint, daß er Das weiß, weil ich gemeint habe, daß er es auch thun würde. Und nun führt er mich heraus, um mir zu sagen, was er sagte. Wären was immer für Schmerzen von Außen gekommen, was immer für Kämpfe, Anstrengungen und Erduldungen: ich hätte sie ertragen, aber nun er — er —! Er macht es unmöglich für alle Zeiten, daß ich ihm noch angehören kann, weil er den Zauber zerstört hat, der Alles band, den Zauber, der ein unzerreißbares Aneinanderhalten in die Jahre der Zukunft und in die Ewigkeit malte.'

Ich ging zu ihr hinzu, um sie empor zu heben. Ich ergriff ihre Hand. Ihre Hand war, wie Gluth. Sie stand auf, entzog mir die Hand und ging gegen das Gartenhaus, an dem die Rosen blühten.

'Mathilde,' sagte ich, 'es handelt sich nicht um den Bruch der Treue, die Treue ist nicht gebrochen worden. Verwechsle die Dinge nicht. Wir haben gegen die Eltern unrecht gehandelt, daß wir ihnen verbargen, was wir gethan haben, und daß wir in dem Verbergen beharrend geblieben sind. Sie fürchten Uebles für uns. Nicht die Zerstörung unserer Gefühle verlangen sie, nur die Aufhebung des Aeußerlichen unseres Bundes auf eine Zeit.'

'Kannst Du eine Zeit nicht mehr Du sein?' erwiederte sie, 'kannst Du eine Zeit Dein Herz nicht schlagen lassen? Aeußeres, Inneres, Das ist alles eins, und Alles ist die Liebe. Du hast nie geliebt, weil Du es nicht weißt.'

'Mathilde,' antwortete ich, 'Du warst immer so gut, Du warst edel, rein, herrlich, daß ich Dich mit allen Kräften in meine Seele schloß: heute bist Du zum ersten Male ungerecht. Meine Liebe ist unendlich, ist unzerstörbar und der Schmerz, daß ich Dich lassen muß, ist unsäglich, ich habe nicht gewußt, daß es einen so großen auf Erden gibt; nur der ist größer, von Dir verkannt zu sein. Ich unterscheide nicht, wer Dir das Gebot der Eltern hätte sagen sollen, es ist Das einerlei, die sind die Eltern, das Gebot ist das Gebot, und das Heiligste in uns sagt, daß die Eltern geehrt werden müssen, daß das Band zwischen Eltern und Kind nicht zerstört werden darf, wenn auch das Herz bricht. So fühlte ich, so handelte ich, und ich wollte Dir das Notwendige recht sanft und weich sagen, darum kam ich. Aus Güte, aus Mitleid kam ich. Die Pflicht leitete mich, in der Pflicht bricht mein Herz, und in dem brechenden Herzen bist du.'

'Ja, ja, Das sind die Worte,' sagte sie, indem ihr Schluchzen immer heftiger und fast krampfhaft wurde, 'Das sind die Worte, denen ich sonst so gerne lauschte, die so süß in meine Seele gingen, die schon süß waren, als Du es noch nicht wußtest, denen ich glaubte, wie der ewigen Wahrheit. Du hättest es nicht unternehmen müssen, mich zur Zerreißung unserer Liebe bewegen zu wollen, es soll, wenn hundertmal Pflicht, Dir nicht möglich gewesen sein. Darum kann ich Dir jetzt nicht mehr glauben, Deine Liebe ist nicht die, die ich dachte, und die die meinige ist. Ich habe den Vergleichpunkt verloren und weiß nicht, wie Alles ist. Wenn Du einst gesagt hättest, der Himmel ist nicht der Himmel, die Erde nicht die Erde, ich hätte es Dir geglaubt. Jetzt weiß ich es nicht, ob ich Dir glauben soll, was Du sagst. Ich kann nicht anders, ich weiß es nicht, und ich kann nicht machen, daß ich es weiß. O Gott! daß es geworden ist, wie es ward, und daß zerstörbar ist, was ich für ewig hielt! wie werde ich es ertragen können?'

Sie barg ihr Angesicht in den Rosen vor ihr, und ihre glühende Wange war auch jetzt noch schöner, als die Rosen. Sie drückte das Angesicht ganz in die Blumen und weinte so, daß ich glaubte, ich fühle das Zittern ihres Körpers, oder es werde eine Ohnmacht ihren Schmerz erschöpfen. Ich wollte sprechen, ich versuchte es mehrere Male; aber ich konnte nicht, die Brunst war mir zerpreßt, und die Werkzeuge des Sprechens ohne Macht. Ich faßte nach ihrem Körper, sie zuckte aber weg, wenn sie es empfand. Dann stand ich unbeweglich neben ihr. Ich griff mit der bloßen Hand in die Zweige der Rosen, drückte, daß mir leichter würde, die Dornen derselben in die Hand und ließ das Blut an ihr nieder rinnen.

Als Das eine Zeit gedauert hatte, als sich ihr Weinen etwas gemildert hatte, hob sie das Angesicht empor, trocknete mit dem Tuche, das sie aus der Tasche genommen, die Thränen, und sagte: 'Es ist Alles vorüber. Weßhalb wir noch länger hier bleiben sollen, dazu ist kein Grund, lasse uns wieder in das Haus gehen, und das Weitere dieser Handlung verfolgen. Wer uns begegnet, soll nicht sehen, daß ich so sehr geweint habe.'

Sie trocknete neuerdings mit dem Tuche die Augen, ließ neue Thränen nicht mehr hervor quellen, richtete sich empor, strich sich die Haare ein wenig zurecht und sagte: 'Gehen wir in das Haus.' (VIII, iii, 151–56)

Risach puts himself in a position of authority over Mathilde. He makes no appeal to her rational self, no attempt to discuss the problem with her on equal terms. Instead he simply tells her, 'daß sie zu gehorchen habe, und daß unter Ungehorsam unser Bund nicht bestehen könne'. Mathilde is so astonished at this that she asks him to repeat what he is trying to say, and he does so in a way which makes his own position abundantly clear: 'Du mußt den Willen Deiner Eltern thun, und das Band mit mir lösen'. In telling her that 'she must give up' the bond between them he implicitly states that he has already given it up. She sees this: 'Du hast den Bund aufgelöst, ehe Du mit mir hieher gegangen bist, ehe Du mich zu dieser Bank geführt hast . . . Du hast die Treue gebrochen, die ich fester gewähnt habe, als die Säulen der Welt und die Sterne an dem Baue des Himmels'. She is accusing him of a breach of faith. Both feel that one of the unstated preconditions of their love was the agreement of the parents. In her picture of their relationship she and Risach have entered into it as equal parties, although she feels that she is bound by the jurisdiction of her parents while he, an outsider to the family, is not.[28] Risach has betrayed her by seeing himself as equally bound by her parents' wishes.

He tries to say that although their feelings remain the same and there has been no betrayal, nevertheless the bond between them must be suspended: 'die Treue ist nicht gebrochen worden. Verwechsle die Dinge nicht . . . Nicht die Zerstörung unserer Gefühle verlangen sie, nur die Aufhebung des Aeußerlichen unseres Bundes auf eine Zeit'. But for Mathilde no such distinction is possible: 'Kannst Du eine Zeit nicht mehr Du sein?'. The tragedy is that it is precisely in choosing to side with authority rather than with her that he is more perfectly being himself: he feels the will of the Maklodens to be the absolute arbiter not only of Mathilde's but also of his own fate because he sees them as his parents. How perceptive therefore and how utterly devastating is Mathilde's cry: 'ich werde . . . gehorchen; aber Du mußt nicht gehorchen, Deine Eltern sind sie nicht'. These words must wound Risach to the quick.

And later on in the conversation her revised understanding of Risach is made clear when she rejects his entire discourse as being a lie: 'Ja, ja, Das sind die Worte, . . . Das sind die Worte, denen ich sonst so gerne lauschte, die so süß in meine Seele gingen, die schon süß waren, als Du es noch nicht wußtest, denen ich glaubte, wie der ewigen Wahrheit'. Risach's words, she now knows, are not synonymous with the truth, they cannot be believed, for to believe them is to be deceived as to Risach's true nature and motives. The man and his words are, for her and, by implication, for the reader, irredeemably divided. There is, literally, nothing more to be said: 'Es ist Alles vorüber. Weßhalb wir noch länger hier bleiben sollen, dazu ist kein Grund'.

So convinced is Mathilde that she has been betrayed that even when, several years later, Risach makes discreet enquiries about her, he receives 'die unzweideutigsten Beweise zurück, daß mich Mathilde verachte' (VIII, iii, 161). From this point until the time she returns to seek out Risach we know nothing of her state of mind except that she comes to feel that her treatment of Risach had been unjust and that she had behaved badly. We do not know what prompted this change of heart. Of Risach we know more. At first he feels desolate: 'mir war alle Verbindung mit Menschen verleidet'. Then, however, he throws himself into his work. This gives temporary relief: 'Solange alle die Verhältnisse, welche in meinen Amtsgeschäften vorkamen, in meinem Haupte waren, war nichts anderes darin'. But it cannot provide total relief: 'Schmerzvoll waren nur die Zwischenräume' (p. 160). He regrets both his subsequent marriage and his choice of career. His marriage he feels to have been wrong because he entered into it 'ohne Liebe und Neigung' (p. 162). His true vocation was, he feels, to convey his understanding of art to his fellow men, a vocation which he feels was frustrated by his job as a civil servant:

Wenn ich nun ein Solcher war, wenn ich bestimmt war, durch Anschauung hoher Gestalten der Kunst und der Schöpfung, die mir ja immer mit freundlichen Augen zugewinkt haben, Freude in mein Herz zu sammeln und Freude, Erkenntnis und Verehrung der Gestalten auf meine Mitmenschen zu übertragen, so war mir meine

Staatslaufbahn in diesem Berufe wieder sehr hinderlich, und dürftige Spätblüthen können den Sommer, dessen kräftige Lüfte und warme Sonne unbenützt vorüber gingen, nicht ersetzen. (VIII, iii, 85–86)

The regret expressed here is inescapable. But through all this time he is always certain that his behaviour with regard to Mathilde was morally right.

The quarrel between Risach and Mathilde is one of many disagreements between lovers in Stifter's works and it has in common with the others the fact that it centres on a lack of communication. In their minds they are, as I have shown, crucially divided. Risach is uncomprehending about his own motives and does not understand Mathilde's distinction between her duty to her parents and his, judging her to be merely immature. Of her motivation we know less, for, crucially, we are reliant for our understanding of her upon Risach's report. But where she is allowed to speak directly she appears to be passionate and utterly straightforward in her love for Risach and thus to feel totally betrayed by him. When they rely on gestures and signals and unambiguous declarations of love, the love can flourish. But when forced to relate this love to the world, to examine it and themselves in words, the gap between them becomes clear. It is not only external circumstances which drive them apart but their inability to speak the same language.

4.3.2.6 *The reunion*

The scene of reconciliation between Risach and Mathilde is of vital importance for various reasons. Within the chronology of the novel it is an isolated scene set after the events of Risach and Mathilde's youth but before the establishment of the world of the Indian Summer. It is a pivotal point because it picks up the pieces of the past relationship and sets the pattern for the future one. Like the other incidents in this chapter it is narrated by Risach who sees it in these causal terms. But if looked at closely the scene need not only be read as part of a linear progression. It is in fact a pregnant moment whose outcome was not in any way preordained. In fact it is even doubtful whether the scene has a clear outcome as such. The true state of things may be closer to a permanent state of irresolution.

Risach is living alone and is 'seemingly' happy: 'So bleichten sich meine Haare, und Freude und Behagen schien sich bei mir einstellen zu wollen'. Then Mathilde returns:

Als ich schon ziemlich lange hier gewesen war, meldete man mir eines Tages, daß eine Frau den Hügel heran gefahren sei, und daß sie jetzt mit einem Knaben vor den Rosen, die sich an den Wänden des Hauses befinden, stehe. Ich ging hinaus, sah den Wagen und sah auch die Frau mit dem Knaben vor den Rosen stehen. Ich ging auf sie zu. Mathilde war es, die, einen Knaben an der Hand haltend und von strömenden Thränen überfluthet, die Rosen ansah. Ihr Angesicht war gealtert, und ihre Gestalt war die einer Frau mit zunehmenden Jahren.

'Gustav, Gustav,' rief sie, da sie mich angeblickt hatte, 'ich kann Dich nicht anders nennen, als: Du. Ich bin gekommen, Dich des schweren Unrechtes willen, das ich Dir zugefügt habe, um Vergebung zu bitten. Nimm mich einen Augenblick in Dein Haus auf.'

'Mathilde,' sagte ich, 'sei gegrüßt, sei auf diesem Boden, sei tausendmal gegrüßt und halte dieses Haus für Deines.'

Ich war mit diesen Worten zu ihr hinzu getreten, hatte ihre Hand gefaßt und hatte sie auf den Mund geküßt.

Sie ließ meine Hand nicht los, drückte sie stark, und ihr Schluchzen wurde so heftig, daß ich meinte, ihre mir noch immer so theuere Brust müsse zerspringen.

'Mathilde,' sagte ich sanft, 'erhole Dich.'

'Führe mich in das Haus,' sprach sie leise.

Ich rief erst durch mein Glöckchen, welches ich immer bei mir trage, meinen Hausverwalter herzu und befahl ihm, Wagen und Pferde unter zu bringen. Dann faßte ich Mathildens Arm und führte sie in das Haus. Als wir in dem Speisezimmer angelangt waren, sagte ich zu dem Knaben: 'Setze Dich hier nieder und warte, bis ich mit Deiner Mutter gesprochen und die Thränen, die ihr jetzt so weh thun, gemildert habe.'

Der Knabe sah mich traulich an und gehorchte. Ich führte Mathilde in das Wartezimmer und bot ihr einen Sitz an. Als sie sich in die weichen Kissen nieder gelassen hatte, nahm ich ihr gegenüber auf einem Stuhle Platz. Sie weinte fort; aber ihre Thränen wurden nach und nach linder. Ich sprach nichts. Nachdem eine Zeit vergangen war, quollen ihre Tropfen sparsamer und weniger aus den Augen, und endlich trocknete sie die letzten mit ihrem Tuche ab. Wir saßen nun schweigend da und sahen einander an. Sie mochte auf meine weißen Haare schauen, und ich blickte in ihr Angesicht. Dasselbe war schon verblüht; aber auf den Wangen und um den Mund lag der liebe Reiz und die sanfte Schwermuth, die an abgeblühten Frauen so rührend sind, wenn gleichsam ein Himmel vergangener Schönheit hinter ihnen liegt, der noch nachgespiegelt wird. Ich erkannte in den Zügen die einstige prangende Jugend.

'Gustav,' sagte sie, 'so sehen wir uns wieder. Ich konnte das Unrecht nicht mehr tragen, das ich Dir angethan habe.'

'Es ist kein Unrecht geschehen, Mathilde,' sagte ich.

'Ja Du bist immer gut gewesen,' antwortete sie, 'Das wußte ich, darum bin ich gekommen. Du bist auch jetzt gut, das sagt Dein liebes Auge, das noch so schön ist, wie einst, da es meine Wonne war. O, ich bitte Dich, Gustav, verzeihe mir.'

'O theure Mathilde, ich habe Dir nichts zu verzeihen, oder Du hast es mir auch,' antwortete ich. 'Die Erklärung liegt darin, daß Du nicht zu sehen vermochtest, was zu sehen war, und daß ich dann nicht näher zu treten vermochte, als ich hätte näher treten sollen. In der Liebe liegt Alles. Dein schmerzhaftes Zürnen war die Liebe, und mein schmerzhaftes Zurückhalten war auch die Liebe. In ihr liegt unser Fehler, und in ihr liegt unser Lohn.'

'Ja in der Liebe,' erwiederte sie, 'die wir nicht ausrotten konnten. Gustav, ich bin Dir doch trotz Allem treu geblieben und habe nur Dich allein geliebt. Viele haben mich begehrt, ich wies sie ab; man hat mir einen Gatten gegeben, der gut, aber fremd neben mir lebte, ich kannte nur Dich, die Blume meiner Jugend, die nie verblüht ist. Und Du liebst mich auch, Das sagen die tausend Rosen vor den Mauern Deines Hauses, und es ist ein Strafgericht für mich, daß ich gerade zu der Zeit ihrer Blüthe gekommen bin.'

'Rede nicht von Strafgerichten, Mathilde,' erwiederte ich, 'und weil alles Andere so ist, so lasse die Vergangenheit und sage, welche Deine Lage jetzt ist. Kann ich Dir in irgend etwas helfen?'

'Nein, Gustav,' entgegnete sie, 'die größte Hilfe ist die, daß Du Du bist. Meine Lage ist sehr einfach. Der Vater und die Mutter sind schon längst todt, der Gatte ist ebenfalls vor Langem gestorben, und Alfred — Du hast ihn ja recht geliebt —'

'Wie ich einen Sohn lieben würde,' antwortete ich.

'Er ist auch todt,' sagte sie, 'er hat kein Weib, keine Kinder hinterlassen, das Haus in Heinbach und das in der Stadt hat er noch bei seinen Lebzeiten verkauft. Ich bin im Besitze des Vermögens der Familie und lebe mit meinen Kindern einsam. Lieber Gustav, ich habe Dir den Knaben gebracht — — wie wußtest Du denn, daß er mein Sohn sei?'

'Ich habe Deine schwarzen Augen und Deine braunen Locken an ihm gesehen,' antwortete ich.

'Ich habe Dir den Knaben gebracht,' sagte sie, 'daß Du sähest, daß er ist, wie Dein Alfred — fast sein Ebenbild — aber er hat Niemanden, der so lieb mit ihm umgeht, wie Du mit Alfred umgegangen bist, der ihn so liebt, wie Du Alfred geliebt hast, und den er wieder so lieben könnte, wie Alfred Dich geliebt hat.'

'Wie heißt der Knabe,' fragte ich.

'Gustav, wie Du,' antwortete sie.

Ich konnte meine Thränen nicht zurück halten.

'Mathilde,' sagte ich, 'ich habe nicht Weib, nicht Kind, nicht Anverwandte. Du warst das Einzige, was ich in meinem ganzen Leben besaß und behielt. Lasse mir den Knaben, lasse ihn bei mir, ich will ihn lehren, ich will ihn erziehen.'

'O mein Gustav,' rief sie mit den schmerzlichsten Tönen der Rührung, 'wie wahr ist mein Gefühl, das mich an Dich, den besten der Menschen, wies, als ich ein Kind war, und das mich nicht verlassen hatte, so lange ich lebte.'

Sie war aufgestanden, hatte ihr Haupt auf meine Schulter gelegt und weinte auf das Innigste. Ich konnte mich nicht mehr beherrschen, meine Thränen flossen unaufhaltsam, ich schlang meine Arme um sie und drückte sie an mein Herz. Und ich weiß nicht, ob je der heiße Kuß der Jugendliebe tiefer in die Seele gedrungen und zu größrer Höhe erhebend gewesen ist, als dieses verspätete Umfassen der alten Leute, in denen zwei Herzen zitterten, die von der tiefsten Liebe über quollen. Was im Menschen rein und herrlich ist, bleibt unverwüstlich, und ist ein Kleinod in allen Zeiten.

Als wir uns getrennt hatten, geleitete ich sie zu ihrem Sitze, nahm den meinigen wieder ein und fragte: 'Hast du noch andere Kinder?'

'Ein Mädchen, welches mehrere Jahre älter ist, als der Knabe,' erwiederte sie, 'ich werde Dir dasselbe auch bringen, es hat ebenfalls die schwarzen Augen und die braunen Haare, wie ich. Das Mädchen behalte ich, den Knaben lasse, weil Du so gütig bist, um Dich leben, so lange Du willst. Er möge werden, wie Du. O, ich hatte kaum geahnt, wie hier Alles werden wird.'

'Mathilde, beruhige Dich jetzt,' sagte ich, 'ich werde den Knaben holen, wir werden mit ihm freundlich sprechen.'

Ich that es, trat mit dem Knaben an der Hand herein, und wir sprachen mit dem Kinde und abwechselnd unter uns noch eine geraume Weile. Ich zeigte Mathilden hierauf das Haus, den Garten, den Meierhof und alles Andere. (VIII, iii, 165–69)

The scene is in two sections, one set outside and one inside the *Rosenhaus*. Mathilde is overwhelmed at the sight of the house. Her emotion shows in the fact that she breaks all the conventions of dialogue. In her opening speech she calls Risach by his first name, uses the 'du' form, does not greet him but instead states her business immediately (she has come to beg his forgiveness) and asks to be taken into the house. Her impetuosity is met in part by Risach who addresses

her with familiarity and warmth (note the uncharacteristic hyperbole: 'sei tausendmal gegrüßt'). Nevertheless his speech retains some formal elements: it has conventional expressions of greeting and welcome, and it makes the familiar Stifterian attempt at all-encompassing completeness, which sounds to the untrained ear like pedantry: 'sei gegrüßt, sei auf diesem Boden, sei tausendmal gegrüßt und halte dieses Haus für Deines'.

The differential in the amount of emotion present in each of them is again expressed in their gestures. Risach goes up to her, takes her hand and kisses her on the mouth. This gesture contains the potential for both formality (greeting) and emotional content (positive emotion, be it love, friendship, or just warmth). But Mathilde cannot remain at this level of ambiguity. She clings on to Risach's hand, converting the gesture into one of straightforward emotion, and sobs wildly. This behaviour prompts an uncharacteristic comment from the recollecting Risach where he gives away the anguish he was in fact feeling under the calm exterior. She sobs so wildly 'daß ich meinte, ihre mir noch immer so theure Brust müsse zerspringen'. But Risach the experiencing character remains in control of his emotions, telling her gently to try to control hers, and leads her into the house.

When Mathilde has recovered her composure enough to speak again her speech is still free from considerations of convention. The first remark sounds like a spontaneous, stock-taking one, an unusual concession to the psychology of speech which allows for the obvious to be stated: 'so sehen wir uns wieder'. In the next sentence she returns to the reasons for her visit, namely her feeling of guilt: 'Ich konnte das Unrecht nicht mehr tragen, das ich Dir angethan habe'. Risach contradicts her: 'Es ist kein Unrecht geschehen, Mathilde'. His reasons for contradicting her (a genuine belief that she has nothing to blame herself for, or perhaps an unwillingness to talk about her past) cannot be ascertained, but his opposition to her is clear. She is dissuaded, we know not whether for her sake or for his, from talking of her grief.

Mathilde interprets his words as an implicit way of saying that he has forgiven her — he will not discuss the question of her guilt because he gallantly refuses to believe in it. This rejection of his only reinforces her feeling of his goodness ('Ja Du bist immer gut gewesen') and, by implication, of her own weakness. She begs again for forgiveness. His reply is as follows:

> O theure Mathilde, ich habe Dir nichts zu verzeihen, oder Du hast es mir auch . . . Die Erklärung liegt darin, daß Du nicht zu sehen vermochtest, was zu sehen war, und daß ich dann nicht näher zu treten vermochte, als ich hätte näher treten sollen. In der Liebe liegt Alles. Dein schmerzhaftes Zürnen war die Liebe, und mein schmerzhaftes Zurückhalten war auch die Liebe. In ihr liegt unser Fehler, und in ihr liegt unser Lohn.

The first sentence states that they are on an equal footing with regard to responsibility for their quarrel. The second sentence ostensibly elaborates on this. Firstly he says that Mathilde was not able to see what was there to be seen,

meaning presumably that her parents' wishes were of overriding importance. Thus he shows that he still feels his own reactions were completely sound. Then he says that if he must forgive Mathilde for this then she must forgive the fact that he was not able to reach her in her anguish as he should have done. This is a vague formulation. It seems to show regret not at what he did but at the method by which he did it. His actions were right but he should have softened the blow and perhaps explained his behaviour and motives more fully. But this is an inadequate response on several counts. He assumes that had he been gentler in his approach she would not have reacted as she did. He fails to recognize that Mathilde's rejection of him, when it came, was absolute and based on principle rather than confused emotion. She did not reject him because of his bluntness or because she did not understand the facts of the situation. As I hope I have shown, she had a clearer instinctive understanding of his own behaviour than he did. It is therefore an act of condescension to pretend that all would have been well had he taken time to win her round. He retracts, in effect, nothing.

Finally he seeks to explain — and perhaps to explain away — their behaviour: 'In der Liebe liegt Alles. Dein schmerzhaftes Zürnen war die Liebe, und mein schmerzhaftes Zurückhalten war auch die Liebe. In ihr liegt unser Fehler und in ihr liegt unser Lohn'. The speech is highly patterned. Both are united in their guilt and in the reason behind it, although the actual manifestation of that guilt is different in each case. Both can therefore trace the cause of the problem via a separate route back to love. But instead of finishing there Risach adds a further parallel so that the speech ends as it began and as it has proceeded, on a note of binary opposition: love, he says, is both their transgression and their reward.

The balance of this speech is maintained to the end. But there are two important things to be noted. Firstly the patterning links Mathilde with the word 'Fehler' and Risach with the word 'Lohn'. Secondly while the word 'Lohn' completes the patterning, it actually introduces a new argument, namely that love brings not only suffering but also reward. Although the speech is stylistically balanced, its overall meaning is heavily biased towards the negative effects of passionate love. The positive side is introduced almost as an afterthought in order to complete the patterning. There is plenty of evidence for the failure of their love but little for love's reward. Risach (and Stifter) is taking refuge in the soothing rhythms of language while refusing to face the painful truth to which that language refers.

Mathilde enthusiastically accepts his analysis of the situation and expresses her love for him: 'ich kannte nur Dich, die Blume meiner Jugend, die nie verblüht ist. Und Du liebst mich auch'. The main content of this speech is her love for Risach which has remained unchanged to the present day. The roses on the house she feels to be a proof that Risach's love is also unchanged, and they remind her again of her guilt: 'es ist ein Strafgericht für mich, daß ich gerade zu der Zeit ihrer Blüthe gekommen bin'. Instead of commenting upon the main

bulk of Mathilde's speech, Risach responds only to this last observation which he rejects. Using two imperatives ('Rede nicht von Strafgerichten' and 'so lasse die Vergangenheit') he declares the subject of the past closed and moves the conversation firmly to a discussion of Mathilde's present circumstances.

Risach's not wanting to talk of the past could be ascribed either to a disinclination to open up old wounds or to a simple desire to spare Mathilde the distress which thinking of the past obviously causes her. All the way through this dialogue his aim has been to calm Mathilde and reduce the level of emotion in the scene. But it becomes clear, when Mathilde reveals the name of her son, that he has also been repressing the emotion in himself. When he hears that she has named him Gustav he 'cannot hold back' his tears. His next utterance is an outburst of repressed emotion which reveals that even now, many years after the experience of his youth, his loneliness and hurt are as profound as ever: 'Mathilde . . . ich habe nicht Weib, nicht Kind, nicht Anverwandte. Du warst das Einzige, was ich in meinem ganzen Leben besaß und behielt'. Despite his ordered and calm existence there is a gap at the centre of his being: he has no family. And just as before Risach unconciously valued the acquisition of a family more highly than he did union with the woman he loved, so here his first reaction is a plea that he be allowed to bring up and educate Mathilde's son. The implication of the outburst is that this would fulfil his deepest personal need. The content of the three sentences is as follows: 'I have no family, you were the only thing I had ever managed to keep (so) please leave me the boy and I will educate him'. He asks for the boy as a substitute for Mathilde. It is strange that he should say that he has managed to 'keep' Mathilde, for it seems that this is very far from being the case. And he even talks of her in the past tense: 'Du warst das Einzige . . .'. It seems he consigns his relationship with Mathilde to the past tense without acknowledging any future potential in it. The part of her which he managed to 'keep' was the memory of their happiness together ('behalten' can also mean to remember). This memory he is unwilling to disturb or rearrange because he has worked it out to his own satisfaction. What could be more natural from Mathilde's point of view or from the point of view of any outsider (but not from the point of view of the reader who is better informed) than if the sequence were to run: 'I have no family, you were the only thing I ever had and managed to keep (so) please marry me and all will be well'. But this is not how Risach thinks.

Nevertheless this does not mean that he does not still love Mathilde, as the next paragraph shows. They embrace — on his instigation: 'Ich konnte mich nicht mehr beherrschen, meine Thränen flossen unaufhaltsam, ich schlang meine Arme um sie und drückte sie an mein Herz'. And he implies that their love now is greater than ever: 'Und ich weiß nicht, ob je der heiße Kuß der Jugendliebe tiefer in die Seele gedrungen und zu größrer Höhe erhebend gewesen ist, als dieses verspätete Umfassen der alten Leute, in denen zwei Herzen zitterten, die von der tiefsten Liebe über quollen'.

But this love is expressed in gesture only, not in words. After the embrace Risach ritualistically leads her back to her place and takes his own again before saying something neutral and unemotional. The heights of passion mentioned in the previous paragraph are left well and truly behind and find no echo now: 'Als wir uns getrennt hatten, geleitete ich sie zu ihrem Sitze, nahm den meinigen wieder ein und fragte: "Hast Du noch andere Kinder?"'. And once again when Mathilde becomes emotional ('O, ich hatte kaum geahnt, wie hier Alles werden wird') Risach tries to calm her down: 'Mathilde, beruhige Dich jetzt'.

Looking now at the whole dialogue we see that Mathilde starts in a very emotional state and remains so throughout, though she is undoubtedly somewhat calmer by the end. Risach remains calm for as long as he can manage it but then the emotion he is repressing breaks out. He quickly distances himself from it, however, and resumes his normal pose which is both collected and, apparently, calm. But the outburst shows by what effort this semblance of calm is achieved.

In their speech they implicitly agree that Risach's behaviour when they quarrelled was correct and that Mathilde's was incorrect. But their feelings towards this and to the present differ. Mathilde is very distressed by the realization of her 'guilt' and seeks to give expression to the hurt this causes her. Risach urges her not to think about it. This may be partly to spare her pain but it is also clear that he is not immune to the hurt which thinking of the past can bring. The order he has established at the *Rosenhaus* is not unshakable. When it comes to the present, once again their feelings differ and the course the relationship takes is determined by Risach. Mathilde indirectly declares her love for Risach ('ich kannte nur Dich, die Blume meiner Jugend, die nie verblüht ist. Und Du liebst mich auch'). He declares his love not to her (he avoids this with the non sequitur 'Du warst das Einzige, was ich in meinem ganzen Leben besaß und behielt. Laß mir den Knaben') but instead only to Heinrich and the reader when he relives the scene. The one moment of intense communion takes place at the level of gesture only, and although Risach's feelings as this moment are profound, he does not communicate the strength of these feelings to Mathilde but takes refuge in order and ceremony. And once again he fulfils his emotional need by acquiring not a wife, but a surrogate family.

This dialogue sets up the pattern for all the future dialogues between Risach and Mathilde which I have already discussed. Mathilde, as we know, does not come to terms with the past but several times tries to express her anguish. Each time Risach tells her not to talk of the past. This difference between them is never resolved. Mathilde's voice is never fully absorbed into the voice of the novel.

But as I claimed earlier, this passage is a pivotal point whose outcome was not preordained. I believe that Mathilde is at least half conscious that the scene does not turn out the way she would have wished. At one point here she calls Risach

'die Blume meiner Jugend, die nie verblüht ist'. This is a wholly positive image, and the use of the perfect tense implies the possibility for her love still to be consummated. Yet later, in a passage which has already been discussed, she uses almost the same image again but this time with a negative meaning: 'Wie diese Rosen abgeblüht sind, so ist unser Glück abgeblüht' (VII, ii, 126). Between the two can be felt a radical change of mood. While the first is firmly in the present and leaves the future open, the second looks to the past with regret and an air of finality. The consummation which was at one point still possible, has not taken place. Mathilde's disappointment about her past behaviour, which could have been dispelled had Risach proved his forgiveness and overcome his own failure to adjust to adult life by marrying her, is extended into the indefinite future.

4.4 CONFIRMATIONS: RISACH AS NARRATOR

The argument about Mathilde's unhappiness is based upon a few speeches dotted throughout the novel. Although they clearly form a pattern, they make up only a tiny percentage of the total discourse of the novel, and it may therefore seem far-fetched to talk of their actually disturbing the equilibrium of the whole. Just because Mathilde is somewhat melancholy, this does not necessarily mean that there is anything questionable about Risach and the ideas he represents. But I believe it is possible to show that Risach himself is not totally at ease with his own interpretation of the story of his youth.

I have mentioned that Heinrich's narration is characterized by an almost complete lack of hindsight. The quality of Risach's narration is quite different but it is equally true to its aims. While Heinrich's narrative gives expression to his self-effacement, Risach's shows his dominant role within the work. The story he tells is unashamedly his story. And as a narrative presence he remains much more conspicuous than Heinrich. He is visibly in charge, using evaluative expressions and telling of his own reactions and feelings where these are an integral part of the story.

What he relates to Heinrich is a negative example of a human relationship which went wrong because of the intrusion of passion. Within the novel the *Rückblick* chapter serves to throw into relief the model relationship of Heinrich and Natalie. Natalie by contrast is meant to find the happiness, 'das ihre Mutter und ihren väterlichen Freund gemieden hat' (VIII, iii, 173). It might be expected then that Risach would distance himself from the events he relates, showing that he has grown and improved since then, and that the past is inferior to the present. But this is not the case. He shows no regret at any of his actions. One would not expect him to regret his attitude to Mathilde during the quarrel because the whole ideology of the novel depends upon this behaviour being laudable. (This is to leave aside the consideration that, as I have suggested, this behaviour was actually motivated by his need for security, and that its validation means

that Mathilde is treated unjustly in the novel as a whole.) But he does not even regret his behaviour during his relationship with Mathilde prior to the quarrel.

The reason why he shows no regret at his past actions with regard to Mathilde, is that he shows no distance from the events he relates. He is as emotionally involved now with these events as he ever was. He does not have the perspective to condemn his past behaviour. He begins his narrative with a strange apology: 'Zuerst muß ich von mir erzählen . . . es dürfte so nothwendig sein' (VIII, iii, 88). This is the voice of Risach as we are used to hearing it: talking of the self only with reluctance. But it is not long before he has reactivated all the old emotions.[29] Describing his journey to town to look for work, he gets carried away in the description of a sunset, for which he apologizes: '"Ich vergesse mich", unterbrach sich hier mein Gastfreund, "und erzähle Euch Dinge, die nicht wichtig sind; aber es gibt Erinnerungen, die, wie unbedeutende Gegenstände sie auch für Andere betreffen, doch für den Eigenthümer im höchsten Alter so kräftig da stehen, als ob sie die größte Schönheit der Vergangenheit enthielten"' (VIII, iii, 93). The narration continues in this vein. The events Risach is relating are the most important in his life to date and he tells of them with an urgency which makes the period of time which has elapsed since their occurrence seem of negligible importance. This chapter is the only one in the novel to obey the normal conventions of story telling. There is a narrative structure — event follows causally or chronologically upon event (the patterning in the *Rosenhaus* world is largely synchronic: time is of little importance). There is tension as to the outcome. And there is characterization of the narrating consciousness. Heinrich's method of presentation, with its lack of narrative tension, and of comment, forces the reader to give equal attention to all aspects of the *Rosenhaus* world. Risach's, on the other hand, involves his listener, Heinrich, and the reader in the dynamic of the story, places the emphasis on the final outcome and is fuelled by the emotion in the narrative voice which has not been able fully to organize, control, and distance its story. At no point does he place the story of their love into its explicit didactic context. Is the reader to believe that he and Mathilde should never have indulged themselves by falling in love? Surely not — the strength of their love is celebrated. Nor is the reader led to believe that they should have waited, been more cautious, confessed sooner. As Risach relives the events he seems to savour the secrecy, the intensity of their passion. One is left with the impression that it simply would not have been the same had the parents been told, had it all been legitimate. But neither is the reader to believe that this passion would ever have triumphed. Since the events are part of the experienced past of their recounter, the only outcome conceivable is the one already known: Mathilde and Risach do not marry. The tragic outcome cannot be reformulated.

Risach's narration, unlike Heinrich's, has the immediacy of events relived. In reliving them he celebrates the sheer excitement of youthful passion. And he

gives away the fact that his own extraordinary fixation on family life has always been and is still his primary motivation. In telling his story, in indulging in the reliving of emotions once felt and never quite banished, Risach (and Stifter) is having his cake and eating it, and is giving himself away. He has devised a way of living which does without the destructive effect of passion and which is ostensibly based on clarity and order and self-effacement. But the acknowledgement of that passion is an integral part of his view of the world. And the didactic edifice of the *Rosenhause* world is revealed, in Risach's narrative, to be built, not on reason, but on emotion, ultimately on anxiety.

The contradictions in Risach's position come to a head at the end of his story. He confirms his continuing involvement in the events he has narrated: 'Nun mein sehr lieber junger Freund . . . ich habe Euch von meinem Leben erzählt, da Ihr einer der Unseren werden sollt, ich habe zu Euch von meinem tiefsten Herzen geredet' and he declares the conversation to be at an end: 'und jetzt enden wir dieses Gespräch'. But Heinrich reacts unexpectedly and says something which also brings out an unusual reaction in Risach:

'Ich bin Euch Dank schuldig,' antwortete ich, 'allein all das Gehörte ist noch zu mächtig und neu in mir, als daß ich jetzt die Worte des Dankes finden könnte. Nur Eins berührt mich fast, wie ein Schmerz, daß Ihr mit Mathilden nach Eurer Wiedervereinigung nicht in einen nähern Bund getreten seid.'

Der Greis erröthete bei diesen Worten, er erröthete so tief und zugleich so schön, wie ich es nie an ihm gesehen hatte.

'Die Zeit war vorüber,' antwortete er, 'das Verhältnis wäre nicht mehr so schön gewesen, und Mathilde hat es auch wohl nie gewünscht.'

Er war schon früher aufgestanden, jetzt reichte er mir die Hand, drückte die meine herzlich, und verließ das Zimmer. (VIII, iii, 176)

Both Heinrich and Risach behave in an uncharacteristic way in this exchange. Heinrich, who is usually so reticent and careful not to speak when he is not sure that speech is appropriate, blurts out a question. He speaks literally, and figuratively, out of turn. The question represents an emotional response in Heinrich, he feels compelled to ask it and it breaks the rules of the discourse for he, the junior party in the conversation, continues the dialogue after it has been declared finished. But the narrative dynamic of Risach's story has been so strong that Heinrich feels justified in asking why the conclusion he feels to be so natural did not happen. Risach is clearly embarrassed. He blushes deeply (an involuntary action which, Heinrich notes, becomes him greatly), and his reply is confused. He answers Heinrich in three extremely brief phrases which show an increasing lack of composure. The first is a categorical statement in the past indicative: 'Die Zeit war vorüber'. The second is an elaboration of the first but shows, in the subjunctive, a projection of his view of the form such a relationship would have taken, had it happened: 'das Verhältnis wäre nicht mehr so schön gewesen'. The possibility that such a relationship could have occurred is

accepted by him but then rejected because it would have been a second best to his memory of their actual relationship. This memory is more sacred to him than anything in the present could be. The third shows a further weakening in his argument: 'Mathilde hat es auch wohl nie gewünscht'. This statement is both ambiguous and astonishingly revealing. It can be read as meaning that even had he wanted the relationship, then Mathilde probably did not, or alternatively that Mathilde did not want it any more than he did. The revealing word is 'wohl' which implies that, whether he wanted it or not, the truth of the matter is that he and Mathilde never actually discussed the possibility. One suspects that after the passionate exchanges of Mathilde's return to him, the couple never actually discussed their future but let it evolve around them. A yawning lacuna is revealed at the heart of the Indian Summer: the idyll of family life and unity is desirable only when seen from Risach's point of view and even then it represents a substitute for painful memories which have not yet been exorcised.

In whatever light this passage is viewed, it is disturbing. On a previous occasion when Heinrich asked a question with uncharacteristic forcefulness (why had Risach not explained to him the beauty of the statue?), this was shown to be proof of his inner worth. At this later stage the reader has built up even more confidence in Heinrich's approach to his education and in his reactions. If we also trust his judgement here, and assume that his question is fully aligned with the didactic design of the text, the problem of Risach's embarrassment is raised. If Heinrich's question is not justified then we have to revise our opinion of his worth, which we are not willing to do at this late stage. Whichever is the case, Risach's vulnerability is inescapable. Heinrich has touched a raw nerve.

Klaus Amann has drawn attention to J. Stenzel's work on *Der Nachsommer* where he reminds us of the interesting fact that in the first edition of the novel every paragraph within this chapter was enclosed in single quotation marks, and every usage of direct speech was enclosed in double quotation marks.[30] Stenzel felt that this was first of all a means of distinguishing between the two narrators, but that this use of punctuation also had a deeper significance. The double quotation marks are meant to be a constant reminder,

> daß die im *Rückblick* geschilderte Welt nur als 'die schon verwundene' und nicht als eine 'andere Möglichkeit' Bedeutung haben könne. Die Anführungszeichen erhielten so den 'Charakter eines bewahrenden Geheges, das lückenlos um jene Welt gezogen wird . . .' und Stenzel fragt, 'wie gewaltig das sein muß, was nur mit solchen Mitteln hintangehalten werden kann.'[31]

Speech marks were used, therefore, as a means of distancing and controlling the events related in the *Rückblick* chapter which have not yet been come to terms with.

4.5 CONCLUSION

Der Nachsommer pictures a utopia of perfect familial relationships from which passion has been purged. Risach and Mathilde's mature love is shown to have a unique purity:

> Es gibt eine eheliche Liebe, die nach den Tagen der feurigen gewitterartigen Liebe, die den Mann zu dem Weibe führt, als stille, durchaus aufrichtige, süße Freundschaft auftritt, die über alles Lob und über allen Tadel erhaben ist, und die vielleicht das Spiegelklarste ist, was menschliche Verhältnisse aufzuweisen haben. Diese Liebe trat ein. Sie ist innig ohne Selbstsucht, freut sich, mit dem Andern zusammen zu sein, sucht seine Tage zu schmücken und zu verlängern, ist zart und hat gleichsam keinen irdischen Ursprung an sich. (VIII, iii, 172)

The final perfect union is that between Heinrich and Natalie. It is the goal towards which the whole novel moves. But it is significant that Risach can point to an ideal relationship which exists well before Heinrich even meets Natalie, namely that between Heinrich's own parents:

> Du hast das Vorbild an Deinen Eltern vor Dir, werde, wie sie sind. Die Familie ist es, die unsern Zeiten Noth thut, sie thut mehr Noth, als Kunst und Wissenschaft, als Verkehr, Handel, Aufschwung, Fortschritt, oder wie Alles heißt, was begehrungswerth erscheint. Auf der Familie ruht die Kunst, die Wissenschaft, der menschliche Fortschritt, der Staat. (VIII, iii, 217)

The pain at having lost the security of a family never leaves Risach and remains his primary motivation. At moments of stress it is the first consideration to come to his lips. The events in the *Rückblick* chapter, while serving as a cautionary example, are not viewed by Risach with distance but with blind tenderness. The morbid fixation with the family, along with the fear of the actual human relations necessary to form one, are the generating powers of Risach's world.

The great edifice of the Indian Summer is not, as first appears, a joint construction, for Mathilde has no say in its making. The structure of the dialogue reflects the structure of the novel: a dominant idea seeks supremacy on its merits and achieves this ninety-five per cent of the time. But where opposition exists it is either not heeded or else it is gently silenced. The dialogue bears witness to Risach's triumph — and also to the opposition that is there, briefly and unforgettably, in the expression of Mathilde's grief.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (New York, 1966), p. 131.
2. Roland Barthes, *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture* (Paris, 1953), p. 51.
3. Italo Calvino, *If on a Winter's Night a Traveller*, translated by William Weaver (London, 1982), p. 69.
4. References are taken from Sauer, VI (Erster Band = i), VII (Zweiter Band = ii), and VIII (Dritter Band = iii), with page numbers in arabic.

5. See Klaus Amann, *Adalbert Stifters 'Nachsommer': Studie zur didaktischen Struktur des Romans*, Wiener Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur, 8 (Vienna, 1977), who says (p. 88) that if a reader is not prepared or in a position 'Wertsysteme des Romans und aktuelles Handeln der Personen aufeinander zu beziehen', then the novel 'zerfällt ihm in eine Vielzahl von akademischen Vorträgen und Diskussionen und in ein dauerndes Repetieren von oft unverständlichen Handlungen und Situationen'.
6. Michael Beddow, *The Fiction of Humanity: Studies in the Bildungsroman from Wieland to Thomas Mann* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 185. See also M. R. Minden, 'The Place of Inheritance in the Bildungsroman', p. 61, 'Drendorf exists as a kind of amputated memory, with no perspective from the implied narrative present'. See also Klaus Dieter Sorg, *Gebrochene Teleologie: Studien zum Bildungsroman von Goethe bis Thomas Mann* (Heidelberg, 1983), pp. 101–34 (pp. 132–34); and, for the fullest analysis of Heinrich's narration, Friedbert Aspetsberger, 'Der Groß-Sprecher Heinrich Drendorf: zu Adalbert Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 32 (1983), 179–219.
7. Gerald Gillespie, 'Ritualism and Motivic Development in Adalbert Stifter's *Nachsommer*', *Neophilologus*, 48 (1964), 312–22 (p. 315).
8. Klaus Amann, 'Zwei Thesen zu Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 31 (1982), 169–84 (p. 174).
9. Aspetsberger, p. 197. See also Karl Wagner, '"Patriarchalisches Stilleben?": ein sozialgeschichtlicher Versuch über Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 29 (1980), 139–65, who says that what prevails here is 'die Gewöhnung, nicht die rationale Diskussion als Grundsatz der Erziehung', and who talks of 'ein derart unbemäntelt zur Schau gestelltes autoritäres Prinzip' (p. 143).
10. Peter Schäublin, 'Familiares in Stifters *Nachsommer*', in *Londoner Symposium 1983*, pp. 86–100 and Amann, 'Zwei Thesen', elaborate on the problematic use of the family as a symbol of order and continuity in the novel.
11. Thomas Keller, *Die Schrift in Stifters 'Nachsommer': Buchstäblichkeit und Bildlichkeit des Romantextes*, Böhlau forum litterarum, 12 (Cologne, 1982), pp. 255–56.
12. Walther Killy, *Wirklichkeit und Kunstcharakter: neun Romane des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1963), p. 101.
13. Joseph Peter Stern, *Re-Interpretations*, p. 295.
14. See Amann, 'Adalbert Stifters *Nachsommer*', p. 138: 'Und im *Nachsommer* weist eben der immense technische Apparat, der formale Aufwand, der nötig ist, um das in ihm formulierte Sinnsystem abzusichern und als möglich und machbar zu suggerieren, bereits auf dessen objektive Geltungsschwäche'.
15. Marie-Ursula Lindau, *Stifters 'Nachsommer': ein Roman der verhaltenen Rührung*, Baseler Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 50 (Bern, 1974), p. 81, says this first conversation is 'noch ein richtiges Streitgespräch'. She explains: 'Rede folgt auf Gegenrede. Keiner stimmt dem anderen zu, keiner will nachgeben'.
16. See Aspetsberger, 'Der Groß-Sprecher Heinrich Drendorf', p. 188: 'Die in Heinrich entstandene emotionale Stauung wird im gemeinschaftlichen Abwarten des wirklich nicht (stattfindenden) Gewitters abgebaut und in die Sachlichkeit von Risachs Behauptungen, die für Heinrich auch Risachs merkwürdige Person zur Geltung bringen, aufgelöst'.
17. For an indication of the importance of this scene within the novel (it is the middle chapter, the statue is at the heart of the *Rosenhaus*, its classical connections represent the education of Heinrich, its beauty reminds him of Natalie) see Heinrich Seidler, 'Die Bedeutung der Mitte in Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 6 (1957), 59–86. See also Wolfgang Peter Betz, *Die Motive in Stifters Nachsommer* (Frankfurt am Main, 1970), p. 40: 'Die aufgefundene Marmorstatue wird als ein Medium inthronisiert, dessen ästhetische Anschauung den Nachsommermenschen das Göttliche vermittelt, ihnen das Ziel ihres Strebens, die reine Gestalt, vor Augen stellt'.
18. They make it a condition of their love that Heinrich's parents, Natalie's mother and Risach should all approve. As Natalie says: 'Wenn Eines Nein sagt, und wir es nicht überzeugen können, so wird es Recht haben, und wir werden uns dann lieben, so lange wir leben, wir werden einander treu sein in dieser und jener Welt; aber wir dürften uns dann nicht mehr sehen' (VII, ii, 289).
19. Christine Oertel Sjörgren, 'The Configuration of Ideal Love in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*', *MAL*, 8 (1975), 190–96 (p. 195).
20. Rudolf Wildbolz, *Adalbert Stifter: Langeweile und Faszination*, p. 112.
21. Emil Staiger, *Meisterwerke deutscher Sprache aus dem neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, second edition (Zürich, 1948), pp. 188–203 (p. 193).
22. Horst Albert Glaser, *Die Restauration des Schönen: Stifters 'Nachsommer'*, p. 38.
23. See John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, p. 25: 'Correlated with the notion of illocutionary acts is the notion of the consequences or *effects* such acts may have on the actions, thoughts, or beliefs, etc. of hearers. For example, by arguing I may *persuade*, or

convince someone, by warning him I may *scare* or *alarm* him, by making a request I may *get him to do something*, by informing him I may *convince him* (*enlighten*, *edify*, *inspire him*, *get him to realize*). The italicized expressions above denote perlocutionary acts'.

24. See Sorg, p. 131: 'wer "Leidenschaften" anheimfällt, büßt es sein ganzes Leben — dies ist die Lehre der Geschichte von Risach und Mathilde'.
25. See Schäublin, p. 95: 'das Schicksal macht ihn zum Individuum, indem es ihn von seinem Ursprung trennt, vom Raum seiner Kindheit'.
26. See Klaus-Detlev Müller, 'Utopie und Bildungsroman: Strukturuntersuchungen zu Stifters *Nachsommer*' *ZDP*, 90, no. 2 (1971), 199–228 (p. 224), who says that Risach's life story is 'der immer wieder gescheiterte Versuch, in der Familie Halt zu gewinnen'.
27. Beddow, *The Fiction of Humanity*, p. 175.
28. See Schäublin, p. 93: 'für Mathilde dagegen ist er der gerade nicht zur Familie Gehörige'.
29. Aspetsberger, p. 200, talks of Risach's life, 'von dem er rückschauend noch überwältigt wird'.
30. In the Sauer edition each paragraph of Risach's narration is enclosed in double speech marks, which means that each spoken utterance is enclosed in two sets of double speech marks. This gives an extraordinarily cluttered appearance, which it was felt better not to reproduce in the present work.
31. Amann, *Adalbert Stifters 'Nachsommer'*, p. 90.

CHAPTER V

DIE MAPPE MEINES URGROSSVATERS: DEFINING THE SELF

> 'Literature is analysis after the event.
> The form of that other piece . . . is nostalgia. There is no nostalgia in this piece . . . but the form is a kind of pain.'
> Doris Lessing, *The Golden Notebook*[1]

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters exists in four versions, three of which are well-known.[2] They are commonly known as the *Journal-* or *Urmappe*, the *Studienmappe*, and the *Romanmappe*. They cover the major part of Stifter's creative period, the *Journalmappe* being typical of his early, Jean-Paulesque stories and the *Romanmappe* being the mature novel Stifter was working on when he died. They are thus interesting for two reasons: they give a good indication of how Stifter changed and developed his style, and they are based on a corpus of material which he felt continually challenged and puzzled by. There is no other work which received this much attention from the author. If, as Curt Hohoff has claimed, *Witiko* and *Der Nachsommer* are 'wie verschiedene Ausstrahlungen einer Kraft, als habe Stifters Wesen dem einen Werk gegeben, was er dem andern vorenthielt', then the last version of the *Mappe* is 'im Brennpunkt seines Wesens'.[3] Despite the work's crucial importance for any understanding of Stifter's artistry it has, however, received surprisingly little critical attention.

The story as it appears in the final version is roughly as follows: the framework narrator finds the notebooks in which his great-grandfather Augustinus used to write during important periods in his life. As a young man Augustinus studied medicine in Prague and was friendly with a young lawyer Eustachius, who was of an artistic temperament. Eustachius fled one day because he had debts resulting from his lending money to an acquaintance who had disappeared without trace. Eustachius leaves a note saying that he will return when he can do so with honour. Augustinus is devastated and searches high and low for Eustachius but to no avail. He also discovers that Eustachius had been conducting a secret love affair with a merchant's daughter, Christine Waldon.

Augustinus returns to his home in the country and sets himself up as a doctor. Despite local resistance (the people see no need for doctors) he succeeds and slowly but surely becomes a highly respected member of the community. He strikes up a friendship with a retired *Obrist* and his daughter Margarita, with whom he falls in love. But he becomes jealous one day when he sees her with her cousin Rudolph, and when he confronts her they quarrel, she accusing him of lack of faith. To help soothe his pain the *Obrist* tells him his own life story: from being a carelessly wild and extravagant young man he came to see the error of his ways and reformed. But tragically he then lost the young wife he loved deeply. During a walk in the mountains, she lost her balance and, without uttering a sound for fear of endangering his life too, she plunged to her death. Although now living an exemplary life, he still feels the pain of that loss keenly.

Augustinus steadfastly continues with his work and becomes a much valued and trusted member of the community. But he never forgets the loss of Eustachius and makes several trips to Prague to see if he can trace him. Disaster strikes again: a sudden illness kills Augustinus's dearly loved brother, sister and father, leaving him quite alone. But he has enough inner strength and resilience by now not to despair and carries on with his work. He hears of a landscape designer who has been working locally under the name of Ewald Lind who sounds in every respect like Eustachius. Augustinus treats the daughter of a local *Fürst* who is suffering from melancholy, and the success of this treatment is a testimony to the skill and integrity that he has acquired, not just as a doctor, but as a man and as a human being, for he treats her not with medicine, but with intuition and understanding by talking to her and encouraging her to talk.

Sadly the work breaks off here, for Stifter died before completing it. But from the endings of the other two versions we may assume that Augustinus would have been reunited with Margarita, and it also seems likely that Lind is indeed Eustachius and would have returned and married Christine.

In this work more than any other Stifter faces head-on the problems which had always been present, if sometimes in a concealed form, in his writing. These problems concern the issues of pain and loss, the tragic implications of individuation in a world where people can never understand the links between events, can never have an overview over the 'heitere Blumenkette' which is behind the structure of the world. In this work, and increasingly so in the later versions, Stifter demonstrates through his characters the courage needed by human beings if they are to accept the blows of fate and emerge whole, if not unscathed. In *Der Nachsommer* problems were suppressed, and therefore intruded only in passages of dialogue and in the *Rückblick* chapter. In *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*, on the other hand, the entire text is involved in the rigorous search for an honest solution to the questions raised.

The theme of mankind's experiencing and gaining understanding of the world is given formal expression through the motif of the diaries or notebooks

which give the work its title. The *Obrist* develops and learns by keeping a diary of important events which happen to him and rereading it after a period of several years has elapsed. Augustinus copies him and the habit helps him continually to mature and deepen his understanding of himself and the world.[4] It is his notebooks which form the main body of the novel, and through them the slow process of his move towards objectivity can be charted. Paul Böckmann writes: 'Das Motiv der Mappe ist nicht nur ein erzählerisches Mittel der Distanzierung durch einen Rahmen, sondern vor allem das Strukturprinzip eines Erzählens, das die ihm zugehörige Ironie aufhebt und dadurch die Aufgabe, die epische Objektivität zurückzugewinnen, dringlich macht'.[5] This epic objectivity is not a lofty and abstract idea divorced from the reality of human life. Rather its attainment is a matter of extreme necessity if mankind is to be saved from despair. As Alexander Stillmark points out, 'the act of making conscious the process of living, of rendering account for each stage of life, serves to give that life point and wholeness'.[6] The issue at the heart of the work is that of human consciousness, without which life is unenlightened and inadequate: 'Die Einsicht in die Bewußtseinsproblematik wird ausdrücklich als Bedingung des Menschseins wie aller dichterischen Bemühungen hervorgehoben' (Böckmann, p. 404). And the problem posed for human consciousness to comprehend is both one of the hardest in the history of human thought, and one of peculiar, personal importance for Stifter himself, namely the need to make sense of the apparently senseless by means of a medium which is fickle: language. Böckmann again puts this succinctly: 'Das Erzählthema der Mappe zeugt damit von einer merkwürdigen Bedrängnis: es geht um die Art, wie der Mensch den ihn zerstörenden Katastrophen begegnen und von ihnen noch erzählen kann' (p. 405).

This crucial quest for insight and objectivity is encapsulated not only in the diaries but also in the form of the novel as a whole and, crucially, in the use of dialogue and direct speech. There is no one omniscient narrator but in effect three narrators, all of whom are caught up in the story — Augustinus's descendant who finds the notebooks, Augustinus himself, and the *Obrist* who recounts his story to Augustinus, who in turn incorporates it into his narrative. All are shown to gain and grow by reading.

In addition to writing, speech is shown to be another way of coming to terms with the world and defining the self in relation to the world. Augustinus is seen to define himself in various conversations and Isabella is healed through the directed use of speech. The *Obrist*'s long account of his life is finely balanced between the desired sense of objectivity in respect of, and distance from, past events, and the still acute sense of pain which thinking of these past events evokes. The central rift between Augustinus and Margarita is also crucial here, for it echoes many of the problems of communication experienced by characters in Stifter's other works. As will be shown, it is here that the gap between the self

and the world is felt at its most radical. It is here too that the question is raised whether Stifter could successfully have completed the novel and achieved the wholeness which was so patently his desire or whether the obstacles to wholeness were too great.

The work is characterized by an honesty and a willingness to take risks unusual in Stifter. He faces here the problem of random catastrophe, which was raised in *Abdias*, without attempting to legislate away the existence of suffering, as he did in *Der Nachsommer* or to subsume the individual totally in the processes of history, as he did in *Witiko*. The outlook is a familiar one — individual human affairs are shown to be as nothing in comparison with the vastness of the world and all that goes on in it. But the standpoint has changed. By doing without an omniscient narrator representing the author's voice in the work, by having the principal narrator of his first person narrative reflecting and growing as Heinrich Drendorf did not do, by having his three presenters' voices conveyed direct to the reader, Stifter brings the reader close to the heartbreak and the loss which are so central as themes, and makes it much harder to establish where the centre of gravity lies. Just as Augustinus and the *Obrist* learn by reading of their past, and the first narrator by reading Augustinus's notebooks, so too the reader is forced to experience pain at close proximity and yet at the same time to see that pain in a wider context: 'Die Mappe empfiehlt, was sie als Inhalt und Form ist: *Lesen dargestellter Wirklichkeit als Therapie*'.[7] The reader is required, not to accept an ideology as he or she was in *Der Nachsommer*, but to work out, in tandem with the author, a tentative and provisional scheme of beliefs of their own.

I want to consider now the issue of the rewriting process. There are obvious differences between the three versions, not least their sheer volume. The *Journalmappe* consists of a mere four short chapters. The *Studienmappe* has seven chapters and is nearly two and half times longer, while the *Romanmappe*, which is of course unfinished, has eight chapters and is half as long again. There is also a difference in the basic structure. Both the *Journalmappe* and the *Studienmappe* start the story of Augustinus *in medias res* at the point where Augustinus has quarrelled with Margarita. The *Studienmappe* then goes back in time to recount Augustinus's return from university, his setting up as a doctor, his relationship with Margarita, before going on to show the resolution of their quarrel. It therefore presents the story in the order: middle, beginning, end. Eustachius is omitted. The *Journalmappe*, on the other hand, has the Eustachius material (although it does not reintroduce him at the end) and does not deal directly with the quarrel between Augustinus and Margarita. From the opening where Augustinus is tempted to commit suicide as a result of the quarrel, there is a flash back to Augustinus's and Eustachius's university days with the chapter 'Die Geschichte der zween Bettler', and then the final section moves forward, as in the *Studienmappe*, to the reunion with Margarita. The *Journalmappe* is thus the

most elusive and fragmentary of the three. It simply presents three episodes from Augustinus's life with a minimum of connective material.[8]

It is remarkable how many themes and motifs in the final version can in fact be traced back to the *Journalmappe*. And despite its gaps and the lack of explanation, the *Journalmappe* has an integrity and a sureness of touch which indicate that the missing connections were already present, in however tentative a form, in the author's mind. To trace the connections between the two versions is, as Hohoff claims, crucial for an understanding of the novel's genesis and final form:

> Die *Letzte Mappe* ist in der Urfassung vorgeformt. Zu sehen, wie sie . . . aufnimmt, verbreitert, ausscheidet und verwandelt, wie sie anders gebaut, empfunden und geordnet ist und wie doch in jenem Keim schon diese Blüte angelegt war, ist für den Beflissenen die aufschließendste Deutung des Werks. (p. 202)

The *Studienmappe* lacks this sure touch and instinctive sense of direction. Although it fills in many of the gaps in the earlier version, it contains many sentimental passages and others whose purpose in the overall design is unclear, for example the long description of the 'Eisfahrt' which lasts for some thirty pages.[9] The omission of Eustachius is another indication of the author's uncertainty as to how to handle the material.

The *Romanmappe* presents the events for the first time in chronological order and has the unhurried, spacious mood of a novel which can afford to be discursive where a Novelle or a drama has to be dramatic. Each section does not merely present an event (the quarrel with Margarita, the loss of Eustachius, the reunion with Margarita), it links them up, it shows the undramatic sections in between, it closes up the gaps. Time is taken to depict the slow process of Augustinus's development as a man and as a doctor. Sentences from the *Journalmappe* describing this theme are reworked, expanded, and made to interconnect.[10] The theme of wholeness and of 'heilen' is a central one, as Stillmark points out. The central character, a doctor, heals his patients and is healed himself. There are many details of social life, yet the work draws its meaning and force 'from the power and consistency of an ideal of wholeness which permeates every feature of the work, and which finds expression in the design and proportions of the whole as well as in individual motifs and symbolic features' (Stillmark, p. 164). The ending, with its resolution of the main problems in the text (the loss of Eustachius, the rift between Augustinus and Margarita) would have stressed the idea of wholeness.

But this is not the whole picture. The moments of hiatus and stark discontinuity in both plot and style are still present in the *Romanmappe* since the basic story is the same, and thus the effect of the levelling and smoothing process is paradoxically to make these lacunae, when they do occur, even more startling. Martin and Erika Swales are aware of this when they write that the *Romanmappe* 'remains curiously sketchy — and this is not just because it is incomplete: it has an internal fragmentariness and discontinuity. The reworking does not entail a

simple process of transfiguration: rather, it involves a reshaping of the uncertainty within the narrative'.[11]

There remains then, a tension between the material, which deals with moments of tragedy and discontinuity, and the artistic will behind it, which increasingly desires to show the success of mankind in coming to terms with those moments. The *Romanmappe* 'is critically suspended between a *Lebensskizze*, a mere sketch of a life, and the determination to join up the discrete strokes of the pen into a solid image of integrity and wholeness' (Swales and Swales, p. 119). The success of the work lies in the delicate balance which essentially admits to the reader the impotence of mankind while yet showing the possibility of fortitude against almost unbearable odds.

5.2 WRITING AND NARRATING

5.2.1 THE FRAMEWORK

The *Mappe* is, of course, largely an *Ich-Erzählung*. But in all three versions of the story there is a framework which describes the narrator, a descendant of the doctor, finding Augustinus's diaries, reading them and transmitting them to the reader. The framework is thus the link between the present time of writing and the past time where the story is set, the protagonists in each period being linked by family bonds.

Apart from this basic structure the frameworks differ considerably in three main ways. These differences concern the relationship of the narrator with his reader and with his subject-matter and also the actual person of the narrator. There is first of all a shift in the narrator/reader relationship, from the *Journalmappe* where the narrator addresses the reader directly and is conscious of his own role as story-teller, to the *Romanmappe* where he has no direct link with the reader, the latter being guided much less explicitly in his or her interpretation of the story. This change corresponds to Wolfgang Iser's analysis of the difference between eighteenth- and ninteenth-century narratives:

> Wurde dem Leser im Roman des 18. Jahrhunderts durch das Gespräch, das der Autor mit ihm führte, eine explizite Rolle zugewiesen, damit er — bald durch sie, bald gegen sie — je nach der im Text wirksamen Steuerung die menschliche Natur und den Zugang zur Wirklichkeit zu konstituieren vermochte, so schwindet im Roman des 19. Jahrhunderts vielfach eine solche, dem Text eingezeichnete Rollenzuweisung. Statt dessen soll der Leser selbst seine Rolle entdecken, die er ständig von den sozialen Normen zugewiesen erhält, um dadurch in ein kritisches Verhältnis zu den gesellchaftlichen Zwängen zu gelangen. Damit aber der Leser diese Rolle entdeckt, darf ihm der Roman selbst keine zuweisen. Folglich komplizieren sich die Textstrategien, da sie nun den Leser ungleich indirekter und verhohlener auf die ihm zugdedachte Entdeckung lenken müssen.[12]

Secondly there is a shift in the form of Augustinus's story, the subject matter mediated by the narrator. In the *Journalmappe* it is fragmentary and diffuse, and

the reader is totally reliant on the narrator to edit and present the material. In the *Romanmappe* on the other hand, Augustinus's story is moulded by Augustinus himself, for this process of learning by writing about one's life is a central theme of the novel. The editorial role of the narrator is correspondingly reduced.

But there is another sense in which that narrator becomes not less but more important as the rewriting process proceeds, namely as a character in his own right. For whereas in the *Journalmappe* his role is purely functional, in the *Romanmappe* he too (and his family and his lifestyle) is a part of the subject matter.

5.2.1.1 *The 'Journalmappe'*

In the *Journalmappe* the narrator is very conscious, and makes the reader very conscious, of his role as story teller. He asserts his presence in every chapter. He introduces the story in the first chapter where he describes finding the manuscripts, he introduces the second chapter 'Der sanftmüthige Obrist', explaining that it is the first section he finds in the old leather book, and he adds an editorial comment in parentheses: 'Wer in den letzten dreyßig Jahren (man bemerke, daß mein Urgroßvater von 1730 spricht) . . .' (J, 19). He introduces the third chapter 'Die Geschichte der zween Bettler' only briefly: 'So lese ich im Lederbuch des Urgroßsvaters: . . .' (J, 41), but before the final chapter he returns to the narrative present for a lengthy statement, with comments upon his reading of Augustinus's diaries. At the end of the story, however, he is silent, for the Novelle ends with Augustinus's final ecstatic 'ich habe nichts geschlafen - immerhin - der Wagen ist in der Nacht gekommen, und harrt eben auf mich - nun zu allen meinen Kranken, und dann zu ihr, zu ihr!!!' (J, 102).

The intrusiveness of the narrator springs partly from his character and partly from the fact that he feels his task to be an important and a difficult one. His main characteristics are a strong curiosity, an enthusiasm for his task and a desire to please the reader. As a child he was interested in Augustinus's things, and was sad when the leather book disappeared. When he returns home as a young man with his new bride, he actively searches for the things. On finding the Margarita statue, he wastes no time in breaking into the chest underneath it with 'Zange und Brecheisen', and on finding the papers he devours them avidly and decides to publish them, presenting them to the reader with the words: 'Somit, lieber Leser, gehe freundlich mit mir an einigen Stücken meines Ahnherrn vorüber, ob es dir auch, wie mir, den Eindruck mache eines drolligen, schwermüthig kräftigen Vorfahrers' (J, 14). From this we see that he values Augustinus's story both as an entertaining tale and as something of moral worth. He has already described it as 'ein kostbar Leben meines Ahnherrn . . . wie ich es mir schon früher aus den Sagen und Bruchstücken alter Erzähler von ihm zusammenlas: eitel Schalksnarrheit, und pure Kraft und Trefflichkeit' (J, 13). His enthusiasm for the figure of Augustinus is felt from the first line of the story when he

launches into a description of his protagonist without even mentioning his name: 'Er war ein weitberühmter Arzt und Doctor der freyen Künste, sonst auch ein eulenspieliger Herr und Ehrenmann' (J, 11).

The style continues to be direct and vivid. But despite his forcefulness, the narrator himself is never the focus of the narrative interest. The energy in his voice serves to arouse interest in his subject matter Augustinus. The narrator himself is merely an enthusiastic mediator. And although he had some intimation of the worth of Augustinus's story, the main beneficiary of this worth is the recipient, the reader.

Augustinus's story, as the narrator finds it, is not a finished narrative. He does not present all the material to the reader, but only extracts. He casually cites some of the chapter headings he finds in the leather book, including two which are not passed on to us: 'gar seltsame rothe Titel: "der sanftmüthige Obrist" - "die Geschichte der zween Bettler" - "Tagebuch eines Gespenstes" - "die tolle Gräfin"' (J, 14). Augustinus's story, like life, is shapeless, diffuse, contains many unexplored avenues. It is the narrator's task to find within this material a reasonably rounded tale, a task he finds difficult. This shows particularly in the introductory section of 'Das Scheibenschießen in Pirling'. It begins with a typically intrusive reminder to the reader of his presence as mediator of the work: 'Der freundliche Leser erinnere sich gütig an das alte lederne Buch meines Ahnherrn, des Doctors, aus dem ich für ihn unlängst die Geschichte der Zween Bettler auszog, und folge mir eben so gütig zu dieser Geschichte, die ich eben wieder ausziehe und übersetze'. But his next sentence points out his problem:

> Als ich das von den beyden Bettlern gelesen hatte und kein rechtes Ende fand, so that ich freylich etwas, was sonst nur eine Schwäche des schönen Geschlechtes zu seyn pflegt, nemlich, ich fing zu blättern an, ob nicht bald wieder etwas von dem närrischen Eustachius käme, nicht bedenkend, daß eine Lebensskizze sich nicht so runden könne, wie Romane, wo sich freylich Alles Verlorene wieder findet. (J, 68)

In the end the narrator, having grown annoyed with his search for further information about Eustachius, gives up and decides to present another chapter, 'Das Scheibenschießen in Pirling'. He chooses this one from his customary desire to please the reader: 'Da nun schon zu Anfang des Aufsatzes . . . schon eine Gestalt auftritt, die der Leser der vorigen Blätter bereits ein wenig kennt, und die ihm vielleicht lieb werden möchte, so lasse ich von der Hand alles Dazwischenliegende aus, und setzte den Aufsatz her, wie folgt: . . .' (J, 70). If he cannot finish off the Eustachius strand, he decides, he will at least pursue the relationship of Augustinus and Margarita to a satisfactory conclusion.

In short, the *Journalmappe* bears many traces of eighteenth-century modes of writing. The relationships between reader, narrator, and subject matter are fixed and each member of the trio has a clearly defined role. The reader is there to be amused and entertained, the narrator to ensure that he or she is satisfied. The subject matter is just that: material, supposedly drawn from life, which has to be

moulded and shaped into a suitable form for presentation. Thus a clear distinction is made between narrative, which is rounded off, and life, which is not finished because, in this case, the protagonist, Augustinus, was not in charge of his life in the way that a story teller is in charge of his material. And reality is shown to be very resistant to ordering: Eustachius is not found, to the frustration of the narrator. Hence the stress on the narrator's part on authentication and apology. He cannot be held responsible for the fact that life is not like fiction. Aspetsberger, in a section of his article on the *Journalmappe* which is appositely called 'Der unbekümmerte Urenkel' indicates why this section had to be rewritten to become integrated into the whole. The narrator 'strebt . . . augenscheinlich keine geschlossene biographische Darstellung an, *widerspricht* also gerade dem Prinzip der Aufzeichnung des Lebens'. He opposes the 'Prinzip der Mappe, die den Menschen vollständig zu seiner Identität führen, die Lebensgeschichte ründen soll'.[13]

5.2.1.2 *The 'Studienmappe'*

The narrator of the *Studienmappe* resembles that of the *Journalmappe* in some respects but is different in others. His voice is heard on three occasions in the work. There is, of course, the introductory chapter which is almost seven times longer than the original. He then introduces the opening section of Augustinus's diaries, 'Das Gelöbniß', with the words 'So stehe es auf dem ersten Blatte dieses Buches, wie ich es getreu erfüllen werde . . .' (S, 31). From then until the end of Augustinus's story he is silent and lets the reader become engrossed in the narrative without giving any direct indication of his presence. But at the end he reappears with a 'Nachwort' which returns to the narrative present (he talks of the problems he has had translating the diaries) and also completes Augustinus's story: he describes Augustinus as an old man and the details of his funeral.

As in *Journalmappe* he is also conscious of his intermediary role as mediator and editor of the material. His job is easier: Stifter has chosen to omit the problematic figure of Eustachius. But the narrator still selects the matertial which he wants to use, and the task of deciphering it is a long and arduous one. At the end he confesses: 'Es ist noch recht viel übrig; aber das Lesen ist schwer. Oft ist kein rechtes Ende, oft deutet sich der Anfang nur an, manchmal ist die Mitte der Ereignisse da, oder es ist eine unverständliche Krankengeschichte' (S, 232). The task is unfinished: 'Ich habe noch recht viel zu erzählen, und werde es in der Zukunft thun, wenn ich es zu Ende geziffert, und ausgezogen habe: Wie die Hochzeit gewesen ist . . .' (ibid.). But in the meantime he rounds off his volume by describing the doctor's last days, his last cure, which has overtones of the miraculous, and his funeral which was a moving occasion because all the gypsies whom Augustinus had treated free of charge joined in the procession. The framework really is just that: an introduction and postscript to the story which is embedded in it.

But the relationship of the narrator to the material is more ambiguous than it is in the *Journalmappe*. He is first of all a very different person and writes from a different perspective. He is an old man looking back on his life. The mood is consequently relaxed and the outlook reflective: the urgency and curiosity of the *Journalmappe* narrator have disappeared. Unlike the latter, who plunders the Augustinus material for a good story, this narrator has been emotionally engaged in the material for the major part of his life. He is very aware of continuity — he likes the thought of his grandchildren following in his traces (S, 11) and sees the generations linked by 'der große goldene Strom der Liebe, der in den Jahrtausenden bis zu uns herab geronnen, durch die unzählbaren Mutterherzen, durch Bräute, Väter, Geschwister, Freunde' (S, 17). He too remembers being interested by Augustinus's belongings when he was a child, and recalls that the leather book, which his own father used to read, disappeared. But the book does not come to light again because he deliberately looks for it, it just turns up: 'Aber eines Tages, da eben ein grauer sanfter Landregen die Berge und Wälder verhing, verschaffte mir das Haus etwas, das ich nicht suchte, und das mich sehr freute, weil es mir gleichsam das ganze versunkene aufgehobene Märchen darin gab' (S, 22). But he asks himself later if it is merely chance that he finds it: 'Aber fast sollte man glauben, daß es keinen Zufall gäbe'. He continues: 'daß das Bildniß hier stand, daß es heute regnete, daß ich herauf stieg und es wegnahm — das sind lauter Glieder derselben Kette, damit das werde, was da ward' (S, 23). This shows a radically different emphasis from that in the *Journalmappe*. Here the narrator himself and not only Augustinus is the focus of our interest. Both are part of a larger continuum of being which makes them both equally important.

In the *Studienmappe* then, the narrator is both narrator and a character in his own right. The work is anchored more fully in him than is the *Journalmappe* and he is the heir to Augustinus in more ways than one: not only is he descended from him, he also continues and maintains the tradition and lifestyle started by Augustinus. Yet he is also still the manipulating narrator moulding his story. And it is interesting to note that although this time he tells his family that he has found the manuscripts, he does not share the contents with them but only with the reader.

5.2.1.3 *The 'Romanmappe'*

In the *Romanmappe* the narrator appears only once: at the beginning of the story. Thereafter he leaves Augustinus's story to make its own impact on the reader, his task being effectively finished, although we cannot say with any degree of certainty whether he would have reappeared at the end of the novel. He is not depicted as an old man and consequently the sadness and awareness of change and decay which are characteristic of the *Studienmappe* narrator are absent. This can be seen in particular by comparing the endings of the two

introductory chapters. The *Studienmappe* chapter ends on a note of melancholy, as the narrator and his new wife leave the family home to start their new life:

> Die Gattin redete nichts, ich aber dachte im Herzen: jetzt wird jeder, der da kömmt, an dem Hause ändern und bauen, und wenn ich einmal in meinem Alter wieder komme, wird vielleicht ein neues prunkendes Ding da sein; ich werde als zitternder Greis davor stehen, und die erblödenden Augen anstrengen, um alles zu begreifen. (S, 31)

The ending of the first chapter in the *Romanmappe* is much more positive, the emphasis being on continuity and permanence, while still allowing for change:

> Ich nahm mir vor, mit meinen Brüdern zu sprechen, daß wenn einmal einer das väterliche Haus übernehmen sollte, er an demselben nicht so viel ändern möge, daß es aufhöre, unser Vaterhaus das Haus unserer Erinnerungen zu sein. (R, 28)

This difference of emphasis is crucial in showing how much more relevant to the themes of the novel the frame section of the *Romanmappe* is. The *Studienmappe* narrator is aware of continuity, but in a negative sense, comparing the present where 'jetzt alles so gewöhnlich und entblößt ist' (S, 19) unfavourably with the past. In the *Romanmappe* on the other hand, the narrative present is shown to be centred and as weighty as the time of the diary inserts. The narrator's grandmother is still allowed to inject a little sadness into the scene when she says: 'ich habe meinen Schwiegervater den Doctor selber sagen gehört: Alles nimmt auf der Welt ab, der Vogel in der Luft und der Fisch im Wasser'. She regrets the dullness of modern life: 'Und so nimmt auch das Seltsame im Leben ab' (R, 9). But this melancholy does not extend to the narrator himself. He is part of the continuum of family life (he and his wife leave their wedding clothes in the house, as did Augustinus, his great-grandfather, years ago), yet that family life is shown to be fulfilling and centred firmly in the present.

The narrator's relationship with his material has undergone a considerable change since the *Journalmappe*. There he conveyed Augustinus's story to the reader because he thought the reader would find it interesting. Here he derives considerable benefit from it himself, as do his family, for he does not keep the notebooks for his private reading but shares them with his family once he has deciphered them. Thus they all benefit from the wisdom in them. The reader is merely the last in a chain of recipients extending from Augustinus himself, via the narrator's father to the narrator and his family.

5.2.2 THE *OBRIST*'S STORY

The *Obrist*'s tale is central to the thematic heart of the story for reasons which will be elaborated, and it is significant that in all three versions it takes the form of a story told to a hearer and recorded for the reader. Its supreme effectiveness in the final version comes from Stifter's exploitation of the tensions inherent in the speech situation.

The *Obrist*'s story serves as a positive example to Augustinus of how to come to terms with pain and shape one's life. His story is gripping in the extreme because he shows at one and the same time that the pain he has suffered is undiminished, yet that he has mastered that pain. His telling of the tale perfectly encapsulates the central problem of the novel, namely 'wie sich vom menschlichen Leben noch erzählen läßt, wenn die subjektive Gefühlsäußerung nicht zureicht und das Schicksal in seiner Fremdheit den Menschen seines Eigenwertes beraubt' (Böckmann, p. 405). Stifter himself placed great emphasis on getting the form of this section just right. He wrote the following to his publisher Gustav Heckenast about it:

> denn die Erzählung des Obrists muß *graniten* sein, ich glaube, daß diese Episode das erste von mir ist, was man etwa *klassich* nennen könnte. In anspruchloser Einfachheit und in massenhaft gedrängtem Erzählen, muß ein ganzes Leben, und einer der tiefsten Karaktere liegen. Lesen Sie recht bald das Ding, und sagen Sie mir Ihren Eindruk. Ich habe aber gerade an der Erzählung des Obrists gefeilt, wie sonst gar nie, und aus einem Bogen Material ist ein Blatt Text geworden, damit mir die Figur so eisenfest bleibe, wie ich ihre Form beabsichtigte.[14]

In terms of experience and maturity the *Obrist* is ahead of Augustinus, he represents the goal which Augustinus is to achieve, and he is the adviser who will help Augustinus in this aim. But the mentor/pupil relationship is not the only link between them. The two men are also bound together by their relationship with a third party, Margarita. This is the cause of tension between them, for the quarrel between Augustinus and Margarita which has just occurred has not yet been discussed by them. This scene moves the action forward in that it makes possible the establishment of their new relationship after the quarrel. And the vital factor in all this, which Augustinus only realizes towards the end of the scene, is that the *Obrist*'s story is not yet finished but is dependent for its final outcome on Augustinus. For as a result of the quarrel between the lovers the *Obrist* is once again exposed to the threat of almost unbearable pain, the pain of seeing his daughter, the embodiment of his dead wife, suffer. Augustinus is not an altruistic, detached observer when he hears the *Obrist*'s story, for he himself holds the *Obrist*'s future happiness in his hands.

The story and the telling of it are thus based on a delicate network of emotional interconnections which are handled, in the *Romanmappe*, with such skill, that they achieve a knife-edge quality. An analysis of the *Obrist*'s narrative act, focusing in particular on the pauses and on the comments made directly to his hearer, Augustinus, will reveal how this is achieved. But first the same passage in the two earlier versions will be looked at quickly.

5.2.2.1 *The 'Journal-' and the 'Studienmappe'*

The main ways in which the first two versions differ from the *Romanmappe* in this scene is that they are more explicit about motivation and meanings, and

they show the *Obrist* as lacking in self-assurance. In the *Journalmappe* the *Obrist* makes many references to Augustinus throughout the speech: 'Seht, Doctor, . . .', 'Junger Mann . . .' (J, 24), 'Lieber Freund, . . .' (J, 25) and so on. He says he is going to relate the most important event in his life which he has never told anyone about. Putting it into words is going to be supremely difficult and represents a new stage in his coming to terms with it: 'Ich komme nun eigentlich zu dem wichtigsten Vorgange meines Lebens, . . . den ich, als er geschah, bloß mit Gefühlen sah, ihn mir unzählige Male mit Gefühlen erzählte, aber vor keines Menschen Ohr im Worte faßte; ich will nun versuchen, ob man das kann' (J, 26). He is explicit about the parallels between his life and Augustinus's ('Gerade wie Ihr, Doctor, . . . verliebte ich mich'; J, 24–25) and about his reasons for telling Augustinus his story:

> Und nun, lieber, junger Freund, werdet Ihr wissen wollen, wozu ich Euch das Alles erzählte, und dieses Wasser in Eure Augen lockte, wofür ich Euch herzlich danke.
>
> Seht, der Schmerz ist ein Kleinod, ein weiser Engel ist er, an dem unsere Seele reifen kann und soll - an dem meinen solltet Ihr den Euren messen und ertragen lernen. (J, 37)

Augustinus visibly learns from the story. Although at first ignorant of the *Obrist*'s intentions ('Ich, der ich eigentlich den ganzen Hergang des heutigen Tages nicht begriff, schwieg ebenfalls'; J, 26), he is shown in the process of measuring his own experience against his mentor's and thus of relativizing his own pain. The passage in which this occurs is worth quoting verbatim for it also shows the struggle in the *Obrist* to overcome his grief:

> Der Obrist hielt hier inne, unter dem weißen greisen Barte der Oberlippe fing wieder jenes seltsame Zucken des Mundes an, wie ich es schon einmal bemerkte, aber heftiger und fast krankhaft, bis er endlich beyde Hände, die alten runzelvollen Hände, vor das Gesicht schlug, und ein heftiges Schluchzen ausbrach, so heftig, daß fast seine Gestalt darunter erzitterte. Einen Mann sah ich vor mir, der schon an der Grenze des menschlichen Alters stand, einen sonst so heitern Mann, nun aber von Rückerinnerung bewältigt, um das Weib seiner Mannesjahre weinend, wie kaum ein Jüngling um seine Braut - es war mir so rührend und erschütternd, daß mir mein eigen Gefühl, das ich vorgestern nicht überleben zu können meinte, fast schal und kindisch dagegen vorkam. Mit übernatürlicher Kraft that er sich Gewalt an, um des plötzlichen Überfalls seines Herzens Meister zu werden, und nach einigen Secunden gelang es ihm auch; - sich aufrichtend drückte er ein Tuch gegen die Augen und sagte dann gefaßter: 'Sie lag unten zerschmettert . . .' (J, 32)

(The *Obrist* later (J, 35–36) goes into considerable detail about his grief, his unwillingness to leave his wife's body and so on.) At the end of the story Augustinus is stunned: 'Ich sah ihn an, und reichte ihm erschüttert die Hand' (J, 38).

Although much of what has just been mentioned does find its way, albeit in a much less direct form, into the *Romanmappe*, the end of the passage does not, for it is much less sure of itself. The *Obrist* is embarrassed to turn the conversation

around to Augustinus: 'Er war sichtlich um die Fortführung des Gespräches verlegen' (J, 38). He seems to regard telling Augustinus his life story and reprimanding him about his treatment of Margarita as two completely separate things: 'und da ich Euch nun meine Lebensgeschichte erzählte, - darf ich noch auch ein anderes Wort reden?' (J, 38–39). The only hint of a link between the two comes in an appeal buried in a longer speech: 'habt Ihr das Herz - nun so verwundet mich, - - ich werde Euch Margarita senden' (J, 39).

The *Studienmappe* is also more explicit about motivation than the *Romanmappe* and is remarkable too for the different picture it presents of the *Obrist*, who now seems shallower and more muddled in his thinking. He begins by talking inconsequentially about Augustinus's patients and about the harvest before bringing the subject round to the previous day when he saved Augustinus from suicide. He then again talks about local people before finally admitting that he has something to tell Augustinus. He wants to tell Augustinus his story so that he knows the truth about him, for he feels his admiration has been too strong in the past (an inappropriate, throwaway remark which is omitted in the final version), 'da denke ich, ist es billig, daß ihr auch meine Fehler wisset, denn ihr habt mich bisher zu viel geachtet - auch könnte euch die Sache vielleicht nützlich sein . . .' (S, 43). He then makes an extraordinary statement to the effect that when he had addressed Augustinus the day before yesterday it was not with any aim in mind other than just to talk, but since then he has decided that he does, after all, have something to tell him. He excuses the longwindedness of his narration in advance: 'Nehmet es nur nicht übel, daß ich alt bin, und etwa weitschweifig in meinen Worten' (S, 43). Near the end of the story he again admits that his narrative is faulty: 'Ich habe vergessen, euch zu sagen, daß mir mein Bruder schon früher geschrieben hatte . . .' (S, 63).

At the end of the story, however, he does make the vital link between his story and his new vulnerability through the agency of Margarita: 'Ich habe nichts, als Margarita, sie gleicht ihrer verstorbenen Mutter im Angesichte und in der ganzen Art so sehr, wie man es kaum glauben sollte, - - Doktor, thut mir nicht weh im meinem Kinde' (ibid.).

So in the first two versions there is a degree of realism in the psychology behind the telling of the story. There are frequent reminders of the context — the *Obrist* addresses Augustinus, tells him why he is relating his story and breaks down occasionally during the telling of it, indicating how painful it is for him to reopen the wounds of his past life. Augustinus, at first innocent, slowly realizes the significance of what he is hearing for his own case. The *Studienmappe* in addition contains passages of sentimentality and is uncertain in its handling of the *Obrist* so that, although it finishes on a similar point to the *Romanmappe* (the appeal 'tut mir nicht weh in meinem Kinde'), some degree of sympathy for the *Obrist* has been lost, which lessens the effect.[15]

5.2.2.2 *The 'Romanmappe'*

The *Romanmappe* passage on the other hand is much less obviously realistic and is more refined and stylized, although all the basic elements are still there. The effect of this tautness and economy is to make it more powerful rather than less, while the power is implicit rather than explicit. The telling of the tale is effective on two levels. It is firstly rooted in the psychology of the teller. The *Obrist* is still shown as being deeply pained by his story but determined to tell it. The tears of the earlier version are replaced by pregnant pauses while he summons up the courage to continue.[16] His absolute certainty of the need to tell his story is the driving force behind it. It is necessary both for him to tell it and for Augustinus to hear it, thus the forward impetus is towards that final 'thut mir nicht weh im meinem Kinde' (R, 222) which unites the two strands.

But the story is also powerful in its impact on the recipients: for Augustinus and for the reader a structure can be perceived which maximizes the dramatic potential of the story. It is carefully constructed to attract and retain the interest of the reader, so that by the time of the climax and dénouement he or she is totally absorbed. The context is referred to less and less until the end where the reader is forcibly reminded of the link between story and context: the story is not just a narrative, it is a directed appeal, it has not only illocutionary but also perlocutionary force.

After an introductory appeal for attention ('Höret mich an, mein Freund'; (R, 200) the *Obrist* does not address Augustinus directly very often, and when he does it is to specific effect. The first pause in his narrative is to show Augustinus the 'Waisenschein'. This is expository evidence of his new desire to do good, a change which occurred in him as a result of his gratitude that a man he had wounded in a duel did not die. To mark this he gave money to an orphanage. This signals the turning point in his career, the point where he leaves behind his reputation as 'Spieler, Raufer, Verschwender' (ibid.) and starts on the slow process of self-improvement which leads to his becoming 'der sanftmüthige Obrist'. The interruption is narrated calmly and without comment: 'Nach diesen Worten ging der Obrist zu einem Schreine, nahm ein Papier heraus, und legte es mir vor. Es war der Waisenchein. Da ich ihn gelesen hatte, schob er ihn auf dem Tische von sich, und fuhr fort . . .' (R, 204).

The next break in the narrative is for a similar cause and is also conveyed to us laconically. The *Obrist* has been describing his habit of writing a diary of important events in his life and describes how this custom has made him a better man. Augustinus tells us:

> Nach diesen Worten hielt der Obrist inne, stand auf, ging zu einem Schreine, öffnete seine beiden Flügel, und sagte: 'Seht, Doktor, hier sind die Päke meiner Schriften, ihr dürft, wenn es euch gefällig ist, lesen, was ihr auswählt, oder, wenn es euch nicht zu gering ist, Alles.'

Der Schrein hatte unzählige Fächer, und sie waren von unten bis oben mit Papieren gefüllt.

Der Obrist schloß die Flügel nicht mehr, sondern ließ sie offen stehen, sezte sich wieder zu mir, und fuhr fort . . . (R, 208)

Thus having anchored his story by showing Augustinus evidence, the *Obrist* moves on to the heart of what he has to say. The next three interruptions are well motivated psychologically and also contribute to the dramatic structure of the tale in that they add to the feeling of mounting tension. The first comes when the *Obrist* is about to mention his wife for the first time. He says that he wished to marry but did not feel that there was a suitable girl among the girls he was meeting:

Nach diesen Worten schwieg der Obrist ein Weilchen. Dann stand er auf, und zog die seidenen Vorhänge seiner Fenster zu. Hierauf setzte er sich wieder zu mir, und fuhr fort: 'Ich habe früher gesagt, mein Freund, daß einmal ein Mensch der erste gewesen ist, der zu mir gesprochen hat, daß ich gut sei, wie ihr heute der zweite. Von diesem Menschen werde ich euch erzählen . . .' (R, 209–10)

The next example is similar. The *Obrist* is setting the scene for his wife's fatal accident, saying that after their child had grown a little, she resumed her habit of going for long walks with him: 'Hier brach der Obrist eine Weile ab, ich wußte nicht, warum. Dann fuhr er wieder fort: "Kennt ihr das, was man in hohen Bergen eine Holzriese nennt? Ihr werdet es kaum kennen, da man sie hier nicht braucht, weil nur breite sanfte Waldbiegungen sind"' (R, 212). This contains the first direct mention of his listener since he began his narration. But the effect is not disruptive, it is rather to involve Augustinus and the reader further. Having to explain to Augustinus the strangeness of the bridge-like contraption, which is a phenomenon outside his everyday experience, serves to increase the tension and the feeling of impending disaster.

The next pause also serves the dual purpose of both emphasizing the difficulty the *Obrist* has in telling the story and increasing the dramatic effect. Describing the dreadful moment when he collapsed after looking round while crossing the bridge and seeing that his wife was not there, he pauses: 'Hier hielt der Obrist eine geraume Weile inne. Dann fuhr er mit gedämpfterer Stimme fort: "Sie lag unten zerschmettert"' (R, 214).[17]

From this point the *Obrist* addresses Augustinus more frequently. The next occasion is when he relates that his wife had managed to save the dog she was holding by shielding it from the impact of the fall. The wonder felt in the *Journalmappe* ('und wunderbar, auf den Kleidern, lebend und fast unversehrt - das Hündchen'; J, 34) is translated in the *Romanmappe* into an appeal to the doctor's sense of wonder: 'aber denkt nur, Doctor, auf den Kleidern saß das Hündchen, und lebte' (R, 215). A few lines further on he addresses Augustinus again, this time on the subject of his grief: 'O Herr, das könnt ihr nicht ermessen, nein, ihr wisset es jetzt noch nicht, wie es ist, wenn das Weib eures Herzens noch

die Kleider an hat, die ihr am Morgen selber darreichen halfet, und jezt todt ist, und nichts mehr kann, als in Unschuld bitten, daß ihr sie begrabet'. This is followed by a pause: 'Jezt hörte der Obrist wieder eine Zeit zu reden auf, dann sagte er: "Und so ist es auch geschehen . . ."' (R, 216). The extraordinary effect of this last appeal is that it expresses his desire for and simultaneous rejection of the possibility of solidarity in pain. He wants Augustinus to understand what it was, and is like to experience bereavement, and so talks to him directly. Yet he knows that the pain cannot be shared, that Augustinus cannot understand. The speech is both a reaching out and a turning inward and thus conveys to Augustinus and to the reader the precarious balance between integration and solitude which is central to the *Obrist*'s way of life.

The next pause emphasizes how the *Obrist* came to terms with bereavement by an effort of will:

'Und der Tag verging, und der nächste verging, und immer mehrere vergingen, und die Sonne stand am Himmel, die Getreide wuchsen, die Bäche rauschten, nur daß sie dahin war, und daß es war wie der Verlust einer goldenen Müke. Und wie ich in jener Zeit fast mit Gott haderte, hatte ich nichts, gar nichts, als daß ich mir fest dachte, ich wolle so gut werden wie sie, und wolle thun, wie sie thäte, wenn sie noch lebte. Seht, Doctor, ich habe mir damals eingebildet, Gott brauche einen Engel im Himmel und einen guten Menschen auf Erden, deßhalb mußte sie sterben.'

Der Obrist hielt nach diesen Worten wieder inne, er hielt länger inne, als er es früher gethan hatte.

Endlich nahm er seine Rede weider auf, und sagte: 'Ich habe mich bis heute bemüht, mein Gelübde zu halten, so weit mir Gott die Kräfte dazu gegeben hatte, und seine Gnade mich unterstüzte.' (R, 219)

The stress on the difficulty of living by this precept is new to this version. In the *Journalmappe* the passage reads as follows:

damals schwor ich es mir zu als ein Vermächtniß der Verstorbenen, so lange ich noch zu leben habe, so sanft, so gut zu seyn, wie sie es war - und Gott half mir es halten bis heute, wenn auch Menschen undankbar sind, und er wird es mir halten helfen bis zu Ende meines Lebens. Seht, Gott brauchte einen Engel im Himmel, und einen guten Menschen auf Erden, deßhalb mußte sie sterben.

Ich wurde wieder heiter und glücklich . . . (J, 38)

There is no mention here of any difficulty which might have been encountered in living up to his oath, the idea of God needing an angel is mentioned as a self-evident truth. The *Studienmappe* introduces the concept of his having to persuade himself of this, and shows that the healing process was slow to begin:

Und wie ich in jener Zeit mit Gott haderte, hatte ich gar nichts, als daß ich mir fest dachte, ich wolle so gut werden, wie sie, und wolle thun, wie sie thäte, wenn sie noch lebte. Seht, Doctor, ich habe mir damals eingebildet, Gott brauche einen Engel im Himmel und einen guten Menschen auf Erden: deßhalb mußte sie sterben. - Ich ließ einen weißen Marmorstein auf ihr Grab setzen, auf dem ihr Name, der Tag ihrer Geburt und ihr Alter stand. Dann blieb ich noch eine lange Zeit in der Gegend: aber als die Berge nicht zu mir reden wollten, und die Pfade um die Wiesenanhöhen so leer waren, so nahm ich mein Kind, und ging mit ihm fort in die Welt. (S, 62)

But it is only in the final version that the enormity of the leap from pain to faith is felt. His pause is even longer than any previous pause, the tension even greater. The task he set himself all those years ago required an effort of will so great that he is even now carrying it out. There is no sense of having arrived, merely a realization of the continued tenacity necessary to keep one's head above water. The task extends to the present moment, 'bis heute', the struggle can never be conclusively won, the best that can be achieved is to keep despair at bay.

At the end of the story the *Obrist* mentions Rudolph, his nephew, whose walking in the woods with Margarita was the trigger to the quarrel between the lovers. He and Margarita are fond of him:

'Im Lidenholze hat er Margarita gebeten, daß sie ihm als Zeichen, sie wolle seine liebe Base sein, einen Kuß gebe. Sie that es. Euch, Herr Doctor, achtet er sehr hoch. Er wollte euch, bevor er fort reiste, noch besuchen; wagte es aber dann nicht. Und so, mein lieber Freund, bin ich an der Stelle meines Lebens angelangt, in der wir jezt sind. In diesem Hause in dem ernsten schönen Walde gedenke ich, den Rest meines Lebens zu vollbringen, nur daß ich zuweilen Prag oder eine andere große Stadt oder mein Haüschen besuche, das jezt in Pacht ist. Und an euch, mein sehr lieber Freund, stelle ich die Bitte: thut mir nicht weh in meinem Kinde.'

'Nein, nein, nein, Obrist,' rief ich, 'es soll Alles sein, wie es sein muß.'

'Ich habe das gewußt,' sagte er. (R, 222)

The two strands, the *Obrist*'s story and Augustinus's learning from it, have now conclusively been brought together with this final appeal to Augustinus. The trigger to his outburst of jealousy is revealed for what it was — an innocent kiss — and his behaviour is made to appear petty. He also realizes that he has been the instrument whereby the *Obrist* has once again been exposed to pain.

The *Obrist*'s story in the *Romanmappe* is thus interesting for the way it is organized and for the way in which it advances the respective relationships between teller (the *Obrist*), listener (Augustinus), mediator (Augustinus again), and reader. The author, as elsewhere in this novel, remains camouflaged and his purpose can only be guessed at by studying the design of the whole, the relationship between the parts. As with all the *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters* material, it is useful that we have the earlier versions so that we know the original conception of the passage. Thus although in the *Romanmappe* there are no explicit references to parallels between the *Obrist*'s and Augustinus's stories as there are in the other versions, we know that we are not wrong in assuming that this was intended. As in much of Stifter's late prose the reader is also required to work harder than before because the narrator is so reticent. Augustinus's narration is laconic in the extreme. Nowhere does he tell the reader his thoughts or feelings or guess at the *Obrist*'s. The nearest he gets are comments such as 'Hier brach der Obrist eine Weile ab, ich wußte nicht, warum' (R, 212), 'Dann fuhr er mit gedämpfterer Stimme fort . . .' (R, 214), 'Der Obrist hielt nach diesen Worten wieder inne, er hielt länger inne, als er es früher gethan hatte' (R, 219). Of course it can be argued that these bald

statements are dramatic in their own way. But the fact remains that much more is now left to the reader's imagination, for he or she receives little help from either Augustinus or the *Obrist* in the way of direct explanation.

Yet as I have shown, this lack of comment is more than compensated for by a corresponding increase in tautness and economy in Stifter's rewriting of the *Obrist*'s speech. The breaks in the passage are carefully chosen to reflect tension between the two opposing impulses in the *Obrist*: the certainty that it is right, indeed necessary, to tell his story, and the difficulty the act of telling it entails. We do not need to be told explicitly (as we are in the *Journalmappe*) that he is talking of the most important event of his life, 'den ich, als er geschah, bloß mit Gefühlen sah, ihn mir unzählige Male mit Gefühlen erzählte, aber vor keines Menschen Ohr im Worte faßte; ich will nun versuchen, ob man das kann' (J, 26). The meaning of the passage is the same, but this time we see his difficulties more clearly as they are acted out in his speech. In particular the pauses towards the climax of his story indicate precisely this difficulty of putting into words what has previously only been experienced. He is able, with a tremendous effort of will, to tell and give structure to his story, yet the pauses reveal the pain that the narrative act brings to the surface. There is no need now for tears on his part, or for long descriptions of his grief: the emotion is encapsulated in the telling of the tale.

The passage can also be seen to be carefully composed when studied with the figure of Augustinus in mind. In contrast to the two previous versions, here Augustinus says nothing about his own feelings during the passage, does not conjecture as to the *Obrist*'s feelings and is only addressed directly by the speaker at a few key points near the end. The effect of this on the reader has already been pointed out: the reader bypasses Augustinus in interpreting the story, guidance as to how to interpret comes from the form of the story rather than from any explicit statements from Augustinus or the *Obrist*. But of course Augustinus is not only the narrator, he is also, however unfocused he may be, a protagonist in the scene, a node on the graph of human relationships depicted and the primary recipient of the tale narrated. It is thus fitting that the final burden of responsibility for the future should rest with him: the phrase 'thut mir nicht weh in meinem Kinde' is not, by the end, an appeal for altruistic sympathy, rather it strikes at the heart of Augustinus's weakness and guilt. Augustinus is inextricably bound up in the story he is hearing and by the time he realizes it, he is as vulnerable as the *Obrist*. His shame is exposed.

5.3 DIALOGUE

5.3.1 AUGUSTINUS

Section 1 has demonstrated how integrated a text the *Romanmappe* is. This strength means that dialogues based on the conflicting views of the participants

can be included without weakening the whole. In some cases these dialogues strengthen the edifice of the whole work because they act out and resolve conflicting elements in the story, allowing difficulties to be faced head on and dealt with.

There are three important places where dialogue of this kind occurs, and it is significant that they are all new to the last version of the story. All concern Augustinus's problems of identity which are dealt with more directly than they had been previously.

The first comes soon after Augustinus has returned home from university to set up as a doctor. He has to overcome opposition because the local people are simply not accustomed to seeking a doctor's advice when they are ill. This conflict is graphically depicted when Augustinus meets a countryman who complains of having had bad luck for that year, for, among other things, his brother is ill:

'So fragt den neuen Doctor, welcher in der Gegend ist,' sagte ich.
'Ach der Doctor,' antwortete er, 'wer wird denn zu dem Doctor gehen?'
'Warum denn nicht?' fragte ich.
'Ach nein,' sagte er, und schüttelte den Kopf.
'Aber einen Grund müßt ihr doch haben,' sagte ich.
'Der Grund ist, daß wir nicht zu dem Doctor gehen,' sagte er.
'Nun, so geht nicht zu dem Doctor,' sprach ich.
'Ja, ja, da habt ihr recht,' antwortete er, 'wir gehen nicht zum Doctor.'
'Vielleicht wird er auch ohnedem gesund,' sagte ich.
'Freilich,' antwortete er; 'denn er nimmt ja immer heilsame Sachen'. (R, 77)

The man's opposition is so absolute, so much an expression of his very existence (note the ontological weight of his utterance 'Der Grund ist, daß wir nicht zu dem Doctor gehen') that Augustinus has to accept it for what it is: the antithesis of everything he stands for as a doctor. His words simply bounce off the impenetrable skin of the countryman. After questioning him Augustinus backtracks and confirms that the position the man holds is the only possible one for him: 'Nun, so geht nicht zu dem Doctor'. Augustinus thus applauds his integrity, his rightness. But in his next speech ('Vielleicht wird er auch ohnedem gesund') he goes even further and confirms that the man may be not only subjectively but also objectively correct. The man's behaviour may prove to be right not just because it is in accordance with his own nature but because the old man is as much a part of existence as Augustinus is. Not only is he entitled to think as he pleases, his way of thinking may contain as much truth as Augustinus's, even allowing for the fact that Augustinus is a trained doctor. This short dialogue shows Augustinus the nature of what he is up against: he must learn the humbling fact that his plans for other people, though well intentioned, will sometimes, quite legitimately, be overthrown by their own plans for themselves. In this case the outcome is a happy one: Augustinus slowly and painstakingly wears down the resistance of the country people until they come

to accept him, but in the short term the effect of this conversation is a firm rebuff.

A similar opposition is felt in some of Augustinus's dialogues with Christine and Cäcilia. Both care deeply about Eustachius but their different circumstances cause them to take opposing views of Augustinus's duty as friend. Cäcilia feels that Augustinus's commitment to finding Eustachius should be absolute and unqualified, Christine on the other hand feels that Eustachius himself knows best and that to search for him is to doubt his integrity. Augustinus has to steer his way between these two contrasting positions but at the same time the voice of each of the two women seems to represent one of the contradictory voices in himself. The powerful effect of these dialogues comes from the fact that Augustinus is forced to justify his position and his actions against a person voicing his own doubts and worries. This *alter ego* effect aids him in strengthening the position he has instinctively adopted. The problem, as he sees it, is that his strong friendship with Eustachius should inspire an absolute commitment to finding Eustachius, who is under a misapprehension about the loan that he made. This is Cäcilia's standpoint. But if he does this, it will mean neglecting his work and his own future, for becoming a doctor is more than just a job to him. It is both a vocation and a mission: it is in his role as a doctor that he will find both himself and the correct relationship with the outside world. So in order to be true to himself he must set a limit upon the amount of time and energy he devotes to searching for Eustachius. But the problem lies in knowing where to set that limit, and it is a problem nobody else can solve for him.

This is a passage from his dialogue with Cäcilia:

'Ja hast du irgend ein Papier, den kleinsten Abriß eines Zettels, ein Streifchen, ein Faserchen gefunden, darauf ein Wort steht, wo er ist?' fragte ich.

'Ja habt ihr ihn denn nicht gebracht?' fragte sie entgegen.

'Gebracht? wenn ich ihn nicht weiß,' antwortete ich.

'Habt ihr ihn denn nicht gesucht?' fragte sie.

'Heißt das nicht suchen,' entgegnete ich, 'wenn ich meine Kranken verlasse, und den weiten Weg nach Prag mache?'

'Habt ihr ihn die ganzen langen anderthalb Jahre, die ihr fort seid, in Einem fort gesucht?' fragte sie.

'Nein, ich sage dir ja, daß ich Arzt in meiner Heimath bin,' antwortete ich.

'Er hat euch Alles geglaubt, und vertraut. Ihr hättet ihn suchen sollen und dann Arzt werden,' sagte sie.

'Du hast am Ende recht,' antwortete ich. 'Wie wir doch nach dem Herkommen verfahren und nicht nach dem Rechtthun. Aber ich hatte kein Geld.'

'So hättet ihr gebettelt,' sagte sie.

'Du hast wieder recht,' entgegnete ich. 'Du hast höhere Gedanken von der Freundschaft als andere. Weib, ich achte dich völlig. Aber er will gar nicht gefunden werden.'

'Weil er die Sache nicht versteht,' antwortete sie,' und welche die Sachen nicht verstehen, für die müssen solche sorgen, die sie verstehen.'

'Höre auf, du hast in Einem fort recht,' sagte ich. 'Aber jezt ist es, wie es ist, Pflicht gegen Pflicht, ich bin ein Arzt, und habe das Vertrauen aller, die um mich in dem Walde

wohnen, heraus gefordert. Aber nun merke auf meine Worte. Das Suchen ist verschieden . . .' (R, 91–92)

The opposition here comes from the woman who represents an absolute and therefore supremely simple position, because she has only one object in mind. Augustinus, on the other hand, is in a dilemma, for he has to consider not only his loyalty to Eustachius but also his duty towards himself. As he himself puts it, it is a question of 'Pflicht gegen Pflicht', and whichever course of action he follows will entail neglecting what would otherwise be a clear duty. But it is the process of talking to Cäcilia which brings about this understanding in Augustinus, for at the beginning there is no clarity of thought in him but on the contrary a marked lack of confidence. Following the course of his replies to her we see that his stance changes several times. At first he is merely defensive ('Gebracht? wenn ich ihn nicht weiß', 'Heißt das nicht suchen . . .', 'Nein, ich sage dir ja, daß ich Arzt in meiner Heimath bin'). But faced with Cäcilia's persistence he suddenly backs down completely and admits that she is right and he is wrong: 'Du hast am Ende recht . . . Wie wir doch nach dem Herkommen verfahren und nicht nach dem Rechtthun'. With this statement he supports Cäcilia's claim for the existence of an unconditional rightness of conduct and dismisses the claims of reality. He then gives a feeble, inaccurate (he could have sold Eustachius's writings as instructed) excuse: 'Aber ich hatte kein Geld'. Cäcilia rightly dismisses this and thereby raises herself in his estimation. She forces a statement from him which reveals Augustinus's worries about the nature and demands of friendship: 'Du hast höhere Gedanken von der Freundschaft als andere'. But then he again gives a throwaway excuse which he does not mean: 'Aber er will gar nicht gefunden werden'. (This is the line Christine takes, but there is no evidence that Augustinus thinks in this way at this stage.) But Cäcilia's persistence does bear fruit: Augustinus stops evading her and introducing red herrings, and gives her, after her next speech, a full reply, a reply which realizes the limitedness of her position and the complexity of his own: 'Höre auf, du hast in Einem fort recht . . . Aber jezt ist es, wie es ist, Pflicht gegen Pflicht'. She is right, but only relatively so: she does not see the full position. As he utters these words, the ontological weight of the 'jezt ist es, wie es ist' is felt.

In this dialogue Augustinus is acting out and coming to terms with his doubts about his behaviour. Using the touchstone of Cäcilia's immovable position, he slowly gains confidence in his own judgement. Although he toys with the idea of declaring Cäcilia to be right, he is aggrieved at the suggestion that he has been idle with regard to Eustachius, for he knows that this is not true. Cäcilia wrings from him an analysis of why he is in such difficulties, and a justification of his position (he proceeds to explain in great detail the steps he has taken to track Eustachius down).

This dialogue is both revelatory and dynamic: it reveals Augustinus's malaise about precisely where his moral duty lies and the forward dynamic forces him to articulate for the first time why the problem does not appear to be soluble. Because, unlike Cäcilia, he has not one but two moral duties, and from his vantage point he is only beginning to see which is the more important.

The conversation with Christine is both more polite and formulaic yet also more disturbing. For while Cäcilia's critique of Augustinus's behaviour is partly unfounded (he has not been idle in his search for Eustachius), Christine is well aware of, yet finds fault with, everything that he has done from the moment of Eustachius's disappearance.

They start by establishing the situation and setting out the basis of their respective positions. Christine recites Augustinus's actions and the reason for his coming to see her (to discover if she has any information regarding the whereabouts of Eustachius). Augustinus agrees with and elaborates on each stage of her scene-setting. The dialogue is stately and highly organized. But Christine concludes this section, when Augustinus asks her if she knows anything about Eustachius's whereabouts, by putting him down with an unexpectedly blunt answer: 'Er hat mir nichts entdekt . . . ich habe nicht im Geringsten geforscht, und wenn sich was immer für eine Spur gebothen hätte, von ihm Kenntniß zu erhalten, so hätte ich sie nicht verfolgt' (R, 108).

Augustinus ignores this first signal of opposition and takes the lead in the conversation, telling her about Eustachius's papers including Christine's own letters, which he has read. Christine remains perfectly composed and again interjects a statement of her position:

> Ich habe mich mit Eustach auf ewig verbunden. Er ist von Prag weg gegangen, ohne mir oder jemanden, mit dem ich in Verbindung bin, zu sagen, wohin er gehe. Daher geziemt es mir, ohne sein Thun zu beirren, auszuharren, bis er Nachricht gibt, oder kömmt. (R, 109)

This time Augustinus takes her up on this and starts to question her:

> 'Und wenn er nun immer nicht kömmt?' fragte ich.
>
> 'So werde ich immer harren,' antwortete sie.
>
> 'Und wenn er den Bund mit Ihnen als zerstört betrachtet, weil er sich für beschimpft hält,' fragte ich.
>
> 'Dann wird er mir es wissen lassen. Bis dahin besteht der Bund,' antwortete sie.
>
> 'Und wenn er aus Zagheit die Ankündigung der Auflösung unterließe?' sagte ich.
>
> 'Das darf ich von ihm nicht voraussezen,' entgegnete sie.
>
> 'Und wenn ihn der Tod hinraft, ehe er irgend eine Nachricht senden kann?' sagte ich.
>
> 'So wird er sterbend jemanden mit der Botschaft betrauen,' antwortete sie.
>
> 'Der Tod könnte ihn unvermuthet überfallen, ehe er Nachricht zu geben vermag,' sagte ich.
>
> 'Ich werde das erst glauben, wenn ich sehr alt geworden bin, und mir stets keine Nachricht von ihm gekommen ist,' antwortete sie. (R, 109–10)

Despite the barrage of questions, Christine's position remains fixed, so convinced is she that she is right. In a final bid to win her over, Augustinus shows her Eustachius's last letter, but just as they judge Eustachius's disappearance differently, so too do they take a different view of the letter, for Christine says: 'Hochvererhrter Herr Doctor, in dem Briefe stehen die Worte: Ich werde kommen, wenn ich es mit der Ehre kann. An mich hat er bisher die Worte nicht gerichtet, weil er weiß, daß sie nicht nöthig sind' (R, 110). At this stage Augustinus is effectively silenced: 'Ich schwieg auf diese ihre Rede, und sah in das schöne Angesicht' (ibid.). Christine takes advantage of this silence to deliver in turn a barrage of reproach in which she shows up each of Augustinus's actions in an extremely negative light. In the fact that Eustachius has not replied to the advertisements she sees clear evidence of his desire to remain undiscovered: 'Er vermag jezt nicht, zu kommen, oder Nachricht zu senden, und an uns ist es, zu harren' (R, 111).

In the end the stark opposition which has been hiding under the veil of politeness comes into the open:

'Aber wenn er unzwekmäßig und unter falschen Voraussezungen handelt, so müssen wir ihm doch helfen,' sagte ich.

'Es ist besser, unzwekmäßig als gegen ein schönes Gefühl handeln,' entgegnete sie.

'Aber es hat ja Alles gut geendet,' antwortete ich.

'Es hat nicht gut geendet,' sagte sie, 'und er weiß es.' (R, 111)

Finally of course they agree to differ. Christine will continue to do nothing while Augustinus will continue to make discreet enquiries, and they will both inform each other of any new information that may come to light. But Christine's analysis of Augustinus's actions has added another dimension to the ethical problems facing Augustinus. And although her comments are so devastating, and although she is intellectually superior to Cäcilia, there is no evidence now that Augustinus is shaken into doubting that he has done the right thing (as he was shaken when talking to Cäcilia). His confidence is growing steadily stronger. He later explains to the *Obrist* that the conflict is unresolved: 'jezt stehen noch immer die zwei Ansichten einander starr gegenüber, meine und Christinens . . . Christine will, daß gar nicht nach Eustachius geforscht werde, und ich will, daß mit allen Kräften geforscht werde' (R, 310). The *Obrist* declares that they are both right, for what is true for one person is not necessarily true for another.

5.3.2 Augustinus and Margarita

The quarrel between Augustinus and Margarita is one of the basic strands of the story in all three versions. The loss of Margarita and the consequent anguish felt by Augustinus are the starting point from which he has to grow and develop as a person. Her return and their final reconciliation mark his attainment of

Stifter's vision of full humanity. The structure of all three versions thus depends on the circle of love, quarrel, loss, slow rehabilitation, and final reconciliation. But there are considerable differences between the treatment of the relationship in the three versions. The most obvious concerns the order in which the events are related: the *Journalmappe* and the *Studienmappe* start in the middle of the story where the quarrel has just taken place and Augustinus, in his fury, is considering hanging himself, while the *Romanmappe* depicts the course of the relationship chronologically. This is typical of the dramatic presentation of the *Journalmappe* and the more leisurely pace of the final version with its stress, not on events, but on the process of becoming. The second main difference concerns the characterization of the protagonists and the depiction of the quarrel. The common view, as expressed by Herman Kunisch and others, is that Margarita becomes more self-possessed and decisive and Augustinus's behaviour becomes 'beherrschter, gesammelter und reifer'.[18] Suicide, for example, is not mentioned in the *Romanmappe*, as Augustinus is not sufficiently unstable to consider it. The toning down of Augustinus's behaviour and the increased self-possession of Margarita are in tune with the generally smoother style of Stifter's later works which shun the excessive display of emotion and place a value on maturity and integrity.

However, as so often is the case in Stifter, the tempering of the style, plot and character means that moments of dialogue, allowing as they do the subjectivity of the characters to be exposed, can be extraordinarily disruptive, and this is the case with the dialogues between Augustinus and Margarita. Paradoxically, despite the general toning down, the tragic potential in the rift between the lovers is more abundantly acknowledged in the final version.

5.3.2.1 *The 'Journalmappe'*

The quarrel is not recorded in the *Journalmappe* but instead Augustinus's notebooks open with his contemplation of suicide immediately afterwards. He is interrupted by the *Obrist* who asks him to call, and without mentioning suicide, manages to deflect Augustinus from his intentions. Augustinus's moods are shown to be changeable as he is restored to good humour just by hearing the *Obrist*'s voice.

Three days later he goes to call and the *Obrist* tells him the story of his life. Afterwards the *Obrist* refers to the quarrel, placing the blame firmly on Augustinus's temper and showing Margarita to be pure but vulnerable. The cause of the quarrel was that Augustinus challenged a guest of the *Obrist*'s to a duel because he was jealous of Margarita's kindness to him, and then proposed to Margarita:

Ihr waret heftig, und da sie unschlüssig, zaghaft war, dränget Ihr, stürmet Ihr - und da sie immer tiefer und tiefer in sich zurückschreckte, da hießet Ihr sie untreu, drohtet in der Raserey trotziger Leidenschaft gar mit Selbstmord, -- damals wußtet Ihr wohl nicht, daß

Ihr wie ein zerstörender Geyer über den reinen Tauben ihrer Gefühle hinget - - zermalmen konntet ihr ein Herz, aber nicht wieder zurückgewinnen. (J, 39)

Having chastised him, the *Obrist* leaves. Augustinus understands that he has lost Margarita: 'Mir war alles, alles klar, - herrlicher als je stand ihr verlorenes Bild vor meiner Seele' (J, 39–40). Margarita enters and by the time he speaks, he is composed: '"Euer Vater," sagte ich ruhig, "wünscht, daß wir zusammen diese Papiere lesen"'. And when they have finished reading the *Obrist*'s diaries Augustinus shows that he has accepted that the woman against whom he raged three days previously[19] holds his fate in her hands and that he may lose her through his own fault:

Als ich geendet, saß sie schneebleich da mit starren Thränen - ich theilte das Edelweiß - dann stand ich auf - ein Gebirge lag auf meiner Brust. - Ich faßte ihre Hand, die sie mir gütig ließ. - -

'Margarita,' sagte ich, 'müssen wir scheiden?!' (J, 40)

When Margarita confirms that they must indeed part Augustinus leaves, fully resigned to his fate and what he has to do:

'Jetzt Doctor,' dacht' ich, 'werd' ein Mann, und ein tüchtiger Artzt, und wenn dich Widerstand und Unglück rasend machen wollen, so setze dich hin, und denke an den alten, sanftmüthigen Obrist und seine standhafte Tochter. Vor Gottes Augen macht es einen geringen Unterschied, ob du bist oder nicht - das merke dir, Augustinus, und sey ein Mann!' (J, 41)

Although the language is vigorous and the speed of narration dramatic, the treatment of the quarrel in the *Journalmappe* is supremely simple. Augustinus becomes jealous, loses his temper and contemplates suicide as a method of revenge. When brought back to his senses, he admits not only that he has acted wrongly, but also that no simple apology will suffice, for he has inflicted harm. And he resolves to reform.

Margarita does not really come into focus in this version for her interaction with Augustinus leading up to and during the quarrel is not recorded. Augustinus's voice predominates.

5.3.2.2 *The 'Studienmappe'*

Augustinus's story also begins in the *Studienmappe* at the point where the quarrel has occurred and he is interrupted in his contemplation of suicide by the *Obrist*. On the next occasion when they meet, when the *Obrist* has told his story, he asks Augustinus to go and see Margarita with a view to resolving their problems, saying: 'Ich habe gewußt, daß es so sein wird, wie es jetzt ist. Ihr habt beide gefehlt. Margarita that auch nicht recht, aber sie konnte nach ihrer Art nicht anders, so wie ihr nicht anders konntet' (S, 64). This puts a different emphasis on the quarrel from the *Journalmappe* where the fault was Augustinus's. Here it seems to be an inevitable result of their differing natures.

Before telling of their meeting Augustinus summarizes for the benefit of the reader his relationship with Margarita. One day, when he had not known her for long and they were out for a walk, he asked her if she loved him. This is conveyed in indirect speech: 'da fragte ich Margarita, ob sie mich recht liebe' (S, 167). Margarita indicates her embarrassment and the subject is dropped: 'Margarita, als sie meine Frage vernommen hatte, schlug die Augenlieder über die sehr schönen braunen Augen herab, sah in die Schäftchen nieder, wurde ganz glüh im Angesichte, und schüttelte leise das Haupt. - - Ich sagte kein Wort, und wir gingen auf dem Wege wieder dahin' (S, 168). Months later he asks her again and they are able to express their love for each other in quite uncomplicated terms:

'Margarita, habt ihr mich wohl lieb?'

'Ich liebe euch sehr,' antwortete sie, 'ich hab' euch über alles lieb. Nach meinem Vater seid ihr mir der liebste Mann auf der Welt.'

Sie hatte dieses Mal die Augen nicht nieder geschlagen, sondern sie sah mich an, aber auf die Wangen ging doch ein recht schönes sanftes Roth, als sie dieses sagte.

'Ich liebe euch auch recht innig,' antwortete ich, 'ich liebe euch mehr, als alle andern Menschen dieser Erde, und da mir alle Angehörigen gestorben sind, so seid ihr auf dieser Welt das Höchste, das ich liebe. Ich werde euch auch in alle Ewigkeit lieben, euch ganz allein, - hier auf dieser Welt, so lange ich lebe, und im Jenseits wieder.'

Sie reichte mir ihre Hand. Ich faßte sie, und wir drückten uns die Hände. - Wir ließen dann dieselben nicht los, sondern hielten uns an ihnen. (S, 171–72)

The problems only arise when Augustinus sees Margarita and her cousin Rudolph walking together and becomes jealous of their physical beauty and their obvious fondness for each other. When he confronts her they quarrel, he accusing her of not loving him and questioning whether she was telling the truth when she said that she loved him more than any other person apart from her father. After this she will not speak any more on the subject (S, 180–81). They meet again and Augustinus talks to her, trying to change her mind. It is after this that he runs out to the woods, swearing to take revenge upon the world (S, 184).

The last time they meet, it is merely to part. Augustinus by this time has regained his composure and accepts that they must part, resolving to devote himself completely to his job.

The quarrel here seems to be as simple as it is in the *Journalmappe*, although there are a few utterances which do not fit with the general picture and which indicate that Stifter was uncertain as to how to treat the incident. There is first of all the *Obrist*'s comment that both lovers were to blame, simply by being who they were. This contradicts the course of the quarrel as we see it, where the fault seems to lie simply in Augustinus's jealousy and quick temper. There is also Margarita's strange utterance when Augustinus asks for forgiveness: 'ich habe euch nichts zu verzeihen . . . ihr habt mir nichts gethan' (S, 185). It is difficult to know at what level this utterance is meant to be taken. As a statement of fact it is simply untrue. It is because Augustinus has wounded Margarita with his lack of

trust that they must part. It could be that she is showing her magnanimity, or merely being polite; but there is no way of knowing which effect was intended as this speech does not fit into an interpretative pattern.

5.3.2.3 *The 'Romanmappe'*

In the final version Augustinus does not contemplate suicide. This fact has often been seen as characteristic of Augustinus's more controlled behaviour generally in the final version. It is certainly true that he is not subject to the wild fluctuations in mood that characterize him in the earlier versions. But in a way this makes the break with Margarita, when it does come, even more radical, for the break results from Margarita's rejection of his whole being and not just her pain at something spoken in haste. And it makes his task after the quarrel much harder, for he now has not merely to learn to control his temper, but to change something deep in his personality.

Augustinus broaches the subject of love for the first time, as he did in the *Studienmappe*, when he is out for a walk with Margarita. This time his words are reported in direct speech, and take a slightly different form. Instead of telling us 'da fragte ich Margarita, ob sie mich recht liebe' (S, 167), Augustinus tells us this time that he asked 'Margarita, habt ihr mich doch auch ein wenig lieb?' (R, 181). The fact that the words are in direct speech makes them appear more intrusive. And the inclusion of the 'doch auch' makes the words at once intimate, confessional (he loves her too) and persuasive.

Augustinus repeats his question some time later:

'Margarita, ihr habt mir nicht gesagt, ob ihr mich denn ein wenig lieb habt.'

Sie schlug die Augen dieses Mal nicht nieder, sondern sah mich an, und sagte: 'Doctor, ich liebe euch nach meinem Vater unter allen Menschen am meisten.'

'Alle Engel und himmlische Heerschaaren und Gott selber,' rief ich entgegen, 'Margarita, ich liebe euch mehr als alle Menschen und alle Geschöpfe dieser Welt, und was es noch immer für Welten gibt.'

'Das ist nicht recht,' erwiederte sie, 'ihr müßt eure Angehörigen mehr lieben, und Gott in jener Welt mehr lieben.'

'Ich weiß es nicht,' antwortete ich, 'in diesem Augenblike ist es mir, ich liebe nichts so sehr.'

'Das darf nicht sein, und das begehre ich nicht,' sagte sie.

Wir hatten uns an den Händen genommen, und sahen uns in die Augen. (R, 182–83)

This is a quite extraordinary piece of dialogue and contrasts greatly with the equivalent scene in the *Studienmappe* which is quite unproblematic. Gestures and words are totally out of step here. The conflict of ideas gives the lie to the joining of hands and the meeting of eyes. Augustinus is trying to give honest expression to the strength of his feelings, which the greater moral and religious sense of Margarita tells her are too strong, too unbridled, as she tries to tell him at first. When he still cannot see that she is right, she utters the extraordinarily categorical statement 'Das darf nicht sein, und das begehre ich nicht'. The

harshness of her words makes one almost forget that this is the first time the two have expressed their love for one another. While accepting and returning his love, she is at the same time totally opposed to his expression of it. The unity implied in the gestures ('wir hatten uns an den Händen genommen, und sahen uns in die Augen') simply does not exist in fact. There is no indication here of the hesitant, vulnerable Margarita of the *Journalmappe*; she has developed into a resolute and self-confident woman. And although Augustinus's behaviour is less wild than in the previous versions, his incomprehension of her and the excess of his passion are potentially more dangerous, even in this early scene.

The wrongness of Augustinus's state of mind even before the quarrel is brought out again in the *Romanmappe* in the episode where he sees Rudolph and Margarita together. Whereas, in the *Studienmappe*, Augustinus merely relates that he was out in the woods to pick some particularly unusual saxifrage flowers for Margarita, his state of mind apparently untroubled, in the *Romanmappe* there are indications of agitation in Augustinus even before he glimpses the cousins together. The passage is in a different, more taut key from the beginning. His intention is still to pick saxifrage for Margarita, but we hear that he has pushed his duty calls forward in order to make time to do so, to the extent of leaving home at two o'clock in the morning. On his return from work he rejects the meal that his devoted sister Anna has prepared to strengthen him, and leaves straight away. To put Margarita before work, family, and self is to demonstrate precisely the fault that Margarita has deplored in him: an over-indulgence in feeling to the extent that it denigrates normal life to something secondary. He finds the flowers: 'Die Steinbrechen waren sehr schön erblüht; allein ich sah jetzt . . . Margarita mit Rudolph wandern'. The very syntax here betrays his fault — his jealousy does not in objective terms contradict the fact that the flowers are lovely, but it clouds his vision. He is prepared for the worst.

In the *Studienmappe* his frustrated jealousy and feelings of inadequacy are given expression in an appropriate style:

> Ein schöneres Paar ist gar nicht auf der Erde. Er war um eine halbe Hauptlänge höher, als sie, war so schlank, wie sie, das feine Gewand war so anspruchslos an ihm und die schwarzen Augen blickten sanft und milde: sie schimmerte neben ihm so klar, wie immer, hatte das weiße Gewand an, und wurde durch ihn fast schöner, als gewöhnlich. Mir stürzten die bitteren Thränen aus den Augen - - wer bin ich denn - was bin ich denn? - - ich bin nichts - gar nichts. (S, 176–77)

The remedy here is quite simple: Augustinus has to build up in himself sufficient appreciation of his own worth, he must become a more stable person. And he succeeds in doing this.

In the *Romanmappe* the account is laconic in the extreme but the emotion no less strong for being suppressed. Indeed the lack of comment about his own emotions draws attention to them by default. The way he watches Margarita and Rudolph appears almost voyeuristic:

Wie wir damals auf die Wulst hatten hinsehen können, so konnte ich jezt von der Wulst auf sie sehen. Sie gingen sehr langsam des Weges, und blieben zuweilen stehen. Einmal stellte er sich vor ihr Angesicht, er schien zu ihr zu sprechen, er hielt sie an beiden Händen, dann neigte er sein Angesicht gegen sie nieder; denn er war um eine halbe Hauptlänge höher als sie, sie hob ihr Antliz gegen ihn empor, und küßte ihn auf den Mund. Ich erhob mich, und kletterte an der Rükseite schnell über die Wand hinab, daß ich mir die Hände blutig riß . . . (R, 184)

The speed with which he moves away breaks the tension of the moment. Augustinus's worst suspicions, which do not need to be spelled out, have, he thinks, been fulfilled.

When Augustinus confronts Margarita the dialogue is extremely direct and to the point:

'Margarita, ich habe heute nicht aus Absicht sondern aus Zufall gesehen, wie ihr euern Vetter Rudolph geküßt habt.'

'Ich habe heute meinen Vetter Rudolph geküßt,' antwortete sie.

'Und das sagt ihr, ohne der Rechte zu gedenken, die ihr mir eingeräumt habt?' entgegnete ich.

'Ich habe zu euch gesagt, daß ich euch nach meinem Vater unter allen Menschen am meisten liebe,' antwortete sie.

'Ja, das habt Ihr gesagt, liebe Margarita, ob es aber auch wahr ist,' entgegnete ich.

Sie sagte auf diese meine Rede kein Wort, sondern sah mich mit ihren großen Augen an. Ihre Augen erschienen mir fast noch größer, als sie mich so anblikte. Dann füllten sie sich mit Wasser.

Sie wendete sich ab. (R, 185–86)

Augustinus's statement that he saw Margarita kiss her cousin by chance is not strictly true since, although he came upon them by chance, he then deliberately watched them. His reproach, that in kissing someone else Margarita is forgetting about the rights that she has accorded him, is couched in strangely cold and imperious language. And his final remark ('Ja, das habt Ihr gesagt, liebe Margarita, ob es aber such wahr ist') is, in Stifter's own terms, possibly the cruellest thing he could say. He casts a doubt on the integrity of her utterances, he implies that for her there is a split between being and speech. In all, within the context of the work and of Stifter's writing as a whole, Augustinus's accusations are devastating.

But Margarita is a match for him. She does not deny that she kissed her cousin, she repeats her declaration of love which, as far as she is concerned, is honestly meant and accurate. For her the gap between language and reality does not exist. It was she, one remembers, who castigated Augustinus for his extravagant use of language. And to Augustinus's final accusation that she lied, that her speech was not underwritten by reality, she cannot, or will not reply. The gulf between them is, at this stage, unbridgeable.

The most important point in the relationship between the two lovers in all three versions, although it is only recorded in the last, is the next scene where

Augustinus tries to persuade Margarita to change her mind and say that they need not part, but Margarita will not be moved. It is from this point that Augustinus has to accept that he has destroyed the relationship, at least temporarily. He also has to see that this does not mean, as it first appears, that life is no longer worth living. He is forced, as the *Obrist* was on the death of his wife, to accept what his whole being wants to reject: the loss of a loved one. He must accept that life goes on and that if he wants to regain his composure he must divert his energies to the process of becoming a useful member of society. Outside the context of Stifter's works this does not sound weighty — a jealous lover loses his loved one through his own fault and must learn to cope with his new position alone. But in the context of Stifter's awareness of the nearness of catastrophe, this turning point is of the utmost importance. Much of the final version is, as I hope I have shown, devoted to the depiction of the process of regaining balance after catastrophe while yet being aware that it may strike again at any time. This is the point where Augustinus, the main protagonist, is seen to confront the catastrophe which threatens to make his life meaningless. And it was only in the final version that Stifter felt able to deal with this pivotal scene directly. All that is recorded of this scene in the first two versions is that Augustinus raged at Margarita for hours trying to get her to change her mind, and when he could not succeed, he stormed out with the avowed intention of killing himself. But in the *Romanmappe* their conversation is recorded and the emphasis is different. Margarita takes the wind out of Augustinus's sails straight away by saying that although she had wanted to marry him, and her father was fond of him, 'da nun Alles anders geworden ist, muß ich euch sagen, daß es nicht mehr geschehen kann.' The passage continues as follows:

Ich sah sie an. Als ich in das Haghaus ging, wußte ich noch nicht genau, was ich sagen werde, nur das wußte ich, daß ich mit Margarita reden müsse. Als sie aber diese ihre Worte gesagt hatte, erschrak ich sehr. Ich konnte ihr nicht gleich eine Antwort geben, sondern sah ihr immer in das freundliche Angesicht. Endlich stand ich auf, und sagte:

'Aber Margarita, ihr schneidet mit diesen Worten jede Möglichkeit ab, in unserer Sache weiter zu sprechen.'

'Sprecht, lieber Freund,' antwortete sie, 'sezet euch zu mir auf diesen kleinen Stuhl, und sprecht alle Worte, die euch gut dünken, und die euerm Herzen zu einer Erleichterung sein können.'

'Wie kann ich sprechen, wenn das Ziel des Gespräches weggenommen ist,' entgegnete ich.

'Sprecht außerhalb dieses Zieles,' sagte sie.

'Gibt es da etwas?' fragte ich.

'Ich fühle, daß es noch sehr viel gibt,' antwortete sie.

'Ihr fühlt das?' fragte ich.

'Ja,' entgegnete sie, 'Liebe, Freundschaft, Hochachtung'.

Ich war während dieser Worte noch immer gestanden, sie war auf ihrem Sesselchen sizen geblieben. Da sagte sie: 'Wollt ihr euch denn nicht zu mir sezen, wie ihr sonst gethan habt?'

Sie sah mich so freundlich und liebvoll an, daß ich mich ihr gegenüber auf den kleinen Sessel sezte.

Ich sagte: 'O Margarita, so erkläret mir das verworrene Gefühl: ich habe euch immer als wahr erkannt, und habe doch gesehen, was ihr gethan habt.'

'Das verworrene Gefühl hätte gar nicht kommen sollen,' antwortete sie.

'Aber es ist ja immer vorhanden, wo eine heftige unaussprechliche Neigung ist,' entgegnete ich.

'Das weiß ich nicht,' sagte sie, 'und glaube es auch nicht; aber ich weiß, daß oft das Herz des Menschen von Empfindungen befallen wird, die es nicht geahnt hat.'

'Wenn ihr das wißt, o Margarita,' anwortete ich, 'so schiebt euern Entschluß bis nach unserem Gespräche auf.'

'Ich habe ihn vor vier Tagen aufgeschoben,' erwiederte sie, 'indessen ist er klar und deutlich geworden.'

'Ihr gebt also Alles auf, was ihr gegen mich empfunden habt?' fragte ich.

'Nein, das thue ich nicht,' sagte sie, 'das kann ich auch nicht. Es hängt immer von dem Andern ab, was wir gegen ihn empfinden. Ich kann euch lieben, achten, ehren, ihr könnt mir nach meinem Vater der theuerste Mensch bleiben; aber wessen Gattin ich werden soll, mit dem soll ich eins werden; sich selbst aber glaubt man immer, ihr habt mir nicht geglaubt. Wenn ich den Glauben nicht finde, bleibe ich bei meinem geliebten Vater.'

'O Margarita, nehmt jenes unbedachte Wort nicht in so ernstem Sinne auf,' sagte ich.

'Das Wort sprach bloß aus, was damals war,' antwortete sie. (R, 188–90)

Margarita is totally in command of this conversation. Although vulnerable, she shows an implacable belief in her own judgement. Her remarkable self-assurance is coupled with a kindly but authoritative attitude towards Augustinus. She is the absolute arbiter of his fate, yet is prepared to help him to come to terms with their new relationship. By commanding him to do what he feels to be impossible ('Sprecht außerhalb dieses Zieles') — to talk to her as a friend rather than as a suitor — she forces their relationship on to a new, more level and more secure plane.

For Augustinus this move is almost inconceivable, for his whole being and energy have been focused on the task of persuading Margarita to forgive him and take him back. But the conversation he has envisaged is not to be, for the reality is different from his conception of it. He is forced to accept the otherness of Margarita. He discovers to his surprise that speech is still possible when his reason for speaking has been removed. (The rest of the novel shows by extension how he discovers that life is still possible when his apparent *raison d'être* has been removed.) When he sits down, thus, according to local custom, honouring her hospitality, and speaks, asking her to explain herself and admitting his confusion, his 'verworrenes Gefühl', he is, in fact, on the way to recovery. For now he no longer tries to change her mind but merely to understand her so that he can come to terms with his new situation. His words are an outpouring of his preoccupation, but the form of them ('O Margarita so erkläret mir . . .') is that of an appeal for help. In his speech acts, therefore, he is no longer addressing her with perlocutionary force (trying to change her mind) but with illocutionary force. He is relating to her now as to a friend who can help him to understand the contradictory information he is faced with, and he thus

implicitly acknowledges that her understanding may be greater than his. In short he is accepting her role as friend and mentor, he is learning to speak 'außerhalb dieses Zieles'. The remainder of his remarks have a pleading though despairing quality, as though he has subconsciously accepted that she is lost to him but cannot yet make his conscious mind accept this. Despair is, I think, the dominant note in the words which finally make her threaten to go to her father: '"O Margarita," rief ich, "Margarita, ich verstehe das Alles nicht, ihr dürft nicht entscheiden, ihr dürft es nicht, ihr dürft es nicht"' (R, 191–92). This is not the 'Heftigkeit' of a selfish, violent young man who thinks he can dominate, rather it is the frustration of an immature but essentially good sensibility at the realization that he has done wrong despite himself, and that Margarita is not to be moved.

So much for Augustinus; but Margarita says some uncomfortable things. His flaw is, according to her, a lack of faith, a faith which she is determined to find in her future husband. It is not Augustinus's fault that he was lacking in this faith. But if Augustinus cannot help his behaviour, if he is not merely acting wrongly but is, in an ontological sense, wrong for Margarita because of his actions, then this makes the rift between them, if anything, more serious, for as Margarita points out 'wenn ihr mir nicht glaubet, so lange wir leben, so würde ich es nicht wissen, und immer denken, ihr könntet mir doch einmal nicht glauben'. It is hard to see how the story could have ended without it remaining a possibility that Margarita, who sets such a high value on faith, will not have faith in Augustinus's trust, since he has once been found wanting, and this must remain a major question mark over the happy resolution of the story.

What then are the main trends in the three versions in the way the quarrel is depicted? Augustinus's flamboyant nature has the corners knocked off it, with the effect, however, of further uncovering the faults within him which become more sustained and serious. The change in Margarita is the result of a different process: it appears that in the course of revision, Stifter chose one aspect of his sketch of her and developed it, rejecting the other aspects, until her character achieved a very convincing degree of unity. The conflict receives different attention in all three versions, from the *Journalmappe*, where its origins are uncertain, through the *Studienmappe*, where it arises purely from Augustinus's glimpsing of Rudolf and Margarita together, to the *Romanmappe*, where, from the moment their love is declared, conflict seems inevitable and their differences irreconcilable.

5.4 CONCLUSION

The *Mappe meines Urgroßvaters* was the last of many of Stifter's works to show an unhappy love affair. The conception of this one was, however, different. Stifter intended to show this time how a character, rather than remaining

imprisoned by his attributes in an unhappy destiny, could grow and develop to become worthy of the woman he has wronged and to be able to stand up to the blows of fate.

The earlier versions show this happening successfully, but, because of their episodic form, they do not show how it happens, they do not dwell on the slow process of change in Augustinus, they do not thematize to such an extent the business of learning. They also do not deal directly with the causes of the break.

The emphasis in the final version is on the break and on the healing process. This difference in approach represents an honest attempt to decide how mankind can cope with the devastating effects of rupture and loss imposed by an apparently arbitrary fate: the question Stifter has been skirting around in many of his other works. The attempt is modestly successful: the overall narrator is enriched by reading the notebooks, the *Obrist* recovers from the shock of his wife's death and lives an exemplary life, Augstinus learns to live without Eustachius, to trust his own judgement while yet accepting the ways in which it may be deficient, and he becomes an admired and respected member of the community. Augustinus is, in a way, the opposite of Risach: thwarted in his plans, he does not build an alternative world where his will dominates, but instead he becomes receptive to the world and develops his own strengths by trying them out tentatively. Unlike Risach he is capable of true dialogue.

But whereas in *Der Nachsommer*, a kind of certainty is achieved, no such concrete answers are possible in the later novel. The openness of the work, the openness of the *Obrist* to pain, even now, through his daughter, the openness of Augustinus to heartache (Eustachius may not return, Margarita may not be able to forgive him) and to the opposition of others in dialogue, belies the common view of Stifter as a writer who takes refuge in an increasing rigidity of style and meaning. It is a life-affirming novel, it celebrates the possibilities open to the individual to find reserves of strength previously undiscovered. But it seems that the individual, though he or she may learn from others, must do this alone. Dialogue defines the boundaries of the individual, it does not admit entry into any communal sphere where the pain of existence can be countered with the comforting certainties of solidarity.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Doris Lessing, *The Golden Notebook* (London, 1973), p. 231.
2. The third, and until recently virtually unknown, version was published only in September 1987, too late to be incorporated into this study: *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters Faksimileausgabe der Dritten Fassung. Faksimile der Handschrift aus dem Besitz der Staatsbibliothek Prag*, edited by Karl-Heinz Hahn (Leipzig, 1987).
3. Curt Hohoff, *Adalbert Stifter: seine dichterischen Mittel und die Prosa des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, p. 202.
4. Hohoff, pp. 204–05, points out that Augustinus is unique among Stifter's main protagonists in that he is 'nicht ein Fertiger; es macht den Roman aus, wie er in ganz anderm Sinne wie Heinrich, Natalie und Witiko wächst und wird, nämlich als ein sein Wesen Andernder'.

5. Paul Böckmann, 'Die epische Objektivität in Stifters Erzählung *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*', in *Stoffe, Formen, Strukturen: Studien zur deutschen Literatur: Hans Heinrich Borcherdt zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Albert Fuchs and Helmut Motekat (Munich, 1962), pp. 398–423 (p. 405).
6. Alexander Stillmark, 'Stifter's *Letzte Mappe* and the Idea of Wholeness', in *Tradition and Creation: Essays in Honour of Elizabeth Mary Wilkinson*, edited by C. P. Magill, Brian A. Rowley and Christopher J. Smith (Leeds, 1978), pp. 162–76 (p. 165).
7. Friedbert Aspetsberger, 'Die Aufschreibung des Lebens: zu Stifters *Mappe*', *VASILO*, 27 (1978), 11–38 (p. 35; Aspetsberger's emphasis).
8. See Marie-Christine Endres, '*Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*: das nachgelassene Fragment Adalbert Stifters als Sprachkunstwerk betrachtet' (unpublished dissertation, Göttingen, 1951), p. 87, who describes the *Journalmappe* as being three Novellen, joined together loosely 'mit naiver Erzählfreude . . . durch Erzählerzusätze'. See also Hohoff, p. 199, who describes the *Journalmappe* as 'eine große Skizze, künstlich und sprunghaft in den Gelenken verbunden'.
9. Although Rudolf Wildbolz (*Adalbert Stifter: Langeweile und Faszination*, p. 66) argues that the importance of this chapter is to show Augustinus's determination, against all odds, to become a doctor. The bad weather represents the ever-present threat of possible catastrophe.
10. An example of this is Augustinus's reminder to himself in the *Journalmappe*: 'vor Gottes Augen macht es einen geringen Unterschied, ob du bist oder nicht - das merke dir' (p. 15 and p. 40). It seems likely that this is the origin of the famous 'Wagen der Welt' metaphor in the later two versions. See also the short reference in the *Journalmappe* to the loss of his family: 'O Vater, o Mutter, daß ihr nicht mehr lebt, zu sehen, wie sich eure Hütte verändert hat - und auch nicht Bruder und Schwester ist da, es zu schauen!' (p. 43). In the *Romanmappe* by contrast, coming to terms with this blow represents a major part of the narrative. References to the *Journal-* and *Studienfassungen* are taken from Doppler and Frühwald, I, ii, 9–102 and I, v, 9–234 respectively. References to the *Romanfassung* are taken from Sauer, XII. References will be given in brackets after quotations and will take the form J for *Journalfassung*, S for *Studienfassung* or R for *Romanfassung* plus a page number.
11. Martin and Erika Swales, *Adalbert Stifter: A Critical Study*, p. 119.
12. Wolfgang Iser, *Der implizite Leser*, p. 10.
13. Aspetsberger, 'Die Aufschreibung des Lebens', p. 17.
14. Letter to Gustav Heckenast, 25 December 1844.
15. This fits with the sentimentalized picture of the *Obrist* seen elsewhere in the *Studienmappe*.
16. See Stillmark, p. 173, who says of the *Obrist*: 'His grief continues to afflict him, as those poignant silences which interrupt his narrative all too clearly testify'. Endres, p. 82, makes a similar point.
17. I am indebted also to Hans-Ulrich Rupp, *Stifters Sprache*, p. 74, who points out that at a crucial point here the *Obrist*'s story moves from the past tense into the present. He quotes the *Obrist* who says 'Als ich begriff, was geschehen war, verlangte ich heftig, in den Abgrund zu steigen. Ich konnte sie mir nicht tot denken, sie muss noch leben, und wartet auf mich'. Rupp comments as follows: 'Ergriffenheit und Erinnerung erreichen an der entscheidenden Stelle des Berichtes ein solches Mass an Intensität, dass der Obrist Zeit und Umwelt vergisst und das schmerzliche Ereignis gleichsam zum zweiten Male erlebt. Die Aussagen im Präsens sind nicht mehr für den Zuhörer, den Doktor, bestimmt, der Obrist spricht sie ganz zu sich selber'.
18. Hermann Kunisch, *Adalbert Stifter: Mensch und Wirklichkeit: Studien zu seinem klassischen Stil* (Berlin, 1950), pp. 157–58.
19. See J, 15, 'Ein Weib, ein schönes, schnödes, fürchterlich geliebtes Weib hatte mich dermaßen rasend gemacht, daß ich vermeinte, jetzt könne ich nicht mehr weiter leben, um es nur recht zu strafen das falsche, das harte Herz'.

POSTSCRIPT

Readers and critics alike traditionally tend to insist on the essentially mimetic quality of direct speech in narrative; good dialogue is, in other words, lifelike dialogue. Hence Dickens and Fontane, for example, are commonly upheld as masters of literary dialogue.

Stifter, on the other hand, was less concerned to convey the impression of naturalness and spontaneity in speech. His predilection for pattern, for control and orderliness dominates his creative production and naturally extends to the passages of dialogue. But this does not mean that his dialogue is ineffective. In the light of recent literary and cultural theory we are now more than ever prepared to acknowledge that all fiction, including realism, indeed all human communication, is encoded and must be deciphered according to the structures operative within it. A writer such as Stifter who was more open than most about the abstractions of his style and the formal organization of his works ought therefore to pose no particular problem for modern readers. To say that Stifter's work is a linguistic system which unapologetically situates itself at a further remove from everyday social reality than the work of many of his great contemporaries is not thereby to invalidate it, but rather to draw attention to the particularity of his stylistic and thematic concerns.

And in the structure of his works the role played by dialogue and direct speech is a crucial one, for he exploits to brilliant effect that moment of importance in a text where the narrator's voice falls silent and the characters' voices are heard. This is particularly the case in a work such as *Der Nachsommer*, where the rhetorical texture of the narrative is so tightly woven that the subjective voice stands out as being both feeble in its isolation and yet extraordinarily strong in its pathos. In other works, such as *Der beschriebene Tännling*, the dimension of characters' speech is used to give a fuller, richer picture of human experience since it often reveals aspects of reality which relativize the narrator's account. In *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters* speech is seen as a way of defining the self in both a positive sense — that is, through the invigorating dynamic of argument; and in a negative sense — one which reveals how far words may simply be incapable of bridging the gap between human beings.

Stifter's statements about his art show that he was concerned with the moral education of his readers and that he was profoundly distrustful of subjectivity. Yet as many critics have shown, his art has endured because it incorporates both his aims and the fears which fuelled them. And time and again the peculiar excitement of Stifter's work is glimpsed most vividly in that moment when the narrator hands over the reins to his characters and a different intake of breath is heard.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary literature

For primary literature see p. xii.

Secondary literature: general

Austin, J. L., *How to do Things with Words* (Oxford, 1962)
Barthes, Roland, *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture* (Paris, 1953)
——, 'Écrivains, intellectuels, professeurs', *Tel Quel*, 47 (1971), 3–18
——, *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris, 1973)
——, *S/Z* (Paris, 1970)
Booth, Wayne C., *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago, 1961)
Cohn, Dorrit, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction* (Princeton, 1978)
Dawson, S. W., *Drama and the Dramatic* (London, 1970)
Engel, Johann Jakob, *Über Handlung, Gespräch und Erzählung*, edited by Ernst Theodor Voss (Stuttgart, 1964; first published 1774)
Fish, Stanley E., 'How to do Things with Austin and Searle: Speech Act Theory and Literary Criticism', *MLN*, 91 (1976), 983–1025
Frey, John R., 'Author-Intrusion in the Narrative: German Theory and Some Modern Examples', *GR*, 23 (1948), 274–89
Friedman, Norman, 'Point of View in Fiction: The Development of a Critical Concept', *PMLA*, 70 (1955), 1160–84
Glowinski, Michal, 'Der Dialog im Roman', *Poet*, 6 (1974), 1–16
Grosse, Siegfried, 'Literarischer Dialog und gesprochene Sprache', in *Festschrift für H. Eggers zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by H. Backes, *BGDSLT*, 94 (Tübingen, 1972), pp. 649–88
Hamburger, Käte, *Die Logik der Dichtung*, third edition (Frankfurt, 1977)
——, 'Zum Strukturproblem der epischen und dramatischen Dichtung', *DVLG*, 25 (1951), 1–26
Hirsch, E. D., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, 1967)
Iser, Wolfgang, 'Die Appellstruktur der Texte', in *Rezeptionsästhetik: Theorie und Praxis*, edited by R. Warning (Munich, 1975), pp. 228–52
——, *Der implizite Leser: Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett* (Munich, 1972)
——, 'Der Lesevorgang: eine phänomenologische Perspektive', in *Rezeptionsästhetik: Theorie und Praxis*, edited by R. Warning (Munich, 1972), pp. 253–76

Jakobson, Roman, 'Linguistics and Poetics', in *The Structuralists from Marx to Lévi-Strauss*, edited by Richard T. De George and Fernande M. De George (New York, 1972), pp. 85–122
Kennedy, Andrew K., *Dramatic Dialogue: The Duologue of Personal Encounter* (Cambridge, 1983)
Kermode, Frank, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (New York, 1966)
Lämmert, Eberhard, *Bauformen des Erzählens* (Stuttgart, 1955)
Lubbock, Percy, *The Craft of Fiction* (London, 1921)
Page, Norman, *Speech in the English Novel*, English Language Series, 8 (London, 1973)
Petsch, R., 'Der epische Dialog', *Euph*, 32 (1931), 187–205
Schmachtenberg, Reinhard, *Sprechakttheorie und dramatischer Dialog: ein Methodenansatz zur Drameninterpretation*, Linguistische Arbeiten, 120 (Tübingen, 1982)
Searle, John R., *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge, 1969)
Sontag, Susan, *Against Interpretation and other essays* (New York, 1961)
Stanzel, Franz, *Die typischen Erzählsituationen im Roman*, Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, 63 (Vienna, 1955)
Steiner, George, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford, 1975)
——, *Language and Silence* (London, 1967)
Wardhaugh, Richard, *How Conversation Works* (Oxford, 1985)
Winter, Hans-Gerhard, 'Probleme des Dialogs und des Dialogromans in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts', *WW*, 20 (1970), 33–51

Secondary literature: Stifter

Amann, Klaus, *Adalbert Stifters 'Nachsommer': Studie zur didaktischen Struktur des Romans*, Wiener Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur, 8 (Vienna, 1977)
——, 'Zwei Thesen zu Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 31 (1982), 169–84
Angress, R. K., 'Das Ehebruchmotiv in Stifters *Das alte Siegel*: ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der bürgerlichen Erotik', *ZDP*, 103 (1984), 481–502
Arts, Eva, *Studien zur Erzählkunst Adalbert Stifters: der Aufbau der vier späteren Erzählungen*, Dissertationen der Universität Wien, 129 (Vienna, 1976)
Aspetsberger, Friedbert, 'Die Aufschreibung des Lebens: zu Stifters *Mappe*', *VASILO*, 27 (1978), 11–38
——, 'Der Groß-Sprecher Heinrich Drendorf: zu Adalbert Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 32 (1983), 179–219
Bahr, Hermann, *Adalbert Stifter: eine Entdeckung* (Zürich, 1919)
Bandet, Jean-Louis, *Adalbert Stifter: introduction à la lecture de ses nouvelles* (Klincksieck, 1974)
——, 'La structure reconstituée: remarques sur la composition de *Der Nachsommer*', *EG*, 26, No. 1 (1971), 46–54

Barnes, Harry George, 'The Function of Conversations and Speeches in Adalbert Stifters *Witiko*', in *German Studies presented to Professor H. G. Fiedler by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends* (Oxford, 1938), pp. 1–25

Beddow, Michael, *The Fiction of Humanity: Studies in the Bildungsroman from Wieland to Thomas Mann* (Cambridge, 1982)

Bennett, E. K., *A History of the German Novelle from Goethe to Thomas Mann* (Cambridge, 1949)

Bertram, Ernst, *Studien zu Adalbert Stifters Novellentechnik* (Dortmund, 1907)

Betz, Wolfgang Peter, *Die Motive in Stifters Nachsommer* (Frankfurt am Main, 1970)

Bittrich, Burkhard, 'Das Liebesgespräch in Stifters *Prokopus*', *VASILO*, 16 (1967), 78–83

Blackall, Eric A., *Adalbert Stifter: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, 1948)

Blanck, Hugo, 'Die Technik der Rahmenerzählung bei Adalbert Stifter' (unpublished dissertation, Münster, 1924)

Blaschek, Hannelore, 'Stifter und das Erlebnis der Wirklichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert', *VASILO*, 10 (1961), 148–60

Böckmann, Paul, 'Die epische Objektivität in Stifters Erzählung *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*', in *Stoffe, Formen, Strukturen: Studien zur detuschen Literatur: Hans Heinrich Borcherdt zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Albert Fuchs and Helmut Motekat (Munich, 1962), pp. 398–423

Böhler, Michael, 'Die Individualität in Stifters Spätwerk: ein ästhetisches Problem', *DVLG*, 43 (1969), 652–84

Bohn, Ursula, *Bild und Gebärde in Adalbert Stifters 'Studien' mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Lesarten*, Germanische Studien, 203 (Berlin, 1967)

Bollnow, Otto Friedrich, 'Der *Nachsommer* und der Bildungsgedanke des Biedermeier', in *Beiträge zur Einheit von Bildung und Sprache im geistigen Sein: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Ernst Otto* (Berlin, 1957), pp. 14–33

Borchmeyer, Dieter, 'Stifters *Nachsommer*: eine restaurative Utopie?' *Poet*, 12 (1980), 59–82

Branscombe, Peter, 'The Use of Leitmotifs in Stifter's *Brigitta*', *FMLS*, 13, No. 2 (1977), 145–54

Brunnhofer-Wartenberg, Ruth, 'Adalbert Stifters Erlebnis und Beurteilung der Revolution von 1848', *VASILO*, 2 (1953), 112–22

Buggert, Christoph, *Figur und Erzähler: Studie zum Wandel der Wirklichkeitsauffassung im Werk Adalbert Stifters* (Munich, 1970)

Campbell, Karen J., 'Towards a Truer Mimesis: Stifter's *Turmalin*', *GQ*, 57 (1984), 576–89

Debus, Kurt, 'Einsamkeit und Stille in der Dichtung Adalbert Stifters' (unpublished dissertation, Frankfurt am Main, 1939)

Dehn, Wilhelm, *Ding und Vernunft: zur Interpretation von Stifters Dichtung* (Bonn, 1969)

Demetz, Peter, 'On Stifter's and Fontane's Realism: *Turmalin* and *Mathilde Möhring*', in *Literary Theory and Criticism: Festschrift Presented to René Wellek*, edited by Joseph P. Strelka (New York, 1984), pp. 767–82

Doppler, Alfred, 'Hebbel und Stifter: Gegensätze und Gemeinsamkeiten', *VASILO*, 34 (1985), 27–33

Dormagen, Paul, 'Die epischen Elemente in Adalbert Stifters *Witiko*' (unpublished dissertation, Bonn, 1940)

Endres, Marie-Christine, '*Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*: das nachgelassene Fragment Adalbert Stifters als Sprachkunstwerk betrachtet' (unpublished dissertation, Göttingen, 1951)

Enzinger, Moriz, *Adalbert Stifter im Urteil seiner Zeit* (Vienna, 1968)

Esselborn, Hans, 'Adalbert Stifters *Turmalin*: die Absage an den Subjektivismus durch das naturgesetzliche Erzählen', *VASILO*, 34 (1985), 3–26

Fischer, Kurt Gerhard, 'Bildungsprobleme, dem *Nachsommer* nachgesagt', *VASILO*, 8 (1959), 45–49

Frye, Wendell W., *Tradition in Stifters Romanen*, *EH*, I, 219 (Bern, 1977)

Gelhausen, Herta, 'Adalbert Stifters späte Erzählungen: Untersuchungen zur Alterskunst Stifters' (unpublished dissertation, Kiel, 1949)

Gillespie, Gerald, 'Ritualism and Motivic Development in Adalbert Stifter's *Nachsommer*', *Neophilologus*, 48 (1964), 312–22

Glaser, Horst Albert, *Die Restauration des Schönen: Stifters 'Nachsommer'* (Stuttgart, 1965)

Godde, Edmund, 'Beiträge zur dichtungsgeschichtlichen Heimat des *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 10 (1961), 132–47

Grolman, Adolf von, 'Adalbert Stifters *Nachsommer*', in Adolf von Grolman, *Europäische Dichterprofile: Vorträge* (Düsseldorf, 1947), pp. 50–63

Grossschopf, Alois, 'Kann man Stifter dramatisieren? Die Novelle *Der Hagestolz* als Hörspiel', in *Linzer Volksblatt*, 18 June 1965

Gump, Margaret, *Adalbert Stifter* (New York, 1974)

Hankamer, Paul, 'Die Menschenwelt in Stifters Werk', *DVLG*, 16, No. 1 (1938), 95–125

Hart-Nibbrig, Christiaan L., *Rhetorik des Schweigens: Versuch über den Schatten literarischer Rede* (Frankfurt am Main, 1981), pp. 111–19 on Stifter

Hertling, Gunter H., 'Adalbert Stifters Jagdallegorie *Der beschriebene Tännling*: Schande durch Schändung', *VASILO*, 29 (1980), 41–65

——, 'Der Mensch und "seine" Tiere: versäumte Symbiose, versäumte Bildung: zu Adalbert Stifters *Abdias*', *MAL*, 18 (1985), 1–26

Hillebrand, Bruno, *Mensch und Raum im Roman: Studien zu Keller, Stifter, Fontane* (Munich, 1971)

Hohoff, Curt, *Adalbert Stifter: seine dichterischen Mittel und die Prosa des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Düsseldorf, 1949)

Höllerer, Walter, *Zwischen Klassik und Moderne: Lachen und Weinen in der Dichtung einer Übergangszeit* (Stuttgart, 1958), pp. 357–77

Huerkamp, Josef, 'Das problematische Vorbild: über das schwierige Verhältnis des Schriftstellers Arno Schmidt zu Adalbert Stifter', *VASILO*, 32 (1983), 163–78

Hüller, Franz, *Adalbert Stifters 'Witiko': eine Deutung* (Nürnberg, 1954)

——, 'Ein "Kommentar" zu Adalbert Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 1 (1952), 91–93

Hunter, Rosemarie, 'Ist der Rahmen des *Waldbrunnen* überflüssig?: einige Bemerkungen zu Stifters Späterzählung', *VASILO*, 21 (1972), 119–23

——, 'Studien zu Stifters späten Erzählungen' (unpublished dissertation, Edmonton, 1970)

Irmscher, Hans Dietrich, *Adalbert Stifter: Wirklichkeitserfahrung und gegenständliche Darstellung* (Munich, 1971)

Jilek, Heinrich, 'Neuere Tendenzen der Adalbert-Stifter-Forschung', *ZO*, 21 (1972), 531–39

Kaiser, Herbert, *Studien zum deutschen Roman nach 1948* (Duisberg, 1977), pp. 107–64 on Stifter

Kaiser, Michael, *Adalbert Stifter: eine literaturpsychologische Untersuchung seiner Erzählungen, AKML*, 103 (Bonn, 1971)

Keller, Thomas, *Die Schrift in Stifters 'Nachsommer': Buchstäblichkeit und Bildlichkeit des Romantextes*, Böhlau forum litterarum, 12 (Cologne, 1982)

Killy, Walther, *Wirklichkeit und Kunstcharakter: neun Romane des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1963)

Klarner, Gudrun, *Pedagogic Design and Literary Form in the Work of Adalbert Stifter, EH*, I, 920 (Frankfurt am Main, 1986)

Kläui, Elizabeth, *Gestaltung und Formen der Zeit im Werk Adalbert Stifters, EH*, I, 21 (Bern, 1969)

Klein, Johannes, 'Auslegung einer Novelle: Adalbert Stifter: *Der beschriebene Tännling*', *WW* (1952), 206–13

Klieneberger, H. R., *The Novel in England and Germany: A Comparative Study* (London, 1981), pp. 59–86

Klockow, Jörn, 'Der Sprachrythmus und seine Entwicklung in den vier Fassungen von Stifters *Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*', *VASILO*, 22 (1973), 93–104

——, *Studien zum Prosarhythmus: die vier Fassungen der 'Mappe meines Urgroßvaters' von Adalbert Stifter*, Dissertationen der Universität Wien, 117 (Vienna, 1974)

Koll, Rolf-Dieter, 'Stifterkoordinaten: Gedanken zum Ort des Menschen bei Adalbert Stifter', *VASILO*, 27 (1978), 63–68

Korff, Friedrich Wilhelm, *Diastole und Systole: zum Thema Jean Paul und Adalbert Stifter* (Bern, 1969)

Kühn, Julius, *Die Kunst Adalbert Stifters* (Berlin, 1940)

Kunisch, Hermann, *Adalbert Stifter: Mensch und Wirklichkeit: Studien zu seinem klassischen Stil* (Berlin, 1950)

Küpper, Peter, 'Literatur und Langeweile: zur Lektüre Stifters', in *Adalbert Stifter: Studien und Interpretationen: Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, edited by Lothar Stiehm (Heidelberg, 1968), pp. 171–88

Lachinger, Johann, (ed.), *Stifter Symposion Linz 1978* (Linz, 1979)

——, Alexander Stillmark and Martin Swales (eds), *Adalbert Stifter heute: Londoner Symposium 1983*, Schriftenreihe des Adalbert-Stifter-Institutes des Landes Oberösterreich, Folge 35; Publications of the Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London, volume 33 (Linz, 1985)

Lange, Herbert, '*Der beschriebene Tännling* von Adalbert Stifter und seine illustrative Begleitung durch Margret Bilger', *VASILO*, 7 (1958), 27–32

Lange, Victor, 'Adalbert Stifter: *Der Nachsommer*', in *Der deutsche Roman*, edited by Benno von Wiese, II: *Vom Realismus bis zur Gegenwart* (Düsseldorf, 1963), pp. 34–75

Leberl, Lucia, 'Vergleich der drei Fassungen von Adalbert Stifters Erzählung: *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*' (unpublished dissertation, Vienna, 1946)

Lenel, Luise A., 'Symbolism and Style in Flaubert and Stifter: A Comparative Study of *La Légende de St. Julien l'Hospitalier* and *Der beschriebene Tännling*', in *Vistas and Vectors: Essays Honoring the Memory of Helmut Rehder* (Austin, 1979), pp. 142–51

Lindau, Marie-Ursula, *Stifters 'Nachsommer': ein Roman der verhaltenen Rührung*, Basler Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 50 (Bern, 1974)

Ludwig, Marianne, 'Stifter als Realist: Untersuchung über die Gegenständlichkeit im *Beschriebenen Tännling*', Basler Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 7 (Basel, 1948)

Lunding, Erik, *Adalbert Stifter: mit einem Anhang über Kierkegaard und die existentielle Literaturwissenschaft* (Copenhagen, 1946)

——, 'Probleme und Ergebnisse der Stifterforschung 1945–1954', *Euph*, 49 (1955), 203–44

Majstrak, Manfred, 'Das Problem von Individuum und Gemeinschaft in den großen nachklassischen Bildungsromanen Stifters und Kellers' (unpublished dissertation, Bonn, 1954)

Maschek, Ingeborg, 'Stifters Alterserzählungen: eine Stiluntersuchung' (unpublished dissertation, Vienna, 1961)

Mason, Eve, 'Die Gestalt des Erzählers in Stifters *Kalkstein*', *VASILO*, 33 (1984), 123–40

——, 'Stifter's *Katzensilber* and the Fairy-Tale Mode', *MLR*, 77 (1982), 114–29

Mattenklott, Gundel, *Sprache der Sentimentalität: zum Werk Adalbert Stifters* (Frankfurt am Main, 1973)

Mautz, Kurt, 'Das antagonistiche Naturbild in Stifters *Studien*', in *Adalbert Stifter: Studien und Interpretationen: Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, edited by Lothar Stiehm (Heidelberg, 1968), pp. 23–56

Meier, Albert, 'Diskretes Erzählen: über den Zusammenhang von Dichtung, Wissenschaft und Didaktik in Adalbert Stifters Erzählung *Brigitta*', *Aur*, 44 (1984), 213–23

Milz, Friedrich, 'Die Erzählzeit in Stifters *Nachsommer*' (unpublished dissertation, Bonn, 1947)

Minden, M. R., 'The Place of Inheritance in the *Bildungsroman*', *DVLG*, 57 (1983), 33–63

Müller, Joachim, *Adalbert Stifter: Weltbild und Dichtung* (Halle, 1956)

——, 'Einige Gestaltzüge in Stifters *Letzter Mappe*', in *Adalbert Stifter: Studien und Interpretationen: Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, edited by Lothar Stiehm (Heidelberg, 1968), pp. 245–70

——, 'Heilen und Wissen: die Gestalt des Arztes und das Problem der Humanität in Adalbert Stifters *Letzer Mappe*', in *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Jena*, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 4 (1954–55), 317–22

——, 'Das Liebesgespräch in Adalbert Stifters Epik', *WW*, 8 (1957), 20–30
——, 'Stifters spätere Erzählungen', *VASILO*, 9 (1960), 79–93
Müller, Klaus-Detlev, 'Utopie und Bildungsroman: Strukturuntersuchungen zu Stifters *Nachsommer*', *ZDP*, 90, No. 2 (1971), 199–228
Müller-Potschien, Marion, 'Das Schweigen in der Dichtung Adalbert Stifters' (unpublished dissertation, Erlangen, 1968)
Nadler, Josef, '*Nachsommer* oder *Witiko*?', *VASILO*, 4 (1955), 123–31
Naumann, Ursula, *Adalbert Stifter* (Stuttgart, 1979)
Neugebauer, Klaus, *Selbstentwurf und Verhängnis: ein Beitrag zu Adalbert Stifters Verständnis von Schicksal und Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1982)
Norst, M. J., 'Stifter's *Nachsommer* and Biedermeier', in *Periods in German Literature*, II: *Texts and Contexts* (London, 1969), pp. 145–64
O'Caroll, O. T., 'Human Relationships in Stifter's later Novellen' (unpublished dissertation, Dublin, 1971/72)
Pascal, Roy, *The German Novel* (Manchester, 1956), pp. 52–75
Piechotta, Hans Joachim, 'Ordnung als mythologisches Zitat: Adalbert Stifter und der Mythos', in *Mythos und Moderne: Begriff und Bild einer Rekonstruktion*, edited by Karl Heinz Bohrer (Frankfurt am Main, 1983), pp. 83–110
Reddick, John, 'Tiger und Tugend in Stifters *Kalkstein*: eine Polemik', *ZDP*, 95 (1976), 235–55
Rehm, Walther, *'Nachsommer': zur Deutung von Stifters Dichtung* (Munich, 1951)
Ritter, Frederik, 'Der begnadete Mensch', *VASILO*, 9 (1960), 1–18
——, 'Der sanfte Mensch', *VASILO*, 9 (1960), 63–78
Roedl, Urban, *Adalbert Stifter: Geschichte seines Lebens*, second edition (Bern, 1958)
Rosebrock, Theo, 'Der sprachliche Stil in Stifters *Witiko*', *Mitteilungsblatt der Adalbert Stifter-Gesellschaft München*, 19 (1955), 217–18
——, 'Der sprachliche Stil in Stifters *Witiko*' (unpublished dissertation, Frankfurt am Main, 1954)
Rossbacher, Karlheinz, 'Erzählkunst und Personendarstellung bei Adalbert Stifter: die Sicht von außen als Gestaltungsperspektive' (unpublished dissertation, Salzburg, 1966)
——, 'Erzählstandpunkt und Personendarstellung bei Adalbert Stifter: die Sicht von außen als Gestaltungsperspektive', *VASILO*, 17 (1968), 47–58
——, 'Quänger-Quartett und Forellen-Quintett: ein vergleichender Essay über Adalbert Stifter und Thomas Bernhard', *VASILO*, 32 (1983), 145–61
Rückle, Eduard, 'Die Gestaltung der dichterischen Wirklichkeit in Stifters *Witiko*: eine Untersuchung der strukturbildenden Formprinzipien' (unpublished dissertation, Tübingen, 1968)
Rupp, Hans-Ulrich, *Stifters Sprache* (Zürich, 1969)
Rutt, Theodor, 'Selbsterziehung und Selbstbildung im Leben und in den Werken Adalbert Stifters' (unpublished dissertation, Cologne, 1939)
Saurwein, Robert, 'Adalbert Stifters dichterische Entwicklung, gezeigt an den drei Fassungen der *Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*' (unpublished dissertation, Innsbruck, 1953)

Schatter, Antje, 'Schwerpunkte des literaturkritischen Interesses an Stifter (2): Forschungsbericht', *LWU*, 2, No. 3 (1969), 196–208

Schmidt, Arno, 'Der sanfte Unmensch: 100 Jahre *Nachsommer*', in *Arno Schmidt: Nachrichten von Büchern und Menschen*, II: *Zur Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt am Main, 1971), pp. 114–36

Schneider, Franz, 'Sehen und Sein bei Stifter: der religiöse Realismus in der *Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*', *VASILO*, 4 (1955), 15–31

Schneider, Gert K., 'Das "sanfte Gesetz" und die Kontinuität der Geschlechter: zur Darstellung der Senioren in Stifters Werk', in *Dialectology, Linguistics, Literature: Festschrift for Carroll E. Reed*, edited by Wolfgang W. Moelleken (Göppingen, 1984), pp. 249–66

Schuller, Marianne, 'Das Gewitter findet nicht statt oder die Abdankung der Kunst: zu Adalbert Stifters Roman *Der Nachsommer*', *Poet*, 10, No. 1 (1978), 25–52

Sebald, W. G., 'Bis an den Rand der Natur: Versuch über Adalbert Stifter', *Die Rampe*, 1 (1985), 7–35

Seidler, Herbert, 'Adalbert Stifter', in *Handbuch der deutschen Erzählung*, edited by Karl Konrad Polheim (Düsseldorf, 1981), pp. 258–70

——, 'Adalbert Stifter Forschung 1945–1970', *ZDP*, 91, No. 1 (1972), 113–56, and 91, No. 2 (1972), 252–85

——, 'Die Adalbert-Stifter-Forschung der siebziger Jahre', *VASILO*, 30 (1981), 89–134

——, 'Die Bedeutung der Mitte in Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 6 (1957), 59–86

——, *Studien zu Grillparzer und Stifter*, Wiener Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur, 1 (Vienna, 1970)

Sinka, Margrit M., 'Unappreciated Symbol: The "Unglücksäule" in Stifter's *Bergkristall*', *MAL*, 16 (1983), 1–17

Sjögren, Christine Oertel, 'The Configuration of Ideal Love in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*', *MAL*, 8 (1975), 190–96

——, 'Klotildes Reise in die Tiefe: psychoanalytische Betrachtungen zu einer Episode in Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 24 (1975), 107–11

——, 'Ein Musterbeispiel der Liebestheorie in Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 26 (1977), 111–15

Sorg, Klaus Dieter, *Gebrochene Teleologie: Studien zum Bildungsroman von Goethe bis Thomas Mann* (Heidelberg, 1983), pp. 101–34

Staiger, Emil, *Adalbert Stifter als Dichter der Ehrfurcht*, second edition (Zürich, 1952)

——, *Meisterwerke deutscher Sprache aus dem neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, second edition (Zürich, 1948), pp. 188–203

Steffen, Konrad, *Adalbert Stifter: Deutungen* (Basel, 1955)

Stern, Joseph Peter, 'Adalbert Stifter: "Erhebung without Motion"', in *Idylls and Realities: Studies in Nineteenth-Century German Literature* (London, 1971), pp. 97–122

——, 'Adalbert Stifters ontologischer Stil', in *Adalbert Stifter: Studien und Interpretationen: Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, edited by Lothar Stiehm (Heidelberg, 1968), pp. 103–20

——, *Re-Interpretations: Seven Studies in Nineteenth-Century German Literature* (London, 1964), pp. 239–300, 351–62

Stiehm, Lothar (ed.), *Adalbert Stifter: Studien und Interpretationen: Gedenkschrift zum 100. Todestage*, edited by Lothar Stiehm (Heidelberg, 1968)

Stillmark, Alexander, 'Stifter contra Hebbel: An Examination of the Sources of their Disagreement', *GLL*, 21, No. 2 (1968), 93–102

——, 'Stifter's *Letzte Mappe* and the Idea of Wholeness', in *Tradition and Creation: Essays in Honour of Elizabeth Mary Wilkinson*, edited by C. P. Magill, Brian A. Rowley and Christopher J. Smith (Leeds, 1978), pp. 162–76

——, 'Stifter's Symbolism of Beauty: The Significance of the Flower in his Works', *OGS*, 6 (1971–72), 74–92

Stopp, Frederick J., 'Die Symbolik in Stifters *Bunten Steinen*', *DVLG*, 28 (1954), 165–93

Stowell, John D., 'Some Archetypes in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*: An Attempt at Restoring Fictional Interest', *Sem*, 6 (1970), 31–47

Swales, Martin, *The German Bildungsroman from Wieland to Hesse* (Princeton, 1978)

Swales, Martin and Erika, *Adalbert Stifter: A Critical Study* (Cambridge, 1984)

Teutschmann, Heinrich, 'Noch einmal Klotilde: zu einer Episode im *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 25 (1976), 63–65

Tielke, Martin, *Sanftes Gesetz und Historische Notwendigkeit: Adalbert Stifter zwischen Restauration und Revolution* (Frankfurt am Main, 1979)

Tismar, Jens, *Gestörte Idyllen: eine Studie zur Problematik der idyllischen Wunschvorstellungen am Beispiel von Jean Paul, Adalbert Stifter, Robert Walser und Thomas Bernhard* (Munich, 1973)

Vancsa, Kurt, 'Ist Adalbert Stifters dichterische Welt eine Utopie?: Variationen um eine Briefstelle', VASILO, 5 (1956), 153–62

——, 'Stifter im Zwielicht: ein Forschungsbericht' *VASILO*, 7, (1958), 92–105

Vorbach, Berta, *Adalbert Stifter und die Frau* (Reichenberg, 1936)

Wagner, Johanna, 'Adalbert Stifters dichterisches Schaffen im Lichte der Psychologie' (unpublished dissertation, Innsbruck, 1949)

Wagner, Karl, '"Patriarchalisches Stilleben"?: ein sozialgeschichtlicher Versuch über Stifters *Nachsommer*', *VASILO*, 29 (1980), 139–65

Weiss, Walter, 'Antworten österreichischer Gegenwartsliteratur auf Adalbert Stifter', *VASILO*, 32 (1983), 133–43

——, *Stifters Reduktionen*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, 15 (Innsbruck, 1969)

Wildbolz, Rudolf, *Adalbert Stifter: Langeweile und Faszination* (Stuttgart, 1976)

Wolbrandt, Christine, *Der Raum in der Dichtung Adalbert Stifters*, Zürcher Beiträge zur deutschen Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte, 29 (Zürich, 1967)

Wysling, Hans, 'Stifter und Gotthelf: ein Vergleich ihrer Darstellungsweise' (unpublished dissertation, Zürich, 1953)

Zinck, Karl Hugo, 'Motive und Motivverknüpfungen in den beiden Fassungen des *Beschriebenen Tännlings*: ein Beitrag zu dem Problem der Gestaltung und der Gestalt in der Dichtung von Adalbert Stifter', *VASILO*, 16 (1967), 9–24

INDEX

Brigid Haines focuses on the crucial interplay between dialogue and narrative in Adalbert Stifter's works and relates this to their overall structure. Stifter, a conservative and often didactic writer, is nevertheless shown to present a complex view of reality which incorporates subjective and sometimes subversive voices. In *Der beschriebene Tännling* the characters' utterances relativize the narrator's apparently objective account, while in the Bildungsroman *Der Nachsommer* one subjective voice succeeds in calling into question the validity of the tightly-woven rhetorical creed on which the novel is based. Stifter achieved a more open form in his final novel, *Die Mappe meines Urgroßvaters*, which articulates honestly his own doubts about the adequacy of human communication and understanding.