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INTRODUCTION

It was the literary fate of Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz to believe passionately in the cause of Sturm and Drang, to expend some of his best efforts in its defense, and to be overshadowed, even during his most productive years, by the genius of Goethe. And of this he was painfully aware for as long as he lived. Not only the reading public but also literary critics have virtually ignored the majority of Lenz's works, preferring to concentrate most of their attention on two plays, Der Hofmeister oder Vorteile der Privaterziehung and Die Soldaten, and to a lesser extent, on the seldom-performed comedies Der Neue Menoza oder Geschichte des kumbanischen Prinzen Tandi and Die Freunde machen den Philosophen.

In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in Lenz as an innovative poet in his own right, and in his distinct place independent of Goethe in German literary history. Georg Kayser, Karl Guthke, and René Girard have spoken of Lenz as one of the founders of modern tragi-comedy. Elizabeth Genton has traced Lenz's relationship with other members of the Sturm und Drang through his unpublished
letters. Walther Hinck has suggested that Lenz be considered a precursor of late nineteenth century naturalism. All these studies, however, concentrate on that restricted number of plays which I mentioned above.

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine an important series of works, which Lenz wrote in 1774 and 1775, and which present a hitherto mostly ignored aspect of Lenz's literary production. In these eight works, i.e. *Pandänonium Germanicum, Die Wolken, Die Verteidigung des Herrn W. Gegen die Wolken, Der neue Menoza oder die Geschichte des kumbanischen Prinzen Tandi, Selbstrezension des neuen Menoza, Zerbin oder die neuere Philosophie, Menalk und Mopsus* and *Der Magister*, Lenz adopts the violent satire of Aristophanes to attack Christoph Martin Wieland as the foremost representative of the Rococo movement who was so deeply despised by many of the young Stürmer and Dränger. This explosion of satire is all the more amazing in that it runs counter to much of the German comic tradition and certainly represents a very drastic deviation from the literary practices of the preceding decades of the eighteenth century.

The dissertation is divided into two main parts: (1) a brief survey of comedy and satire in Germany until 1750 which will provide the historical background for an informed appreciation of Lenz's originality in this field,
and (2) a detailed examination of the individual works which will determine Lenz's specific objections to Wieland, uncover some of the satiric devices he used, and clarify as many of the literary allusions as possible. It was necessary to combine historical research with literary criticism in this section because of the dearth of secondary material on the subject. A final chapter in this section will present an objective appraisal of Wieland in the light of Lenz's sudden and surprising reconciliation with his erstwhile antagonist.
PART I

THE COMIC-SATIRIC TRADITION IN GERMANY BEFORE LENZ
CHAPTER I

THE THEORY OF SATIRE FROM OPITZ TO GOTTSCHEID

The function of satire and the position of the satirist in literature underwent a significant development in Germany during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Any treatment of Lenz as a satirist must, therefore, first ascertain his position in relation to this historical development. It must answer the question: does his work continue the trend set by his predecessors, or must he be considered an outsider who stands apart from the conventions of literary satire in his time? It will be necessary to discuss this change in attitude towards satire fully so that we may understand Lenz's position with regard to his predecessors.

I begin by describing those definitions of satire which the leading theoreticians of the age gave, and by commenting on their pronouncements concerning the subject of satire. We must keep in mind, however, that these statements need not necessarily be true reflections of what was actually being written as satirical literature during the respective periods. The question of the disparity between the aesthetic definition of satire and its practice in
literature will be dealt with at the end of the first chapter.

It was Martin Opitz who formulated the most influential theory of literary aesthetics for the Baroque age. In his Buch von der deutschen Poeterei (1624), a short section is devoted to a definition of the satire:

Zue einer Satyra gehören zwei dinge; die lehre von gueten sitten und ehrbaren wandel, und höffliche reden und schertzworte. Ihr vornemstes aber und gleichsam als die ist, die harte verweisung der laster und anmahnung zue der tugend: welches zue vollbringen sie mit allerley stachligen und spitzfindigen [spöttisch, stachlicht] reden, wie mit scharfen pfeilen, umb sich schieuszt. Und haben alle Satyrische scribenten zum gebrauche, das sie ungeschehet sich vor feinde aller laster angeben, und jahrer besten freunde ja jhrer selbst auch nicht verschonen, damit sie nur andere bestechen [wound slightly] mögen: wie es denn alle drei Horatius, Juvenalis und Persius meisterlich an den Tag geben.¹

Immediately following this, he deals with the epigram in one paragraph in which he states that the epigram has to be considered in conjunction with the satire because
die Satyra ein lang Epigramma und das Epigramma eine kurze Satyra ist.²

He further adds that the writer of (satires and) epigrams would be well-advised to confine his works to the praise of important men and women and to beware of "spöttischer hönerey

¹Martin Opitz, Buch von der deutschen Poeterei (1624), p. 20.
²Ibid., pp. 20-21.
"und auffruck [Vorwurf] anderer leute laster und gebrechen."
In the light of these quotes, Opitz's views on satire appear to be quite contradictory. His opening statement begins with an expression of sympathy for the aims of satire. The second requirement for a satire, however, is incompatible with the actual practice of this genre. How can a satirist employ "höfliche reden" in connection with what Opitz refers to as the "vornemste" quality of satire, the "harte verweisung der laster und anmahnung zue der tugend?" The answer is that he cannot: satire ceases to exist when attempts are made to turn it into a didactic piece of writing which would border on the sermon, and to rob it of its inherently aggressive nature. As Opitz continues, he again implies a feeling of sympathy with satirists by stating how boldly they declare themselves the enemies of all vices, sparing neither their friends nor themselves. With this statement, all the motives of the satirist are placed in a questionable light. Why had the satirist been such an outspoken foe of vice? To enable him to wound (bestechen) others. If one prefers to use the other possible meaning of the word, to bribe, which indeed was in use during Opitz's lifetime, then the passage becomes an even greater indictment of the satirist's motives. These statements, coupled with what has been said in the paragraph devoted to the
epigram, reveal that Opitz is not the champion of fearless, vituperative satire, but rather an advocate of a genre with a much more placating approach to the realities of society. The attempt to improve morals and to educate is basic to his definition of the term, but this is not to be achieved through a direct attack on any one individual. Opitz addresses himself specifically to the question of finding the appropriate subject matter for an epigram. Bearing in mind his equating of the two forms, we arrive at a clearer view of his intentions for the satire:

Wiewol aber das Epigrama aller sachen und wörter fähig ist, soll es doch lieber in Venerischem wesen, überschriften der begräbnisse und gebäwe, Lobe vornemer Männer und Frawen, kurzweiligen schertzreden und anderem, es sey was es wolle, bestehen, . . . ³

Proceeding from this statement of the function of the "kurze Satyra," then, his definition of the full-length satire would necessarily exclude all works with any real satiric content. His closing words indicate that a vicious individual attack would have been an admission of overweening pride and presumption:

Denn es ist eine anzeigung eines unverschämtten sicheren gemütes, einen jetweden, wie unvernunftige thiere thun, ohne unterscheidt anlauffen.⁴

³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
After reading Opitz's thoughts on the satire, the reader is left with the feeling that Opitz has tried to reconcile satire's innately aggressive nature with a politic approach towards well-positioned members of society, who would be the most obvious targets of satirical attacks. This is less than honest, but is an unquestionably expedient policy dictated by the dependent position of the writer. Since they were, almost as a matter of rule, in positions of social and economic dependence on the nobility, many writers during this period were forced to rely on patronage for their existence. If they wrote effective satire, they would undoubtedly have lost even those minor official positions at court, in the universities and schools, or as clerks which most of them needed to make a living. The reading public, accustomed to literature which was patterned after the French classicists and the Pléiade, demanded works which were written according to a canon of good literary taste. Writers in the Baroque age were no longer interested in the violent attacks, polemics and bitter satires of the Reformation. An ordered, temperate and meticulously structured literature allowed little room for the satire of the ancients. Christian Reuter (1665-1710?) represented an exception to this trend in the German Baroque. His excellent satire of the Baroque novel, Schelmuffsky Curiose und Sehr gefährliche
Reisebeschreibung zu Wasser und Land (1696), can not, because of its appearance at the very end of the seventeenth century, be considered typical of the literature of the age.

This aversion to real satire becomes obvious also in August Buchner's Anleitung zur deutschen Poeterey (1665) which leans heavily upon Opitz as far as the title is concerned, but does show a certain transition in respect to its content. It must be remembered that Opitz exerted an enormous influence on the seventeenth century. He was able to re-introduce some order into literary aesthetics, which too long had been in a chaotic state. His contemporaries and the writers of the later seventeenth century considered him to be the one man who had made it possible for them to flourish within, and to find guidance from, a clearly defined code of taste. It would have been unthinkable that anyone following in Opitz's wake should deviate significantly from his tenets. Buchner begins with a derivation of the satire:

Aus dieser [der Comödie] die Satyra entsprungen/ welche die Fehler und Laster der Menschen höflich durchziehet und mitten unter dem Lachen und Schertzen nützlich Anweisung zur Tugend thut.⁵

No longer is mention made of a purely ornamental function for satire, such as was the case with Opitz's paragraph

---

⁵August Buchner, Anleitung zur Deutschen Poeterey (1665), p. 10.
devoted to the epigram. Here again a key word is "höflich," implying not only the politeness necessary in so delicate a matter as pointing up the vices and mistakes of others, but also indicating the close connections with the court and courtly society, who, after all, were the main consumers and supporters of the literature of the age. Buchner leaves one with the impression that, although all actions on the part of the satirist must be circumspect, at least there is room for genuine "attack" on the vices of a period. The satirist is no longer relegated to the position of being completely subservient to the wishes of the nobility. He must no longer confine himself as poet to inscriptions on headstones and buildings which glorify his wealthy patrons.

But for the first significant break with the tradition created by Opitz and carried on by Buchner, we must look to Christian Thomasius. He was the first to use the German language in his university lectures instead of Latin and he published the first monthly scholarly journal (1688) written in the German language. Thomasius was indebted to the French for examples of how a national language and literature could be cultivated, and yet he questioned the supremacy of the French application of the Aristotelian unities and rules of the theater (la bienséance, la vraisemblance). One would expect some changes also with
respect to the definition of satire from an individual who was bold enough to attack the dogma of Opitz and French Classicism, and who was innovative enough to question the weight of tradition; and one is not disappointed. The inviolability of old rules for writing satire seems as questionable as that of the old rules of theater. In his "Höchstnötige Cautelen für einen Studiosus Juris," the eighth chapter of the work entitled Von dem Studio der Poesie (1713), Thomasius introduces his section pertaining to satire with a comment on the derivation of the term:

Die satirischen Schriften kommen ursprünglich von den Komödien her, in welchen man vor Zeiten Satyros aufführte, die die Laster der Leute auf beissende Art durchziehen mussten.⁶

Thomasius has gone back to the original form of the satire, as evidenced by the use of "beissende" as opposed to Opitz's and Buchner's "höfflich," in order to find a new justification for satire. Even though his statement shows an almost identical formulation in the key phrase, "... welche die Fehler und Laster der Menschen höfflich durchziehet ..."⁷ as compared to "... die die Laster der Leute auf

---


⁷Buchner, p. 10.
beissende Art durchziehen mussten," the difference between "höflich" and "beissend" radically alters the two definitions, the one a qualifying and delimiting factor, the other a violent admonition to action. Thomasius now deals with the problem of the pasquill and of whether a satirist should name the individual being satirized:

Nach der Zeit haben die Poeten ganze satirische Komödien gemacht, auch ausser den Komödien Satiren geschrieben, die aber diesen Fehler haben, dass weil die Personen darinnen mit Namen genannt werden, man leicht eine Satire von einer geschriebenen Injurie unterscheiden können. Und also hätten sich die heutigen Satirici vor diesem Fehler hauptsächlich hüllen sollen, zu mal da die Exempel der römischen Satiricorum sich auf unsere Zeiten gar nicht schicken. Die grösste Kunst eines Satirici bestehet darinnen, dass er zweideutig schreibt, doch so, dass der Leser den verborgenen Verstand und die rechte Meinung ohne sonderbare Mühe erraten kann.9

One should avoid using the real name of the object of a personal satire since this would border on the pasquill. Ambiguity is recommended so that the author will avoid the dangers inherent in a direct attack, and, at the same time, the reader will not fail to see his point. This seems a rather fine line of distinction and hardly worth the trouble if the veil of ambiguity is so easily pierced. One must bear in mind, however, that to be guilty of writing a

---

8 Thomasius, p. 124.

9 Ibid.
pasquill was, at this time, tantamount to slander, and, as such, punishable by imprisonment. Those people most likely to be satirized were generally powerful members of the wealthy ruling class. The fact that a literary attack on another person was regarded as an un-Christian act also played a role in turning the satire into a less than acceptable literary form. When Thomasius talks of a "geschriebene Injurie," he is, of course, including in this category the pasquill. The change in attitude towards the satire, exemplified by this quote, reflects Thomasius' ideas rather than an actual change in public opinion. It appears that Thomasius is offering the young author a guide through which he can maintain his integrity and yet stay out of the way of oppressive forces always present in the scholarly-literary world. This element of sympathy and encouragement distinguishes Thomasius from his predecessors and contemporaries. For the first time since the Renaissance the idea of satire as literature has been reintroduced into German literature, and the man who accomplished this had much personal experience with the satiric form through his monthly journal, which was noted for its bitter attacks on Aristotelian dogma. But even he vacillated between dogmatic Protestant thought and innovative reform. In his Kurze Abfertigung (1693), one can clearly follow the swing from his first period of "avant-garde"
activity to an extended period of devout Pietism. He explains in this work that God has granted him mercy in that he has been shown the vanity of the satiric form of writing. Thomasius then pledges to demonstrate how the satire is anathema to the word of God and the rules of Christianity. By the year 1713, the date of Von dem Studio der Poesie, the pendulum has again returned to a less extreme position, as evidenced by the more tolerant outlook towards the satiric form. His next words, therefore, present a return to prevalent thought on the satire:

Es mögen aber die Satiren so behutsam geschrieben werden, als sie immer wollen, so tut doch ein Liebehaber der Weisheit wohl, wann er sich solcher Schreibart enthält; denn es kann nicht fehlen, er muss sich Feinde dadurch machen und den Leser bessert er auch nicht damit, da seine eigene heimlich Ehr- und Rachbegierde wird dadurch nur gestärkt.10

Making enemies is indeed an obvious result of writing successful satire, but how one's personal ambition and lust for revenge will be strengthened through the use of the satiric "Schreibart" is unclear. It would seem plausible that Thomasius wishes only to lighten the effect of his rather bold statements by paying lip-service, at least in some measure, to Opitz. And he continues with yet another

10 Ibid.
reversal:

Die Lesung aber satirischer Schriften schadet einem Liebhaber der Weisheit, der sich um die Erkenntnis des allgemeinen und seines eigenen Elends bekümmert, gar nicht; denn er findet darinnen die Torheit und Laster der Menschen deutlich beschrieben und mit lebendigen Farben abgemalet.\textsuperscript{11}

The reader has now been offered a positive view of the purpose of the satirist's art: satirical writings aim at satire's traditional targets, human stupidity and vice, which are effectively held up to ridicule. While exhibiting many resemblances to Opitz in the form of the satire, Thomasius has succeeded in conveying a much more permissive attitude towards satire without directly condoning vituperation.

Johann Christoph Gottsched was responsible for introducing French classical ideas of the theater into Germany during the Enlightenment. In his \textit{Versuch einer kritischen Dichtkunst vor die Deutschen} (1730), a work largely dependent on Nicolas Boileau's \textit{L'Art poétique} (1674), Gottsched presented the Germans with a literary handbook that served to join the rationalistic philosophical ideas of the age to literature. According to Boileau, the most important factor in the creation of a work of art was the use of reason, which would insure the representation of the good, the true and the beautiful. Boileau also required

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid.
the use of Aristotle's unities and the strict separation of tragedy and comedy. The rigorous requirements of the classical French theater were exactly what Gottsched needed to combat the mannered excesses of the Baroque which were still present in the German theater of his day. Gottsched was able to destroy a good deal of the influence of the Spanish "novela picaresca" and the Italian "arlecchino," in Germany. His reforms substituted, for the "Hanswurst," the operas and the "Haupt- und Staatsaktionen," a theater based on the ancients and on their French imitators.

Gottsched's thoughts on satire represent therefore almost the same view that his predecessor Opitz promulgated more than a century earlier, and this in spite of Gottsched's avowed antibaroque sentiments. Both men effected widespread reform based indirectly on classical models, both were considered by their contemporaries to have been literary preceptors, and both have been judged by posterity to have been, at best, mediocre literary talents. Each believed that obedience to a set of rules was more important for the production of literature than any inborn talent on the part of the author. This is, of course, a gross oversimplification, but it does serve to point up the similarity between the position of Opitz and Gottsched historically and with regard to their positions as preceptists. Opitz
is considered to represent the Baroque, and Gottsched, the Enlightenment period of literature. When, however, one realizes that they were attempting to effect badly needed reform based on Aristotle and the French, it becomes clear that both were classicists, Opitz belonging to what Richard Alewyn calls the "vorbarocker Klassizismus" and Gottsched to the "nachbarocker Klassizismus."

The difference between Gottsched and Opitz in their treatment of the satiric mode is to be found in Gottsched's use of Aristotle as a source when discussing the origins of satire:

Es ist nämlich bekannt, dass alle Götter der Griechen vormals Menschen gewesen seyn sollten, die nur wegen ihrer Vortrefflichkeit unter die Einwohner des Himmels wären aufgenommen worden. Bey solchen Lobliedern nun, schlichen sich auch die stachlichsten Spottgesänge mit ein. Aristoteles gedenkt, dass man schon vor Homers Zeiten schimpfliche Lieder auf die Leute gemacht, und sie sehr anzüglich darinnen herumgenommen. Selbist Homer hat auf einen gewissen Müßiggänger, Margites, eine Satire gemacht.\textsuperscript{12}

The attempt to derive the origins of satire from the Greek custom of apotheosizing heroes, although not present in Aristotle, appears quite plausible when one recalls the all too human qualities of the Homeric deities. The bards

\textsuperscript{12}Johann Christoph Gottsched, \textit{Verauch einer kritischen Dichtkunst vor die Deutschen} (1730), p. 83.
responsible for transmitting the history and mythology to succeeding generations through song and poetry would have found it easy to extend the scope of their work to include topical problems. The result of this process would then have been either parody, pasquill or satire. In his main chapter dealing with satire, however, Gottsched further elaborates on this same part of the Poetics in a questionable manner:

Aristoteles, der uns dieses im vierten Kapitel seiner Dichtkunst erzählt, setzet hinzu: dass diese Lieder sehr unflätig und garstig gewesen, und dass Homerus sie zuerst von dieser Unart gesaubert, da er in heroischen Versen auf den Margites eine Satire gemacht. Dieser Margites, wie schon bey anderer Gelegenheit gedacht worden, mochte ein Müßiggänger gewesen seyn, der weder einen Schäfer, noch einen Ackermann, noch einen Winzer abgeben wollte; und also nach der damaligen Art ein unnützes Glied der menschlichen Gesellschaft war. Auf diesen machte nun Homer ein Strafgedicht, welches er von den oben erwähnten Fehlern der Grobheit und Schandbarkeit befreyete; und gab uns also, nach Aristoteles Urtheile, den ersten Begriff von einer guten Satire, wie er uns vom Heldengedichte das erste gute Muster gemacht. Da aber dieses seinen Nachfolgern Gelegenheit gegeben, die Tragödie zu erfinden; so hat auch jene nämlich die Satire, zur Erfindung der Komödie Anlass gegeben.13

Nowhere does Aristotle actually state that the phallic performances of pre-Homeric poetry were "unflätig" or "garstig." At one point he does use the words "grotesque language" in

\footnote{13Tbid., p. 548.}
reference to the origins of tragedy and, by extension, comedy:

Going back to the improvisations in which it at first consisted (and so the comedy-tragedy began with the leaders of the dithyramb, and comedy with the leaders of the phallic performances) . . .
As to its amplitude: it [tragedy] acquired its serious character at a late stage, when it outgrew slight fables and grotesque language . . . 14

This does not seem to be a very significant liberty on Gottsched's part since phallic celebrations were characterized by obscenities and crudities. In the next clause, however, Gottsched reports that, according to Aristotle, Homer was the first to clean up this "Unart." But when we read Aristotle's text we find that he says no such thing in the Poetics:

The more serious writers imitated illustrious doings, involving illustrious persons: the lighter-minded imitated those of low people, at first in the form of flytings, 15 while others were writing hymns and encomiums. We cannot tell of any such light poem by any one before Homer, though it is likely there were many who wrote them, but beginning with Homer we can: his Margites, for instance, . . . And just as Homer was the great exemplar of High poetry, being the only poet who not only wrote nobly


15 "Flyting," Websters Third International Dictionary (1961), p. 880: "A dispute or exchange of personal abuse or ridicule in verse form between two characters in a poem . . . or between two poets . . ."
but also made dramatic imitations, so too he was the first to adumbrate the outlines of comedy by making his drama not vituperative but ludicrous.\textsuperscript{16} The change from vituperative to ludicrous may or may not indicate a cleansing of the language of comedy, but, since the work has been lost, speculation would seem fruitless. Aristotle certainly never stated that Homer had done away with comedy's affinity for obscenities; in fact, he does state that there were no other examples of "any such light poem by any one before Homer." The way in which this cleansing was to have been effected, the change to an heroic verse form, would also, upon examination of Aristotle, seem to be contradicting Gottsched's interpretation. Aristotle explains that in the \textit{Margites}:

\dots the iambic meter came into use, in virtue of its appropriateness for the purpose; that is how the meter got its present name, because it was the name of the lampoons in which they attacked each other. So it came about that some of the early poets wrote heroic verse and others in iambics.\textsuperscript{17}

Gottsched is clearly mistaken in thinking that heroic verse is introduced into satire in the \textit{Margites}. The \textit{Oxford Companion to Classical Literature} does mention that the \textit{Margites} was a satirical epic and that "iambics were here

\textsuperscript{16}Aristotle, pp. 22-23.

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 23.
and there intermixed in it with hexameters."18 The contrib-
ution to satire contained in the Margites would then seem
to be exactly the opposite of what Gottsched claims when he
states that Homer "... in heroischen Versen auf den
Margites eine Satire gemacht." His real contribution was
the introduction, in the Margites, of iambics into a genre
dominated by the heroic hexameter. It is for this reason
that Aristotle credits Homer with the creation of the
comedy.19

18 The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, ed. by

19 Quoted in Manfred Forderer, Zum Homerischen
Margites (Amsterdam 1960), p. 11. The question of whether
or not Homer actually was the author of the Margites has
been the subject of much literary scholarship. Pauly in
the Real-Encyclopädie presents the facts relating to the
Margites in great detail. His final conclusion is that the
work could not have been written before the sixth century
B.C. which would, of course, preclude Homer's having written
it. One of the reasons for dating the work so late is,
according to Pauly, the presence of both hexameter and trimeter.
This mixture of hexameter and iambic verse is a tech-
nique which could only have been achieved by a "sentimental"
in Schiller's sense of the term poet. It is then left to
the reader to conclude that since Homer was the personifica-
tion of the "naïv" (again Schiller's term) poet he could
scarcely have written the Margites. Pauly believes that the
Margites-figure is an early Schwank character, much like
Till Eulenspiegel and therefore belongs to Greek literature
in common and to no one specific author. The recent dis-
covery (1954) of seventeen additional lines of the Margites
has resulted in further discussion of its authorship and
position as a pseudo-Homeric work. Manfred Forderer pre-
sents a good case for attributing the work once again to
Homer. This is not the place to discuss the merits of his
One result of Gottsched's refusal to tolerate what he terms "Grobheit" or "Schandbarkeit" is the complete lack of any mention of Aristophanes, surely one of the finest of satirists. The only other explanation for the failure on Gottsched's part to have ever mentioned him would be due, quite simply, to his having been unfamiliar with his works. And yet one can scarcely believe that the plays of Aristophanes, so popular with the great figures of the Reformation, with Hans Sachs, Melanchthon, Erasmus and Nicodemus Frischlin, and familiar to his French source Boileau, could have remained unknown to someone as well-informed in literature as Gottsched was. Much more plausible is the assumption that Gottsched chose to avoid any discussion of a writer whose works contained grotesque figures which resemble the "Hanswurst" figure in Baroque literature, and who advocated violent satire to destroy the enemies of the state. Gottsched does, however, correct his immediate predecessors, Opitz and Buchner, by stating that satire, not as a literary genre, but in the form of personal attacks, gave birth to comedy and not the reverse. Herbert J. Rose, in his Handbook of Greek Literature, describes the origins of comedy in the article, but since Aristotle firmly believed in the Homeric authorship of the Margites and Gottsched used him as an authority there can be no argument with my discussing Gottsched's interpretation, or rather false interpretation, of the material in Aristotle.
following manner:

Both literary and archaeological evidence show that it was the custom in early times at Athens and the smaller towns and villages of Attica to engage in a performance known as a "komos," or band of revelling dancers and singers, who often wore grotesque disguises, including masks, etc., representing beasts or birds. This was not merry-making, at least not regularly or normally so; rather was it a religious ceremony of a joyous type. The mummers, if we may call them so, were honoring deities of fertility, and especially, it would seem, the greatest and most popular of such divinities, Dionysos himself. It was the opinion of Aristotle that comedy originated from the leaders of these processions or dances, which he calls "phallika," because they regularly carried large images of the male organ of reproduction, the phallos. That such people had anything like dialogue or dramatic representation of any kind as part of their performance, in Attica, we are not told, though it is not an unlikely thing in itself that they had.20

The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature says essentially the same thing with one slight addition which is pertinent:

The word "komos"; there were several kinds of "komoi" and they took place on festivals, particularly of Dionysus, and consisted of, or wound up with a procession of revellers, singing, dancing, and bantering the onlookers;21

and further:

Lucilius first gave to the satire a definite character of outspoken personal criticism, herein following the Old Attic Comedy.22

---


22Ibid., p. 247.
The Handbook of Classical Drama treats the subject in the following way:

No element is more indigenous to Attic comedy than indecent personal abuse. Such abuse was one of the most important features of the old Phallic ceremonies—ritualistic abuse, designed to drive out the evil spirit of sterility. From the beginning it was directed towards specific individuals and was outrageously frank and obscene. The literary development of comedy had subordinated such abuse to the dramatic plot, but the poets still clung to this privilege.²³

There seems, then, to be plenty of evidence that satire, in the form of personal abuse during phallic rituals, did indeed give rise to the Old Attic Comedy, which in turn was followed by the Middle and New Comedy. Gottsched was then correct in calling satiric attacks on specific individuals or institutions the parent form of Greek comedy. His failure, however, to admit that any obscenity or vulgarity existed in the genre of satire or comedy results in his presenting a purist's one-sided view of what had constituted not only the origins, but the greatest flowering of comedy and satire.

Addressing himself to satire as a literary genre, Gottsched continues in the tradition now familiar to us:

Diese [die Satire] ist die Frucht einer gründlichen Sittenlehre, und hat ordentlich die

Liebe der Tugend zur Mutter, und den Hass der Laster zum Vater.\textsuperscript{24}

This is, of course, nothing more than an attractive rephrasing of the seventeenth century credo advanced by Opitz: the purpose of satirical writing is moral improvement at the expense of vice. Gottsched now becomes quite detailed in his exposition on the satiric form:

Die wahre Satire greift also nicht unschuldige, sondern schuldige Leute an: ja sie strafet das Böse an sich, ohne die Personen, die es an sich haben, zu nennen, oder auf eine anzüglich Art zu beschimpfen.\textsuperscript{25}

Once more, great emphasis is laid on differentiating between a gratuitous personal attack and the moral edification envisioned by Gottsched as the necessary concomitant of satire. The satirist is warned to avoid naming the personal object of his invective since this would raise the possibility of considering the work a personal attack or pasquill. Gottsched then proceeds to outline some of the consequences of the pasquill:

Und also ist es gewiss, dass man die wahre Satire mit gottlosen Pasquillen oder Lästerschriften nicht zu vermischen habe. Jene ist die Seele aller Kömodien, . . . diese aber sind Stifterinnen unzähllichen Unheils, weswegen sie auch durch die Gesetze der Obrigkeit allzeit verbothen und scharf bestrafet worden.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{24}Gottsched, p. 115.
\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 116.
An interesting anecdote is related in Rose's *Handbook of Greek Literature*. Kleon is purported to have brought suit against a famous "Stifter des Unheils," Aristophanes, for a particular lampoon. There are indeed indications that a law forbidding the mention of any specific names in a comedy was in force in Greece for a very short period of time, possibly two years.

After this condemnation of the pasquill, Gottsched offers a definition of the term:

> Sie ist nämlich ein moralisches Strafgedicht über einreissende Laster, darinn entweder das Lächerlich derselben entdecket; oder das abscheulich Wesen der Bosheit, mit lebhaften Farben abgeschildert wird.\(^27\)

A second attempt at definition then follows:

> Mann kann also sagen, die Satire sey eine Abschilderung lasterhafter Handlungen, oder das Gegenteil von den Lobgedichten: welche nur die guten und löblichen Thaten der Menschen abschildern und erheben.\(^28\)

These definitions point up how very little Gottsched has progressed from Opitz's statement pertaining to the purpose and function of the satire. The preoccupation with vice and virtue and the moral improvement of the reader is still paramount. Gottsched does come out against one of the major

\(^{27}\)Ibid., p. 557.

\(^{28}\)Ibid.
objections to satire. Opitz had stressed the fact that it was not really in the jurisdiction of the artist to bring his fellow men to task for their failings; this was to be left to the clergy. Gottsched, however, differs on this point:

Einen ordentlichen Beruf, die Sittenlehre zu predigen, und das Böse zu strafen, hat ein Poet auch nicht: und daher glauben viele, es stünde den geistlichen Lehrern allein zu, wider die öffentlichen Laster zu eifern. Allein auch diese irren, wenn sie meynen, dass man zu Beförderung des Guten, und zu Ausrottung des Bösen im gemeinen Wesen einen besonderen Beruf haben müsse. Ist nicht ein jeder rechtschaffener Bürger verbunden, für sich selbst, zur Aufnahme und Wohlfahrt der Republik so viel beyzutragen, als er kann? Und was bedarf er also einer neuen Bestallung, seine Einsicht in moralischen Dingen, zur gemeinen Besserung in Schriften zu zeigen? Hierzu kommt noch die Liebe zur Tugend und der heftige Abscheu vor den herrschenden Lastern . . .

In this one respect Gottsched has reversed the general mood, which tended to consider the satirist as a pariah living on the periphery of art and at the expense of his contemporaries. This feeling had even been shared by many of the satirists of the period. The office of the satirist is then no longer to be left to the spiritual leaders of the

29Ibid., p. 558.

30See Brämer's Poetik of 1744 and Johann Ulrich König.
community, but might now be accepted as a respectable position by any Bürgert. The area to be covered by the satire was also extended beyond vice and evil to include, "alle Ungereimtheiten in den Wissenschaften, freyen Künsten, Schriften, Gewohnheiten und Verrichtungen der Menschen . . ."\textsuperscript{31} While the basic tenet that satire must have a moral aim and combat vice has not changed from Opitz through Gottsched, there has been a definite shift in the attitude exhibited towards satire. Its existence was accepted more readily and its sphere of activity widened to encompass not only vice but the arts, sciences, and practically all other human activity. Gottsched also addresses himself to the question of the admissability of naming the persons satirized. He answers by citing precedents--ancient Greece, Boileau--and then by evaluating the good and bad points pertinent to each period during which the naming of names was allowed:

In der That zieht solches zwar viel Gutes, aber auch viel Böses nach sich. 1) Hindert der Poet dadurch, dass man seine Verse nicht auf die unrechten Personen deute; welches sonst gemeiniglich geschieht. zum 2) fürchten sich die Lastenhaften desto mehr: denn

\textit{Ense velut stricito, quoties Lucilius ardens/ Infremuit, rubet auditor, cui frigida mens est/Criminibus; tacita sudant praeordia}

\textsuperscript{31}Gottsched, p. 560.
culpa, inde irae et lacrimae.\textsuperscript{32}

Zum 2) aber ist es für den Poeten mehrenteils gar gefährlich, sonderlich, wenn es vornehme Leute sind.\textsuperscript{33}

Still another change is evident in Gottsched's tacit approval of the naming of names which is implied in his closing statement on this subject:

Man mag es aber machen, wie man will; so ist der Unwillen der Getroffenen nicht zu vermeiden: und wer diesen nicht erdulden kann; der muss sich entweder mit keiner Satire ans Licht wagen; oder doch nur solch Laster beschreiben, die kein Mensch begeht, das heißt, eine vergeblich Arbeit thun.\textsuperscript{34}

The alternatives are clearly presented; one must either accept the dangers inherent in writing satire or satirize those vices which no man commits. This is a very ironical summation for Gottsched, and quite surprising, considering the similarity of his views to those of Opitz. The preoccupation of the Enlightenment with rational thought and logic enabled Gottsched to conceive of satire more objectively than any of his predecessors. The balance has swung from the pre-

\textsuperscript{32}Gottsched is quoting Juvenal Book I, Satire I, lines 165-68. The reason for the capitalization of \textit{Infremuit} and \textit{Criminibus} would seem to stem from the fact that this is verse quoted as prose and \textit{Infremuit} and \textit{Criminibus} both begin new lines and should then be written with capitals.

\textsuperscript{33}Gottsched, p. 561.

\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid}. 
Gottschedian antagonism towards the satire to an attitude of
guarded acceptance of the form as a useful tool.

The last theoretical work which I will consider in
this brief outline is Johann Georg Sulzer's *Allgemeine
Theorie der schönen Künste* (1771-74). This work contains a
good discussion of the origins of the Old Comedy, with a
treatment of Aristophanes included under the heading of
satire. Reference is made to the phallic rituals and to the
custom of heaping personal abuse upon spectators during the
revels. I chose Sulzer's encyclopedic treatment of the arts
instead of one of the other aesthetic works, such as
Mendelsohn's *Über die Hauptgrundsätze der schönen Künste
und Wissenschaften* (1761), largely because of its great
effect on Wieland and on the *Stürmer und Dränger*. Sulzer
expresses the Enlightenment idea of the educative function
of art which had a definite influence on Wieland's work and
on Schiller's essay *Die Schaubühne als eine moralische
Anstalt betrachtet* (1784). Another reason for citing Sulzer
is the fact that he specifically discusses individual genres,
whereas Mendelsohn's work never treats separate genres and
would for that reason be much more difficult to approach.
In spite of Sulzer's wide acceptance by the *Sturm and Drang*
generation, there is an interesting disparity between the
two on the subject of satire. This difference may be clearer
when Lenz's satires are treated at length. Briefly, however, the satires of Lenz do not conform to what Sulzer recommends in his section on the satire. This contradiction between what Sulzer, the preceptist, advocates and what Lenz, the satirist, practices, is perhaps the main reason for closing my brief outline of theoretical works on satire with Sulzer's Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste.

Sulzer begins his treatment of the satire with an accurate analysis of the origin of Greek comedy from the functions of the chorus at certain festivals:

Herodot erzählt, dass bey den Epidauriern an einem gewissen Opferfest der Chor keine Mannesperson sondern blos Frauen mit Schimpfwörtern habe anfallen dürfen. Hier sehen wir also, dass gewisse Personen, nämlich der Chor, zu erwähnten Schimpf-und Spottreden bestellt gewesen. Es scheinet, dass diesem Chor an gewissen Festen besonders aufgetragen gewesen, das Volk auf mancherley Art zu belustigen. Dieses hat allem Ansehen nach den Ursprung der Comödie veranlasset. Dieses wäre also die erste rohste Gestalt der Satire. Alsdann entstehen aus dieser ursprünglichen Satire Comödien ... 35

He then postulates a definition of the satire as a modern form of the ancient custom of sanctioned personal abuse:

Man kann also überhaupt sagen, die Satire, in sofern sie als ein Werk des Geschmacks betrachtet wird, sey ein Werk, darin Thorheiten,

Laster, Vorurtheile, Misbräuche und andre der Gesellschaft, darin wir leben, nachtheilige, in einer verkehrten Art zu denken oder zu empfinden gegründete Dinge, auf eine ernsthafte, oder spöttische Weise, aber mit belustigendem Witz und Laune gerügt, und den Menschen zu ihrer Beschämung, und in der Absicht sie zu bessern, vorgesehen werden.  

This statement really contains nothing new or startling when compared with Gottsched and the theoreticians of the Baroque and Enlightenment periods. Improvement of the individual is still considered the principal goal of a satire. The necessity for humor is specifically mentioned, but then this quality could have been postulated by any of Sulzer's predecessors as a concomitant to satire. If comedy did have its origins in the obscene humor of bacchanalian revels, it is logical that some measure of this humor may be retained in satire. Sulzer then continues in a predictable fashion:

Wir schliessen von der Satire aus die schimpflichen oder spöttischen Anfälle auf einzelne Personen, oder Stände, die blos von persönlicher Feindschaft herrühren, und Privatrache zum Grund haben.  

In this instance he is referring to the proscription of the pasquill emphasized by all those writers of treatises, such as Gottsched, Opitz, Buchner, Thomasius, Johann Gotthelf Lindner, and Johann August Eberhard, who have in any way

36 Ib., p. 130.
37 Ibid.
dealt with the satire. That the majority of the Greek and Roman satires were pasquills seems to have escaped Sulzer's attention:

Wir sehen auch nicht, dass die sogenannten Silli\textsuperscript{38} der Griechen, die eigentliche Schmäh- und Nachgedichte waren, die beissenden Jamben des Archilochus, die Oden des Horaz, darin er eine Canidia, oder andere Personen feindselig anfällt, oder endlich die spöttischen Simmgedichte, wodurch Martial sich, an manchem Feind rächt, unter die Satiren wären gezählt worden.\textsuperscript{39}

Sulzer's arbitrary statement reveals not only his own opinions on what the content of a satire must be, but also what close connections he maintains with Enlightenment thought and values. He seems oblivious to the fact that Archilochus became known to history as a "scorpion-tongued"\textsuperscript{40} satirist, that the Epodes of Horace—Sulzer has incorrectly cited Canidia as a figure in the Odes—are in form and spirit descended from the invective of Archilochus, or that the "Silli" are primarily satiric poems. Sulzer's censure of Martial must have been founded on the obscenity contained in many of the Epigrams, for Martial never names the person he


\textsuperscript{39}Sulzer, pp. 130-31.

\textsuperscript{40}Oxford Companion, p. 39: "Eustathius spoke of him as 'scorpion-tongued.'"
is satirizing; his aim having been "parcere personis, dicere de vitis." The artificial category set up in the Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste ignores the reality of the situation and the very definition of satire. The examples which have been proscribed are those works which have often served as paragons of the satiric form.

The nature of the satire is next treated by Sulzer:

Hier merken wir zuvorderst an, dass ihr Stoff eine herrschende Abweichung von Vernunft, Geschmack, Tugend, von guter Lebensart, oder endlich von anständigen Sitten sey, die zugleich Wichtigkeit genug habe, um öffentlich gerügt zu werden, damit die Menschen davor verwahret, oder die, welche davor angestekt sind, davor abgebracht werden.\(^{42}\)

Any deviation from the Enlightenment goals of "Vernunft," "Geschmack," or "Tugend" is fit material as subject matter of a satire. He remembers to include in his description a word on the presumed beneficial effects of satire in improving those individuals towards whom the satire is directed and in giving pause for thought to other readers who might have contemplated such transgressions:

Der Endzweck der Satire ist, dem Übel, das sie zum Inhalt gewählt hat, zu steuern, es zu

\(^{41}\)Quoted in The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, p. 262.

\(^{42}\)Sulzer, p. 131.
verbannen, oder wenigstens sich dem weiteren 
Einreissen desselben zu wider setzen, und die 
Menschen davon abzuschrecken.\textsuperscript{43}

The works cited up to this point have, with little 
exception, expressed the theoretical view of the Baroque and 
the Enlightenment periods of literature towards the function 
of satire in society. Great stress has been laid on the 
fact that the object of satire is to improve the morals of 
the reader and that this is not to be achieved at the expense 
of another human being. In other words, the satirist is not 
to name the object of his personal attack. Had these rigid 
requirements been adhered to, the writing of satire would 
never have reached the status of literature during this age. 
There were fortunately, however, exceptional individuals who 
fought the stultifying system established by tradition and 
expediency.

The Enlightenment produced the controversial figure 
of Christian Ludwig Liscow, a writer whom some scholars\textsuperscript{44} 
consider to have been an outstanding satirist. His dispute 
with Johann Ernst Philippi, a professor of rhetoric and the 
object of several of Liscow's satires, provides the modern 
reader with an excellent example of what an Aristophanic

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{44}See G. G. Gervinus, W. Scherer, H. Kurz, and A. 
Koberstein.
satire really is. The object is no longer primarily to edify the reader, but rather to destroy totally an opponent who is considered an enemy of society. The language never shies away from the crude or obscene. Because of his anonymity, ruthlessness, and crudity of language, many scholars\textsuperscript{45} feel that Liscow was nothing more than a cowardly slanderer who was afraid to acknowledge his own works. One thing is certain: he did not subscribe to the dictates of men like Gottsched. He never hesitated to name his opponent or to use profanity in his very violent attacks. Liscow's existence proves the possibility of a literary form of attack apart from what was being advocated by Opitz and his successors. Lessing and Lichtenberg would also have to be included in this group. Lessing's "Anti-Goeze," for example, contains some excellent satirical pieces, and Lichtenberg's detailed explanations of Hogarth's etchings are astounding interpretations of bitter visual satire.

\textsuperscript{45}See P. Richter, W. Wackernagel and H. Hettner.
CHAPTER II

THE FASTNACHTSPIELE AND LATER FOREIGN INFLUENCES

In addition to the writers just mentioned, there are those authors who belong to a tradition of satirical comedy with roots dating back through the Schwänke and Fastnachtspiele of the pre-Renaissance fifteenth century to the pre-Christian fertility rites which were performed immediately before the spring planting season. The comedy and satire derived from these rites thrived in Germany throughout the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and Reformation, and, in spite of Gottsched's theater reforms, well into the eighteenth century.

These rites were characterized by a procession built around a figure representing the god of fertility. The celebration itself was one of great rejoicing, commemorating the end of winter and the beginning of spring, or the rebirth of fertility. After Christianity became established in Germany, the joyous nature of the procession and festival was retained, with the important substitution of the devil for death or winter. Gradually, the procession assumed the form of a revue, with many characters participating in a
primitive dramatic representation of the defeat of the devil. These early Fastnachtspiele were characterized by obscenities, crude humor, and a complete lack of plot. It was necessary for the Church to move the time of the festival back to before the pre-lent period, since it would have been blasphemy to have had these performances taking place during the most solemn period of the Christian calendar, the period preceding Good Friday and Easter Sunday. The fact that these original spring fertility rites were now set back to a late winter date detracted not at all from their basically joyous nature. People today tend to consider the pre-lent Mardi Gras festivities a final chance to celebrate before the abstentions demanded by Lent. This explanation, however, disregards the real origins of the festival and gives the impression that Mardi Gras began as a result of Lent, when, in fact, Mardi Gras is a much older phenomenon.

The Fastnachtspiel is documented in literature for the first time during the fifteenth century. Towards the middle of this century, Hans Schnepperer, called Rosenplüt, used the form of the Fastnachtspiel to dramatize a political theme, the threat imposed by the Turks. This represented a great departure from the standard material treated in the Fastnachtspiel up to that date. Des Türken Fastnachtspiel (1456) had little dramatic tension and was more like a revue
than a drama, in keeping with its original function of entertain-
ing the participants at the Fastnacht celebrations.

Regardless of the failings of the Fastnachtspiel at this date as a
dramatic form, it is most definitely satiric in nature. This is to be expected of works which
originally relied upon pantomime techniques to illustrate the
downfall of a perennial stock figure, conceived of as a
villain. By the time that Rosenplüt was using the Fastnacht-
spiel form, the possibilities for subject matter had been
widened considerably. One was no longer required to treat
solely the defeat of the devil in a humorous fashion. It was
now possible to deal with topics more relevant to the age.
In Des Türken Krieg (1456), for example, we have a satire
written by a representative of the bourgeois middle class
and directed against both the declining institution of
knighthood and the peasant class. The satirizing of peasants
is by far the most common element of the late medieval
Fastnachtspiel, in which they are always associated with
crudeness of language and personal behavior.

The sixteenth century and the Protestant Reformation
brought changes for the Fastnachtspiel. Hans Sachs developed
its form from the relatively crude state under Hans Folz to
that of a respected literary genre. The technique of dis-
connected, episodic series of scenes characteristic of
Rosenplüt was left behind, and the Fastnachtspiel achieved respectability. Sachs was able to add to the standard repertoire of the Fastnachtspiel, the peasant satire, by drawing upon literary sources such as Bocaccio's Decamerone, Pauli's Schimpf und Ernst and Eulenspiegel for several of his plots. The satirizing of the peasants was still present, but a new element, didacticism, appeared. The function of the Fastnachtspiel evolved from one of pure entertainment to one of entertainment subordinated to education.

At the turn of the sixteenth century there were two writers, Jakob Ayrer and Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig, who stood in the Fastnachtspiel tradition of comedy and satire. They were, however, in spite of their heritage, exposed to powerful new influences from Italy and England.

The work which best illustrates Braunschweig's talents as a writer of satirical comedy is Vincentius Ladislaus (1594), a play which for the first time contains two clown figures, Johann Bouset and miles gloriosus. The figure of the cowardly, but loud-mouthed captain is documented in most European literatures and was definitely known to the theater of the ancients. The original Greek prototype for these offspring has unfortunately been lost, but the Miles Gloriosus of Plautus provides a famous classical source. The character of the miles gloriosus must have been known to
Braunschweig through the performances of the Commedia dell'arte, which had preceded the englische Komödianten to Germany.

Eckehard Catholy in his work, Das deutsche Lustspiel (1969), conclusively proves the Italian source for the miles gloriosus figure by quoting from the stage directions contained in Vincentius Ladislaus:

Sie springen etliche Sprünge / die thut er nach gar schlim / Etliche aber kan er nicht thun / und entschuldigt sich / das Kleid sey jhme zu eng / und den einen Schenckel hatte er vertreten. Nach dem Springen wird getanzet / im Tantzen aber / wie er sich so umdrehet / fellet er / und gibt darnach für / Es sey ein Nagel jhm im wege gestanden / daran hatte er sich gestossen. Nach diesem Tantzet er mit der Jungfraw / und stellet sich gar freundlich im Tantzen mit geberden gegen die Jungfraw / Sie mercket / das er mit einem Hasen schwanger gehet / hächelt jhn derowegen an / da meinen er nicht anderst / sie habe jhn lieb / und brüstet sich gewaltiglich / In dem entfellt der Jungfrauen jhr Nasetuch / do ist er stracks da hebet denselben auff / und gibt jhr denselben wieder.46

This text could only have been influenced by the Commedia dell'arte because not only have gestures and dancing techniques been left to the actor's ingenuity, but also the dialogue itself.

The first documented instance of a performance of an Italian troupe in Germany dates back to 1568, whereas the

**englische Komödianten** first appeared in 1585. The Italian **comici dell'arte** or performers of the **Commedia dell'arte** were professionals, who based their performances on a certain limited number of scenarios or rough outlines rather than on fixed literary texts. The satire is directed against certain stereo-types—the **Dottore** or pedant, the **Pantalone** or simple father and cuckolded husband, the **Arlecchino** or clever servant to name but a few—and is descended from the **Atellane**, a popular type of extemporaneous comedy in antiquity. The **Atellane** can in turn be traced back to early Roman sources, attesting to the ancient origins of the **Commedia dell'arte**. The stock characters in these performances of the **comici dell'arte**, were immediately recognizable by their distinctive costumes, half-masks and actions. The players were expected to be talented mimics capable of extemporizing, and the fact that an audience was composed of non-Italian speakers undoubtedly provided the troupe with an opportunity to be even more elaborate and explicit in their pantomime. This, in part, explains why there was never a great impetus for the **Commedia dell'arte** troupes to perform in the German language. The repertoire of the **englische Komödianten**, with its written dialogues, was, on the other hand, quickly translated into German.
The most important figure, as far as a discussion of satire is concerned, to be introduced by the *englische Komödianten* to the German theater was the clown or *Pickelhering*. His name was later changed to *Hanswurst*, but his character remains unmistakably the same.

Because of their scant knowledge of the German language, these travelling players were forced to emphasize the role of the clown, which depended more upon mimicry and visual humor than on language. This figure was so important to the success of a troupe that he often became the leader. The goal of these troupes was entertainment, pure and simple; and this was to be achieved above all else through a striking visual effectiveness. With these requisites, the literary level of material produced was generally quite low. Crude realistic works with large doses of obscene humor were favored at the beginning because of the language barrier.

Jakob Ayrer, who lived and wrote in Nürnberg at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, learned much from these *englische Komödianten*. He was always aware that his works were written to be performed and not merely read, a fact which Hans Sachs often lost sight of. Another innovation of Ayrer is the use of the fool figure to connect two or more separate plots within a single play.
Until this time, the figure of the fool that was familiar in Germany was the character presented in the didactic-satirical literature of the Renaissance and the Reformation. One need only think of Murner's *Von dem grossen lutherischen Narren* for an example. The fool or fools presented in these works, however, were rarely noted for their wisdom. English literature of the sixteenth century, on the other hand, supplies us with a very different fool, one who is the personification of great wisdom and is aware of the futility of earthly existence. Several examples from Shakespeare come to mind immediately: the gravedigger who philosophizes with Hamlet on the ephemerality of life, or the fool who continually reminds Lear that he alone is the cause of his own unhappiness. When transporting their fool figure to the continent, the *englische Komödianten* were none too scrupulous about their characterizations and consequently gave to the Germans a very crude representation of the English clown.

We have seen how three different types of comic theater came to exist in Germany and provided a rich tradition of themes, characters, and techniques for subsequent humorous and satirical writers. In all three of these theatrical traditions, some of the humor took the form of satiric commentary; that is to say, the jokes and situations
were made at the expense of definite individuals, character types, or institutions. The Fastnachtspiel satirized ignorant peasants and anachronistic remnants of the chivalric age. The englische Komödianten used the fool as a source of low comedy and as a tool for offering humorous comment on others. The character types of the Commedia dell'arte (miles gloriosus, Dottore, Pantalone, and Arlecchino) represent a stylization and a revival of ancient satire for European audiences.

This comic-satiric heritage was almost lost during the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) when prolonged fighting and suffering caused theaters to be destroyed and troupes of actors to be disbanded. Fortunately, some actors managed to eke out an existence as puppeteers. Hanswurst became the central figure in these one-man productions, enabling the tradition of the fool or clown to live on through the seventeenth century.

Born towards the close of the Thirty Years' War, 1642, Christian Weise rejects the stock comic figure preserved in the puppet plays in favor of a much more individualized character. The fools are no longer called Johan Bouset or Hanswurst, but run the gamut from Allegro to Zzakzaku. Weise is familiar with the Roman comedy written by Plautus and Terence, with Shakespeare, and with Molière. He is
able to integrate his fool figures into his plays in a much more convincing and consistent fashion than his predecessors. The Hanswurst figure no longer serves to introduce an entertaining interlude between two acts of tragedy, or to evoke belly-laughs in a gratuitous attempt to pander to the audience. His humor is still present, but it is now an integral part of the plot, proceeding logically from the action. Weise transforms his fool figure into a character who represents good common sense and who passes comment, often in a satirical fashion, on everything and everybody in the play. This "fool" belongs to the tradition of Shakespeare and not the crude, over-simplified clowns which the englische Komödianten first presented to German audiences. It is possible that Weise may have been familiar with the French sotie in which fools are made the porte-parole for political and social satire.

The most famous of Weise's comedies, Der Bäurische Machiavellus (1679), offers us an excellent satire of a bourgeois philistine town in the seventeenth century. No one escapes in this satire: he manages to include the schoolmaster, who always quotes Latin, the miles gloriosus figure, the shrewish wife and not one, but three candidates for the office of Pickelhering. Weise, like Duke Heinrich Julius Braunschweig, has broken effectively with the one-clown
tradition of the *englische Komödianten*.

Weise was also familiar with the plays of Molière, which had appeared in German at that time. One work which contained some of Molière's plays was published under the impressive title of: *Schaubühne Englischer und Französischer Comödianten, auff welcher werden vorgestellet die schönsten und neuesten Comödien, so vor wenig Jahren in Frankreich, Deutschland und andern Orten bey vollkreicher Versammlung seynd agirt und präsentirt worden* (1670). Contained in this collection are five of Molière's plays: *L'Amour médecin*, *Les Précieuses ridicules*, *Sganarelle ou le cocu imaginaire*, *L'Avare*, and *Georges Dandin*. In his comedy *Der verfolgte Lateiner* (1695), Weise uses a plot found also in Molière's *Les Précieuses ridicules* (1659), a satirical *comédie de caractère* on the pretensions of two conceited young ladies of the middle class.

The many different types appearing in Molière's plays, the religious hypocrite or *faux dévot*—Tartuffe, the miser—*L'Avare*, the misanthrope, the hypochondriac—*Le Malade imaginaire*, the parvenu—*Le Bourgeois gentilhomme*, represent a development and refinement of the stock figures of the *Commedia dell'arte* or its French counterpart, the *comédie italienne*. Molière creates characters who have more psychological realism than the conventionalized Italian
figures, suggesting contradictions, idiosyncratic details, and possible tragic implications in their personalities as well as the humorous idées fixes. The Commedia dell'arte tradition of a fixed scenario in which the stock characters improvise their broadly outlined roles is also changed by Molière. The attention shifts from the scenario to the plot itself and centers on the development and interaction of the characters. Molière, then, is important for the history of comedy and satire in Germany because of his remodelling of Commedia dell'arte practices as well as the innovations that he himself added to this tradition.

To be sure, the Italian troupes returned to Germany after the unsettled conditions of The Thirty Years' War had subsided, but their performances were limited almost exclusively to the popular theater of the lower classes. The aristocracy and those writers who wrote for the aristocracy and for the educated (e.g. Weise and Reuter) were dependent on intermediary sources for exposure to the Commedia dell'arte. In addition to Molière, these intermediary sources include the published collections of scenarios of the Commedia dell'arte such as the Schaubühne Englischer und Französischer Comödianten (1670), Gherardi's Théâtre italien (1700), the collected texts of the Nouveau Théâtre italien (1700), the Théâtre de la Foire ou l'Opéra comique
(1721-37) by Lesage and d'Orneval, the plays of Marivaux translated into German by J. C. Krüger (1747-49), and various translations of the Danish writer Holberg during the 1740's.
CHAPTER III

THE PRACTICE OF COMEDY DURING THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Christian Reuter, twenty-three years younger than Christian Weise, was also exposed to the influence of Molière and indirectly to that of the Commedia dell'arte. This becomes clear when one examines his early satirical work L'Honnête Femme Oder die Ehrliche Frau Plissine (1695). The work was conceived by Reuter as a pasquill attacking a Leipzig landlady and her two blue-stockings daughters. The relationship to Weise's Verfolgter Lateiner and Molière's Les Précieuses ridicules is quite apparent. Reuter, however, greatly improves on Weise's technique by providing his audiences with types who are also real individuals and not distorted caricatures, as had previously been the rule with the pasquill form. Indeed, Reuter's satire was so successful that the inhabitants of Leipzig were able to recognize the objects of the satire. Unfortunately, a judgement was rendered against Reuter and his publisher for personal injury. Reuter succeeds in creating a true comédie de caractère as distinct from Weise's comedy of intrigue in which the individual is subordinated to the plot. The characters, although based on
individual qualities, have been expanded to general types so that we have not only a personal satire directed against the Müller family, but also a satiric comedy of the bourgeois striving to climb higher on the social ladder. The personal traits have served therefore to lend individuality to the types.

Other examples of the indirect pattern of Italian influence are provided by the works of Johann Ulrich König and Christian Friedrich Henrici/Picander. Henrici/Picander's Teutsche Schauspiele (1725/26) stem directly from the collection of Gherardi, and König's Die verkehrte Welt (1725) is taken from the Théâtre de la Foire.

Why did König and Henrici/Picander draw upon written repertoires of the Commedia dell'arte or of the Comédie italienne for material when there was already extant in Germany a tradition of satiric comedy to which they could certainly have turned? Henrici provides the answer for this rejection in his "Vorbericht an den Leser" in Picanders Teutsche Schau-Spiele, bestehend in dem Academischen Schlandrien, Ertz-Säuffer und der Weiberprobe, Zur Erbauung und Ergötzung des Gemüts entworffen (1726): Whoever wants to write comedies with profit, Henrici states:

... muss ein oder mehr Laster zu tadeln zu seinem Hauptzweck nehmen: und weil die Liebe ein
fruchtbarer Quell aller Schwachheiten, so kann man die Neben-Umstände am besten von ihm entlehen, Gleichwie aber nicht alle Patienten geneigt, die bitteren Tropfen ohne Vermischung eines süßen Säftes zu verschlucken; also muss auch ein Moraliste, der mit kranken Gemüthern zuthun hat, seine beissenden Pillen mit lachendem Munde vorhalten, und mit angenehmen Scherze ausreden. Dahero ist die lustige Person in einer Comödie unentbehrlich, weil die satyrischen Wahrheiten dadurch nicht so trocken, auch nicht zu empfindlich werden.\footnote{Quoted in: Walther Hinck, Das deutsche Lustspiel des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts (Stuttgart 1965), pp. 144-45.}

Henrici feels that the interplay of individuals in love is the most fertile area for the observation of human foibles, weaknesses, and vice. The Commedia dell'arte and its ancestors, more than any other literary source, offer a thoroughly stylized investigation of the amorous aspect of human behavior in all its variations. The theme of love is at the heart of every scenario: the characters try to promote or thwart an affaire de coeur, and sometimes both. The father figure, for example, often hopes to seduce a female servant, break up the marriage plans of his young daughter, marry her off to an obnoxious but powerful personage, and keep from being cuckolded by his wife. Traditionally associated with comedy, the problems of love and marriage provide engrossing entertainment of a light variety--just the vehicle, in Henrici's opinion, for the palatable promulgation of
didactic messages.

Enlightenment thinkers such as Gottsched also subscribed to the idea of *prodesse et delectare*, with the emphasis on *prodesse*, implying the spread of rational, progressive morality to the German population. Unlike Henrici, they tended to neglect the second element of the formula, the entertainment of their reading public. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the many weeklies, bi-weeklies, and monthlies that sprang up in Germany during the eighteenth century. Patterned after the example of English journals such as *The Tatler* (1709-11) and *The Spectator* (1711-12) of Addison and Steele, these publications were intended to cause the improvement of morals through the use of satire which attacked specific vices.

Mattheson's first edition of the *Vernünftler* in 1713 appears with an epigraph of Juvenal, which states that in order to effect an improvement of impaired morals one must first deride them. Gottsched's *Vernünftige Tadlerinnen* has as its motto the lines of the German satirist Canitz "... die Larve vom Gesicht des Lasters abzureissen."

Bodmer and Breitinger state in their *Discourse der Mahlern* that "... die räsonierende Moral viel zu schwach ist, uns von dem Laster abzuschrecken und zu der Tugend zu determinieren." They are aware that reason alone is not
sufficient to make an individual embrace the Enlightenment ideals of virtue and rationality. One must enlist satire to cajole and shame the majority into taking the straight and narrow path. The Patriot, appearing in Hamburg, formulates its aims in the following fashion: "Irrtümer nach ihrer lächerlichen oder gefährlichen Wirkung vor Augen zu stellen." There were even some German weeklies which included their programs for moral improvement through satiric means in the title of the publication: Die Zellischen vernünftigen Tadlerinnen oder moralische und satirische Abhandlungen derer im gemeinen Leben vorfallenden Begebenheiten (1741).

The continual stress on satire to arrive at the desired end of an improvement of morals, however, is rarely followed through in these moralistic publications. Most of the articles are pure didacticism, preaching or moralizing with little or no satire present. This seems to have been the result of the dogmatic statements made by Gottsched in the first issue of his Vernünftige Tadlerinnen: "Tadeln heisst, unserer Einsicht nach, die Fehler und Schwachheiten der Menschen beurteilen." The absence of any mention of satire by Gottsched indicates that he felt that the satiric form had no place in a moral newspaper. He further promises that the "Tadeln" in his weekly will be, "kein spöttisches, sondern ein wohlgemeintes und liebreiches Tadeln," and that
his warnings will be, "übergültet und verzuckert." The one exception to the long list of would-be satiric moral reviews in Germany was the Patriot in Hamburg, which really did attempt to provide its readers with effective satire and an attractive style.

Gottsched's moral program extended to the theater, that institution which philosophers have always considered either dangerous to, or important for, public morality. Dismissing Henrici's works as too crude, too erotic, and too dependent on the amoral Hanswurst figure, Gottsched thought of the comedy, in particular, as serving a high moral function. Karl Holl has effectively summarized Gottsched's conception:


Looking about for a playwright who exemplified his ideas, Gottsched was for some time sympathetic towards König, who was attempting to moderate the extensive use of the Harlequin figure. This association broke up in 1730 because
of König's activities as an opera librettist, which Gottsched strongly condemned.

His reform ideas were, however, adopted by the Neuber troupe, and in 1734 Caroline Neuber characterized their work in a petition to the court of Saxony as follows:

Unsere Bemühung ist überhaupt iederzeit dahin gegangen, in unsere Vorstellungen die strengste Moral beyzubehalten, alle leere Possen und unerbare Zweydeutigkeiten zu vermeiden, und welches der eigentlich und vernünftige Endzweck des Schau Flazes seyn sol, die Zuschauer nicht sowohl zum Lachen zu reizen als solche zu verbessern.49

In October of 1737, Caroline Neuber arranged for the public banishment of the Harlequin figure from Leipzig. Lessing later, in his Briefe, die Neueste Literatur betreffend (1759-65),50 described this banishment procedure as the greatest "Harlekinade" of them all. Although the public demonstration was the personal inspiration of Caroline Neuber, it was in keeping with Gottsched's ideas of reform.

It was necessary for Gottsched at this point to offer the German theater a substitute for the proscribed Harlequin or Hanswurst figure. Armed with his theory on the aims of comedy, Gottsched turned to the French for his examples of comedy and theater in general. Molière, already well known

49Quoted, ibid., p. 120.

50This statement of Lessing's is found in the 17. Literaturbrief of Die Briefe, die Neueste Literatur betreffend (1759-65).
in the German theater, was not chosen by Gottsched as a model for two reasons. First, there was always the possibility in Molière's work that a very crude type of humor could break forth unexpectedly, revealing all too clearly the Commedia dell'arte tradition. *Le Malade imaginaire* (1673) provides an excellent example of this sudden change from polite intellectual humor to burlesque pantomime and farce. In the second place, the complexity and humanity of Molière's characters imbue them with a tragic potential in contradiction to their comic roles. This twofold possibility, so often present in Molière, did not coincide at all with Gottsched's concept of the comedy figure: i.e. a character who shows steady moral improvement throughout the play. There was no room in this theory for sudden changes bordering on the tragic genre as in *Le Misanthrope*.

Instead of Molière, Gottsched chose several others as models for the German playwrights, of whom only Marivaux even approached Molière's artistic achievements. Destouches's (1680-1754) comédie sérieuse, a forerunner of the comédie larmoyante, appealed to Gottsched because of its didactic qualities and the obvious goal of bettering the morals of the audience.

Because of Gottsched's reforms, the comedy did become a more acceptable and influential genre in Germany during
the first half of the eighteenth century. The comédie larmoyante of Nivelle de la Chaussée was adopted, with a resultant scaling down of the humorous elements and an addition of sentimentality. This new form of comedy, as practiced in France, contained criticism, but little or no satire. Gottsched felt, however, that satire was a necessary ingredient for the comedy in his reform plans. Martini expresses this quite succinctly:

Gottsched hatte das Lustspiel als Mittel verstanden, die Laster und Unsitten zu verspotten und durch das Lachen zu vernichten, das derart zum pädagogischen Lachen wurde.  

This addition of satiric elements to the conventions of the comédie larmoyante can be readily seen in the works of Gottsched's wife Adelgunde. In 1736 her Die Pietisterey im Fischbeinrocke appeared anonymously. This was actually a translation of the French Jesuit Bougeant's La femme docteur, a satire of the Jansenists. Gottsched's wife translated the work into German, changed the names from French to German and directed the satiric attack against the pietists in the city of Königsberg. Some of her other works are adaptations from French models (Molière's Georges Dandin becomes Die ungleiche Heirat), or if not direct translations,

then satirical *Typenlustspiele* based on French patterns and satirizing universal types such as the ingrate, the slanderer or the vengeful man.

Not all the German dramatists of the period were as ready to acquiesce to Gottsched's demands as was Adelgunde. Christian Krüger, for one, attempted to write comedies in which the humorous elements existed independent of any moralistic program for the improvement of the audience. The *comédie gaie* of Marivaux served him at first as a model for his own works. Krüger's first comedy, *Die Geistlichen auf dem Lande* (1743), contains a satiric attack upon the hypocrisy and narrow-mindedness of some of the clergy, and was based on the experiences of the author as a theology student. His most popular work, *Die Candidaten* (1747), is no longer a comedy, but rather a mixture of intrigue, character comedy and satire against society.

More important than Krüger for the development of comedy in Germany was Johann Elias Schlegel. He was able to carry the theory of comedy promulgated by Gottsched further, in that he recognized the necessity for a motivating force behind every action in a play. It was not enough that the audience be presented with actions designed to better their morals; they would enjoy the play far more if there were justification for all that happened in the plot. In
his *Der Triumph der guten Frau* (1748) Schlegel describes how a pair of clever wives are able, with the help of a bright maid-servant, to win back their husbands. The satire present in his work, at best of a very general nature, is aimed at the behavior of the husbands. One has deserted his wife for an existence of changing love affairs; the other, however, is in the opposite position, suffering from irrational attacks of jealousy.

The use of satire in the literature of the eighteenth century was not confined solely to comedy. The *Robinsonaden*, a particular form of the adventure novel patterned after Daniel Defoe's *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe of York, Mariner* (1719), were extremely popular in the period from 1720–1760 in Germany. Of the forty versions which appeared in Germany, a small percentage could be considered to contain material of satiric-didactic nature. The vast majority, however, represent either tales of adventure or are devoted to fanciful travel descriptions.

*Der medizinische Robinson* (1732), one of the *Robinsonaden* exhibiting satiric content, carries the following revealing subtitle: *Höchst merk- und denkwürdige Lebens- und Reisebeschreibung eines in diesem Jahrhundert verstorbenen Medici, darinnen alle dessen wunderbare Unfälle, unglaubliche Widerwärtigkeiten, erschreckliche Lebensgefahren*
und unendliche Unglücke, auch wie er einige Jahre auf einer unbewohnten Insel höchst wunderbar erhalten worden . . .
A closer examination of the work reveals no mention of great dangers or of uninhabited islands, and is really nothing more than the uninspired outpourings of a doctor, who, as the title further indicates, insbesondere zum öfteren des eingerissenen Missbrauchs und Vermehrung der edlen Gesundheitsgelahrtheit und der Unart einiger seichten Ärzte gedacht, überhaupt aber manch guter Gedanke über gute und böse Dinge angebracht wird. Any similarity between this work and the English original exists purely in the two titles. It is extremely dull and the satire promised in the title never materializes.

The one exception to the general rule of empty satire in the Robinsonade appeared in 1731. Die Insel Felsenburg was so successful that a second part appeared in 1732, a third in 1736 and a fourth in 1743. Little is known of the life or the work of the author Johann Gottfried Schnabel. Whether he was familiar with Simplizissimus, a work which manifests definite similarities with the Insel Felsenburg, is unknown. Both works are filled with a disdain of worldly possessions and contain much satirical comment on society, morals and civilization at the time of their conception.
In addition to the Robinsonade there is another prose form which is important in any treatment of satire in the Enlightenment. For both Christian Wolff and Gottsched, the fable represented a tool with which a moral lesson could be presented to the reading public. One reason for the extreme popularity of this form during the period may have been the absence of real satire. Both the fable and the satire have unquestionable didactic aims. The disadvantage of the fable, however, lies in the very general nature of the lesson around which it is constructed. The satire, on the other hand, can be painfully specific in its attack on an institution or an individual. The author of the satire would, of necessity, leave himself open to retaliation from those satirized by him.

The advocacy by Wolff and Gottsched in the 1730's of the fable resulted in its general acceptance as a literary genre. The moral weeklies, such as Gottsched's own Die vernünftigen Tadlerinnen, rarely missed including at least one fable in each issue. The first writer of the period to devote himself to the fable was Friedrich von Hagedorn. His Versuch in poetischen Fabeln und Erzählungen (1738) (alluded to in Lenz's Pandämonium Germanicum), was strongly influenced by the work of La Fontaine's Contes et Nouvelles en vers (1664). Hagedorn's great talent lies in his ability
to take a story or situation from a foreign source, be it French, English or classical, and to present it to the reader in a simplified form, with a minimum of rhetorical devices. His end product is then a moralistic poem with humorous and satiric elements. Ramler said of Hagedorn:

Herr Hagedorn ist dem Exempel des La Fontaine gefolgt und hat die Erzählung anderer Dichter nachgeahmt und mit seinen eigenen Gedanken, besonders aber mit satirischen Zügen sehr glücklich vermehrt.²²

The satire contained in Hagedorn's fables could hardly be termed biting; names are never revealed and he is usually very general in what he attacks. Nevertheless he doesn't hesitate to satirize the German princes, the toadies at court and the anachronistic nature of the countless German principalities in a period of enlightened thought.

The fable increased its popularity in the decade of the 1740's with the work of Christian Fürchtegott Gellert. His Fabeln und Erzählungen (1745) were translated into most European languages. At the heart of his great success lies several factors. His moral aim is readily understandable and universally applicable. The irony which made Lessing's fables so much more satirical than those of his forerunners

²²Quoted in: Maria Tronskaja, Die Deutsche Prosasatire Der Aufklärung (Berlin 1969), p. 332.
is absent. Original sources are always altered by Gellert so that nothing which could distract from the didactic message is present. Classical antiquity or foreign countries are rarely mentioned. Gellert establishes an intimate relationship between himself and his reader by offering fatherly advice in his fables and by being gentle in his reproaches. His enormous popularity lasted a relatively short period of time and, by the year 1771, Jakob Mauvillon and Johann August Unzer pronounce Gellert to have been "seicht, ohne alles Genie"\textsuperscript{53} and his works to have been "matt, schal, wässerig."\textsuperscript{54}

Lessing's fable production much more closely approaches strong satire than the works of Gellert or the other fable writers of the eighteenth century. This end is achieved through a new definition of the fable postulated by Lessing, and then put into practice in his own collection of fables which appeared in 1759. Some of his predecessors, Breitinger and La Motte, had insisted that the moral lesson of the fable be disguised or hidden. For Lessing, however, the aim of the fable is not the mystification of the reader, but rather the illumination and education. The fable

\textsuperscript{53}Quoted, ibid., p. 341.

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid.
should never assume the form of a puzzle whose meaning must be worked out. Lessing required that the presentation of an argument in favor of a particular point in a fable be carried out as quickly and directly as possible, and that the moral truth be instantly clear to the reader. The other distinguishing element in Lessing's fables was the use of irony to underline the point being made in the work. The existence of this irony in Lessing's fables related them to the satire. The general nature of the evils attacked in these fables, however, prevents them from ever crossing the boundary which separates them from real satire.

When discussing effective satire in the first half of the eighteenth century, two names come to mind immediately. Christian Ludwig Liscow and Gottlieb Wilhelm Rabener have been at the center of much controversy, first among their contemporaries and later among the literary historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The question of whether Liscow is to be considered an original satirist or a cowardly slanderer and of how to evaluate the works of his younger contemporary Rabener are still considered relevant in the field of Germanistik.

The reasons for objecting to the satiric production of Liscow, put forward by his contemporaries and later subscribed to by some Germanisten such as Hettner, Wackernagel,
Danzel and Ebeling are summarized in Klaus Lazarowicz's *Verkehrte Welt; Vorstudien zu einer Geschichte der Deutschen Satire:

1. Liscow schreibt gegen einen Menschen, den er nicht persönlich kannte und der ihm "niemahlen das geringste zwiether gethan hatte."

2. Er schreibt nicht aus eigenem Antrieb, sondern auf Betreiben seiner Freunde; d.h. er stellt seine Feder in den Dienst einer Sache, die ihn im Grunde nichts anging und über deren Hintergründe er sich vermutlich gar nicht zuverlässig informieren konnte.


4. Liscow hat kein Bedenken, gegen einen "kleinen Geist" und "elenden Sribenten" zu schreiben; er ist zwar mutig genug, einen ihm nicht ebenbürtigen Gegner zu züchtigen; aber er riskiert nicht, die grossen Herren anzugeifen oder an den eigentlichen Zeitmissständen Kritik zu üben.

5. Die unrechtmässige und taktlose Verwendung von Philippis Manuskripten beweist, dass er in der Wahl der Mittel, die der Blossstellung und Verhöhnung seines Gegners dienten, völlig skrupellos war.


7. Liscows Satiren enthalten spöttische Bemerkungen über die Heilige Schrift und die Religion.\(^{55}\)

For all those prepared to ignore or condemn Liscow, there were many who felt his achievements to have been unique and

\(^{55}\)Quoted in: Klaus Lazarowicz, *Verkehrte Welt; Vorstudien zu einer Geschichte der deutschen Satire* (Tübingen 1963), p. 34.
significant for German literature. Bodmer mentions Liscow as the man who had plucked the feathers of "der Habichte Schnäbel und Pittich."\textsuperscript{56} Hagedorn considered him the one able to penetrate "mit glücklichem Verstand in edler Eile den Nebel grauer Vorurteile."\textsuperscript{57} And Abraham Gotthelf Kästner was not the only person to refer to Liscow as "Deutschlands Swift."\textsuperscript{58}

The majority of those who have aligned themselves against him have given the fourth reason, or a variant thereof, in Lazarowicz's list as a basis for their position. These people have failed to grasp the fact that the attacks contained in Liscow's works, the attacks ostensibly aimed at the professor of rhetoric Philippi, the theologian Manzel and the minister Sievers, also apply to all the dogmatic, pedantic scholars, theologians and obscurantists of the period. The real people appearing in his work represent themselves and at the same time they stand for a universal type. Liscow never resorts to the fictional heroes so popular in fables or in the works of Rabener. A further innovation on his part is the technique of pretending, with

\textsuperscript{56}Quoted in: Tronskaja, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{57}Quoted, ibid., p. 19.
\textsuperscript{58}Ibid.
an air of utmost seriousness, to be on the side of the very evil which he is attacking. This has the effect of heightening greatly the irony and satire in his works. In his most famous series of satiric writings, those works that deal with Professor Philippi, Liscow demonstrates that skill which assures him the title of the most effective satirist of the Enlightenment.

This series culminates in a report written by Liscow, but alleging to be the work of a medical man, Der Glaubwürdige Bericht eines Medici (1734), in which the death of Philippi is announced. The last words of the dying man are further reputed to have been a recantation of his works. In reply to this amazing stroke of satiric genius, Philippi asserts in a letter subsequently published in the Hamburgischer Correspondent that he has been attacked by a nameless coward, but he is indeed alive and living in Göttingen. This reply was exactly what Liscow needed to deliver his last blow. With his Bescheidene Beantwortung der Einwürfle, welche einige Freunde des Herrn D. Joh. Ernst Philippi ... wieder die Nachricht von dessen Tode gemacht haben (1735), he again reiterates the news of Philippi's death and ends by stating that the letter in no way changes the situation. The letter could have been a forgery and even if it were not, then the fact that a man
has written a letter is no proof that he is alive. After this very sarcastic note, he closes with the following lines and a quote from Molière:

der Philippi, der ietzo zu Göttingen zu sehen seyn soll, nicht der rechte Philippi, sondern sein Gespenst [ist]

Disparoissez donc, je Vous prie,
Et que le Ciel par sa bonté
Comble de joye & de santé
Votre défunte Seigneurie.59

In comparison with the inspired and innovative nature of Liscow's satires, the works of Rabener appear as very timid attempts in the field. By way of explanation for the unaggressive nature of Rabener's satire, Hermann Hettner stresses the political situation in Germany at the time. "Wohl hätte die religiöse und politische Bedrückung und Zerrüttung dieses Zeitalters einem Aristophanes, Juvenal und Swift oder den grossen Satirikern der Reformationszeit das Blut in die Wangen getrieben . . . Aber zur Satire gehört Freiheit der Rede und Macht der öffentlichen Meinung; und wo war diese in Deutschland zu finden, zumal in Sachsen . . . 60 Rabener himself admits that, "Deutschland ist nicht das Land in welchem eine bessernde Satire es wagen

59Quoted in: Lazarowicz, p. 31.

60Quoted in: Hermann Hettner, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert, Band I, p. 294.
dürfte, das Haupt mit Freiheit emporzuheben . . . 61 Given the atmosphere in Germany and the "friedfertige" nature of Rabener, one is not surprised at the tenor of his works. He produces what Lazarowicz has termed "gefallende Satiren," which represents, according to Lazarowicz, "eine Vereinigung des im Grunde Unvereinbaren." He always prided himself on the fact that his satires were never directed against any individual and is reported to have become incensed when readers mistook his works for personal satires and attempted to find out who the models for his works had been. At the heart of his satire theory were a preference of the general as opposed to the specific satire and a strict division between satire and pasquill. In fulfilling these requirements Rabener effectively thwarted his own efforts to write satire and produced nothing but moralistic sermons.

61 Quoted, ibid., p. 294.
SUMMARY OF PART I

In this discussion of the comic-satiric tradition in Germany, we have proposed a working definition of the concept of satire: a definition, by no means authoritative, complete, or universally acceptable, but useful for the discussion of Lenz's satiric art. According to this compromise definition, satire is characterized by two essential elements: humorous entertainment and criticism of those aspects of human behavior, which the author considers worthy of contempt. In "authentic" satire it is, in fact, difficult to separate these two elements, for the humor derives from the object of criticism, and the criticism takes a comic form. The spirit of satire is not logical, but polemical, seeking to destroy an object by deflation, scorn, mockery, and the reductio ad absurdum.

In ancient Greece there was no distinction between comedy and satire. The comedy was satire and developed from the phallic songs sung at the festive religious occasions. The Old or Aristophanic Comedy represents a relatively late development in the history of comedy. It is, however, the oldest source for which written documentation
exists. Aristophanes, considered the best practitioner of Old Comedy, was noted for his ability to combine a serious political aim with outrageous burlesque elements. He was manifestly unfair in his attack upon Socrates in the Clouds; and yet he had been moved to extremes by the conviction that he was combating the real danger represented by the increase of sophistry without a commensurate improvement in real education.

Except for the Vagantendichtung of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which speaks for a familiarity with the literature and mythology of the ancients, the example of Greek and Roman satire was not imitated during the Middle Ages. An indigenous tradition of satirical comedy may have evolved in the German-speaking areas from pre-Christian fertility rites, conventional jokes and peasant revels. As may also have been the case in the ancient Greek rituals, obscenity, personal invective, and extravagant behavior seems likely to have served a function of catharsis as well as entertainment. In any case, the cause for celebration was the end of the rigorous winter and the advent of spring and new life. By the fifteenth century there were playwrights who used the loosely-organized Fastnachtspiel form as the basis of written dramas. Political satire, such as Rosenplüt's treatment of the Turkish menace was even
introduced. Hans Folz and Hans Sachs give evidence of increasing sophistication in the genre, with some realistic dialogues, definite plots, dramatic tension, and increased didacticism. For the most part, however, these variations in the Fastnachtspiele were intended mainly as amusement rather than as media for the improvement of morals.

The aspect of moral improvement did not assume any importance with the wandering English and Italian troupes, who appeared in Germany during the Renaissance, but the objects of satire became more varied. The englische Komödianten added the aspect of the "wise fool" to the German tradition of the vulgar clown, who, as an outgrowth of the devil, was sometimes more sinister than comic. The Commedia dell'arte introduced a whole cast of comic characters against whom satire could be directed. In addition, they popularized love intrigues as a means of illuminating human foibles and vices. We have called the ridicule cast on these character types "satire," but it should be recognized at the same time that this "satire" does not involve both elements of our working definition. Although the pedant and the bragging soldier are mocked, the purpose of the comedy was not really to reform the pedants and bragging soldiers of society.

With Molière's comédie de caractère, audiences were
presented with definite social and moral lessons. The blue-stockings of certain French salons, the parvenus, who tried to ape decadent aristocrats, the monomaniacs of all kinds who saw life completely out of perspective: these were real contemporaneous problems. The moral lesson provided by satire is then reinforced by characters who represent the honnête homme or raisonneur. Satire in Molière is indirect, however, addressing generalized abuses rather than specific individuals.

The academic tradition in Germany that began with Martin Opitz and culminated in Gottsched also separated criticism from comedy and thereby changed the nature of satire. Whereas the Fastnachtspiele and the Commedia dell'arte had emphasized the aspect of revelry, these writers are more concerned with morals and proprieties. Opitz stressed the presumption, danger, and bad taste of being too specific in the criticism of vices; only God has the right to judge a human being. He felt that writers should praise important men and attempt to improve morals without attacking anyone; satire was thus defined out of existence. It would seem that Gottsched, like Boileau in France, was trying to deny the whole history of native German comedy by going back to carefully selected classical sources. Unlike Gottsched, Boileau does make reference to Aristophanes.
He has no praise, however, for the great comic playwright and instead finds favor with an Athenian law that prevented personal attack and raised criticism to the level of reason and good taste. In this as in other matters of taste, Gottsched was the avowed disciple of Boileau:

Aux accès insolents d'une bouffonne joie
La sagesse, l'esprit, l'honneur furent en proie;
On vit par le public un poète avoué
S'enrichir aux dépens du mérite joué,
Et Socrate, par lui, dans un choeur de nuées,
D'un vil amas de peuple attirer les huées;
Enfin, de la licence on arrêta le cours:
Le magistrat, des lois emprunta le secours,
Et, rendant par édit les poètes plus sages,
Défendit de marquer les noms et les visages.
Le théâtre perdit son antique fureur;
La comédie apprit à rire sans aigreur;
Sans fiel et sans venin sut instruire et reprendre;62

Gottsched's theory of refined literature, then seems to have more in common with French neo-classicism than with the writings of Horace and Persius whom he meant to imitate. In his discussion of the origin of comedy, he failed to mention Aristophanes, the use of obscene language, or the practice of violent personal attack. What Gottsched offered was guarded acceptance of the satirist, provided that he acknowledged as his primary objective the promotion of the Enlightenmerent sense of values. In practice, this philosophy led to the humorless moralistic tracts of journals like the

Vernünftler, the imitations of the melodramatic French comédie larmoyante, the sanctimonious adaptations of the fable form by writers like Hagedorn and Gellert, and incompletely assimilated satirical additions to the popular new type of adventure story, the Robinsonade.

The one significant exception to the Enlightenment practice of "gefallende Satire" is found in the writing of Christian Ludwig Liscow. For the first time actual people are named and subjected to satirical attack. The language is strong, at times obscene, and no concessions are made to Gottsched's canons of good taste. At the same time Liscow tries to suggest the universal significance of a satire directed against one particular incarnation of a vice. In spite of his satirical innovations, Liscow was little known by his contemporaries and all but forgotten by the following generations until Gervinus rediscovered him in the nineteenth century.

There were admittedly precedents in Germany for the writing of satire, but somehow the two essential strands of humor and criticism were always more or less disconnected until Lenz lashed out in a fury against Christoph Martin Wieland as Aristophanes had done against Socrates.
PART II

LENZ'S SATIRES OF WIELAND
CHAPTER IV

MENAÎK UND MOPSUS

Scholarly preoccupation with Lenz's two most popular plays, *Der Hofmeister* and *Die Soldaten*, to the exclusion of his other plays, prose pieces, lyric poetry and fragments has given us a simplified view.

A broader reading of Lenz, which would have to include his *Pandämonium Germanicum*, *Die Wolken*, *Der neue Menoza*, *Selbstrezension des neuen Menoza*, *Zerbin*, *Menaik* and *Mopsus*, and *Der Magister*, suggests that a very consistent and important characteristic of Lenz's work is its satiric tendency. This interpretation has too often been neglected, in spite of Lenz's early translations of Plautus, his frequent literary attacks on Wieland and Wieland's philosophy of eudaemonism, and, most important, the presence of satirical elements in every literary form which he practiced—poetry, drama, pasquill, reportage and essay. What I propose to do is trace the satire directed specifically against Wieland in Lenz's works throughout the period from 1774 until the reconciliation towards the end of 1775. This relatively short span of time encompasses Lenz's most productive writing
period; almost every work produced within this time is affected by Lenz's "Ehr- und Rachbegierde."

Lenz was not the only writer of his time who considered Wieland's works immoral, a dangerous influence on the younger generation of poets, and thus an appropriate target for satire. Wagner's Prometheus, the anonymous Wieland und seine Abonnenten and Goethe's Helden, Götter und Wieland (1774) provide examples. The Göttinger Hainbund, a group of idealistic young poets dedicated to writing poetry in the fashion of Klopstock, was extremely hostile to Wieland, whose early style was very similar to that of their mentor and therefore made his subsequent divergence from his principles all the more abhorrent to them.

While Klopstock's early poetry tends to be abstract, intellectual, and strongly rhetorical, Wieland was gifted with an ability to create sensual images and finely nuanced situations and characters. He did not, however, reveal this talent in his early writing since he was influenced, like Klopstock, from an early age by the pietistic philosophy of religion, which stressed a turning inward from the external world to "listen to one's soul," seek a personal religious experience, and know God through feeling. This internalization of experience and this mystical preoccupation were not conducive to an art of the senses. First Wieland's
thoughts were formed by his father, a pietistic minister and theologian, who hoped that his son would follow in his path. Then, like Klopstock, he made a pilgrimage to Zürich where he lived for several years in the home of Bodmer, writing many works of a definitely religious and vaguely sentimentive cast: *Die Prüfung Abrahams* (1753), *Die Psalmen* (1755), *Der Antilukrez* (1751), *Der Antiovid* (1752) and *Die Briefe der Verstorbenen* (1753). During this time, Wieland accepted Bodmer's ideas and prejudices so completely that he praised his mentor's mediocre literary efforts and condemned Uz, Rost, and all other Rococo writers, whom he called, in the dedication to the first edition of his *Empfindungen eines Christen* (1755).

schwärrende Anbeter des Bacchus und der Venus, die man nach der inbrünstigen Andacht, womit sie diese elenden Götzten anbeten und lobpreisen, für eine Bande epikurischer Heiden halten sollte, die sich zusammen versprochen, alles, was heilig und feierlich ist, lächerlich zu machen und die wenigen Empfindungen für Gott, die im Herzen der leichtsinnigen Jugend schlummern, völlig auszutilgen.

Within a few years, this militantly religious, but largely emotional, attitude gave way to a more hedonistic sensual philosophy and a more restrained and precise style of writing. With the *Comische Erzählungen* (1765), Wieland joined in spirit, and in practice, the Rococo poets he had formerly execrated. Soon he was recognized as their new
leader. Extremely well-read, he introduced these poets to the even more daring French habits of thought through his literary borrowings from such writers as Voltaire, Le Sage and Prévost. Changing from faithful disciple to "immoral" apostate, Wieland inevitably angered the Göttinger Hainbund and their followers of the 1760's. Their attacks against Wieland were taken up and continued by Lenz in the first half of the next decade.

Menalk und Mopsus, written early in 1774 and published in 1775, marks the beginning of Lenz's satiric attacks on Wieland, on other writers of pastoral, anacreontic and rococo poetry, on Graziendichtung, and on the philosophy of pleasure itself. Its subtitle, Eine Ekloge nach der fünften Ekloge Vergils, gives the impression that Lenz is following the venerable tradition of Virgilian pastoral poetry, to which the members of the German movement, most notably Wieland, Gleim, Uz and Götz, had added references to erotic and bacchic pleasures. The choice of the Virgilian eclogue to satirize these writers draws attention to their poetic excesses. At the same time, the parody of pastoral poetry contained in Menalk und Mopsus exposes Lenz's opinion of this genre: that it was artificial and an anachronistic vestige of antiquity imported from France.

The similarities between Vergil's fifth Eclogue and
Menalk und Mopsus are only superficial because of Lenz's satiric intentions. The names, Menalk and Mopsus, to be sure, have been retained as well as the amoebean verse of the original, a form in which shepherds try to out-perform each other in alternate songs. But the tone and purpose of Lenz are completely different. Vergil's Eclogue is a serious work of lament which describes the apotheosis of the dead hero Daphnis. Lenz's crudely humorous satire is directed against Wieland, although not as obviously as are some of his later, more vitriolic works such as Die Wolken and Pandémonium Germanicum.

The figure of Menalk represents, according to Erich Schmidt, the Strassburg poet Kamm, a great admirer of Wieland. The identification of Wieland with Mopsus presupposes a knowledge of the life of the young Wieland and of his work, Der neue Amadis (1772):

Sein Nebenbuhler Mopsus hatte nie Erfahren in dem Stück als mit der Phantasie. (I, 78)

---


64 The quotations from Lenz's works are indicated in the body of the dissertation to avoid excessive footnoting. The Roman numerals indicate volume number; the Arabic numerals refer to the page.
This can only be a reference to the well-known literary precociousness of the young Wieland, who was able to create poetry at a tender age, before he had had any experience of the real world. These poetical works were products of his imagination, combined with vicarious experience from the vast amount of literature to which he had been exposed during the very regimented and ambitious reading program which his father had devised for him. This literature served both as a pattern for the early poetry and as a substitute for life. The next lines are even more explicit in this respect:

Doch hatt' von den frühsten Knabenjahren
Gelesen und studiert, was andere erfahren. (I, 78)

J. G. Gruber, one of Wieland's friends and early biographers, had the following opinion of the young Wieland's education:

Die Gefahr, eine so schöne Natur, als in diesem Knaben sich offenbarte, wo nicht gar im Keime zu ersticken, so doch bedenklich misszuleiten, wuchs in eben dem Grade, als der Vater die geistige Bildung des Sohnes übereilte, und den Unterricht etwas treibhausartig betrieb.65

Wieland's education began before he was three years old. At first only his father instructed him, but soon a tutor was engaged. At seven Wieland was writing poetry; at ten he had read enough Horace and Vergil to be able to embarrass his Latin teacher. In his pietistic home he was encouraged

to learn the Bible and hymnal by heart. At eleven Wieland directed his studies towards poetry and became familiar with Gottsched's *Critische Dichtkunst vor die Deutschen*. Although this is hardly what one would expect an eleven year old boy to read, understand and enjoy, it is certainly a clear indication of where his interests and talents were to take him.

Wieland's method of writing poetry is next subjected to Lenz's satiric wit:

Vom Naso zu Pücellle alles exzerpiert  
Was nur verboten hiess, dann schön filtriert  
Zum Ofen denn lauwarm hineingeschoben  
Gibt einen Crem, den Alt' und Junge loben.  
Von allen Orten her verschrieb man sich  
Aus seiner Küche: Herrn und Grafen schlich  
Das Ding so süß vom Mund in die Culotte,  
Sie machten ihn zum Koch, das Volk zum Gotte. (I, 78)

Wieland's penchant for borrowing ideas, styles, characters and content from literary sources, from Ovid to Voltaire, is alluded to in the first line. According to Lenz, Wieland shares many literary characteristics with Ovid: he is wittily superficial and often concerned with erotic subjects. Lenz claims that there is little of the seriousness of Vergil or Horace in either poet. One seldom finds the expression of a strong personal feeling because the main purpose of Wieland's and Ovid's poetry is to amuse the reader. For the purposes of his satire, Lenz chooses to
disregard completely the pedagogical content of Wieland's works and his concepts of government and education, for achieving a better state. Lenz particularly stresses Wieland's predilection for excerpting "forbidden" passages and Ovid's works offer many opportunities.

The actual technique of putting together the different excerpted sections is equated by Lenz with cooking. One need only mix the different elements, allow them to heat, and the result cannot fail to be a success. Although literary borrowing was not uncommon in the eighteenth century, Lenz suggests that Wieland's claim to originality was greatly impaired by the extensiveness of his appropriations. Nor, according to Lenz, does he gather the best that has been thought and said, but rather he caters to a low level of intelligence and taste, skimming frothy titillating passages, guaranteed to arouse interest, and whipping them up into a product devoid of real substance and nutrition. The use of the French loan word Crem to describe Wieland's poetry serves to heighten the satiric effect. Wieland seems never to use a native German word if he can possibly find a foreign term to express the same thing. This technique is often carried so far that a reference work is necessary to decipher his complicated allusions. Wieland frequently resorts to the footnote in order to provide the
reader with an explanation or, occasionally, to complicate and convolute the situation further. Also Lenz employs the footnote in *Menalk und Mopsus* in an obvious parody of the way Wieland uses it, the only difference being that Wieland and his associates are always the butt of Lenz's humor when they appear there.

Lenz then suggests that the reading public found the Gallicisms and sexual innuendoes of Wieland's *Crem* so tasty that it raised him to the level of a God. For the *Herrn und Grafen*, his admirers and literary followers, he became the *chef d'école* for all other poets to follow and the head of the German Rococo movement. The *Göttinger Hainbund* poets and Lenz especially resented the critical articles Wieland wrote for the influential *Teutscher Merkur* and his stance as a lawgiver for all young poets who hoped to achieve success. The question of a poet's considering himself a paragon for the younger generation is touched upon in Lenz's *Verteidigung des Herrn W. gegen die Wolken*, which will be treated later on.

Lenz now follows with a caricature of Mopsus in which his appearance is compared to a fat, lazy, gluttonous prelate such as the one Boileau describes in *Le Lutrin* (1674). To make certain that his readers do not miss the allusion to Boileau's poem Lenz reinforces it with a
footnote:

Derweil lag Mopsus da, wie der Kanonikus,
Den Despreaux [Boileau] beschreibt, den ich
zitieren muss**).

**) Im Lütrin. Dieses unschätzbare Gedicht verdient von
all unsern Lesern und Leserinnen gelesen zu werden.
Wir empfehlen es daher jedermann. (I, 78)

The portrait of the Kanonikus to which Lenz calls attention
does not seem at all appropriate for the frail, hard-working
Wieland, but perhaps any method is fair in Lenz's opinion, in
casting ridicule on one's adversaries.

The appearance of Menalk at the bedside of Mopsus
gives Lenz his first opportunity to allude to Wieland's
recent work, Der neue Amadis (1771):

Der seidne Vorhang rauscht, er sieht Menalken stehen,
Glaubt fest den Anti-Seladon zu sehen
und bebt. (I, 79)

The Anti-Seladon is one of the characters of Wieland's
Der neue Amadis, a fact which must have been well known to
contemporaries. The necessity of an extensive knowledge of
Der neue Amadis becomes more apparent as one proceeds with
a reading of Menalk und Mopsus. Menalk informs Mopsus that
they will have a singing contest "... von Amors Macht."

This is an allusion to the anacreontic pastoral poetry pro-
duced by the Rococo, and especially, to some of Wieland's
works such as Musarion and Der neue Amadis. Menalk makes
two attempts to introduce his song by summoning the Muses,
but Mopsus is so shocked by the crudeness of his efforts that he decides to demonstrate how the Muses must be addressed:

Ihr Grazien! wenn mein Dienst euch je gefällig war**),
So lasst bei diesem Gesang mich euren Einfluss empfinden;

**) Siehe den neuen Amadis, das in seiner Art einzige Buch unseres Jahrhunderts, aus welchem diese Stelle wohl scheint mehr als nachgeahmt zu sein; wohin wir denn unsere Leser verweisen. (I, 80)

If the reader does indeed look up this appeal to the Muses, in Der neue Amadis, the full impact of Lenz's wit and satire becomes clear. These two lines and the eight which immediately follow have been excerpted without alteration from Der neue Amadis and included in his own text; thus he attacks Wieland with Wieland's own words and ideas:

Ihr Grazien! wenn mein Dienst euch je gefällig war,
So lasst bei diesem Gesang mich euren Einfluss empfinden;
Wie könnt' ich sonder euch der Gefahr,
Die uns bevorsteht, mich und meinen Helden entwinden;
Die Wahrheit, so schön die Weisen sie unbekleidet finden,
Wird allzuoft dadurch den Schwachen ärgerlich.
Erlaubt ihr, Sokratische Grazien! sich
Vor Zynischen Faunen und kritischen Zwergen
In euren Schleier zu verbergen,
Und ist noch Raum—so deckt auch mich. (I, 80)

Truth appears beautiful to the wise, but is often, in its unclothed state, distressing to the weak. As it appears in Wieland's Der neue Amadis this statement has the
effect of poking fun at those narrow-minded individuals who were offended by the numerous delicate situations alluded to, implied, or described in his poems. The use of dashes in many of these sections to avoid coming right out and saying that a character had been seduced by another did little to silence his enemies. When Lenz uses the very same ten lines in his satire, the result is to answer Wieland's anticipated criticism in advance by accusing him of the same narrow-mindedness which he has attacked in others in _Der neue Amadis_.

The theme of protection from criticism is continued in Mopsus's reply to Menalk's praise:

_Das ist ja schön. Hum! das ist besser drum,_
_Beinah als meines._

_Mopsus_

_Ein Palladium,_
_Mich gegen die Kritik zu decken. (I, 80)_

A palladium was in Greek and Roman practice an image of immemorial antiquity on which the safety of a city was thought to depend. Lenz's seeming preoccupation with the subject of criticism is understandable when one bears in mind Wieland's position as the publisher of the _Teutscher Merkur_ and as the most influential literary critic of the period. In a later section of the poem Lenz renews his attack on Wieland's reputation as a critic. Mopsus informs Menalk he will no longer need his _Rute_, which in the past had been used with such success against the critics, since
he has now become, thanks to the Merkur, a critic himself.

Ich schenke euch diese Rute.
Sonst war den Kritikern vor ihr nicht wohl zu Mute
Bedient euch deren nur; ich brauche sie nicht mehr,
Weil ich selbst einer bin. (I, 85)

Menalk's next statement contains yet another allusion
to Der neue Amadis:

Drauf hab' ich auch gedacht, die Kritiker zu schrecken.
Was mir zu Handen kommt, bring ich in mein Gedicht**),
Und darum kehr' ich mich an keine Regel nicht:
Könt' ich das Wahre gleich vom Falschen unterscheiden,
Tät' ich doch solches nicht-

**) Siehe oben. (I, 80)66

One might logically argue that the attack in this instance
is clearly aimed at Kamm and that Wieland escapes unscathed.
Kamm, however, when informed of his role of dubious dis-
tinction in Menalk und Mopsus, is purported to have expressed
amazement at his being included in the august company of
a poet of Wieland's stature.

Kaum war ich ein wenig ruhig, als eine zweyte Critik
über mein Gedicht vorgelegt wurde. Ich war voller
Verwunderung, als ich sehen musste, dass man mich
als ein so schwaches glimmendes Fünkgen des Parnass
mit einem unserer grössten Lichter desselben auftreten machte und in einen Zwyekampf verwickelte.67

66 This is a reference to an earlier footnote, not
quoted above, which in turn refers to a work of the Strass-
burg poet Kamm (Menalk), the Gallimatisches Allerlei, iden-
tified by Erich Schmidt in the Archiv für Literaturgeschichte,
IX, 179-99.

67 Quoted in: Erich Schmidt, "Satirisches aus der
Geniezeit," Archiv für Literaturgeschichte, Vol. IX (Leipzig),
183.
A satiric attack by Lenz on a man so respectful towards Wieland and what he stood for, is tantamount to a direct attack on Wieland. The reproaches directed against Kamm become by implication a criticism of the very faults of Wieland's *Der neue Amadis*: the inappropriateness of both the source and the content of much of his work in Lenz's eyes, the inclusion of all sorts of extraneous material, and perhaps even the inability to distinguish between truth and falsehood.

Is it possible that with the disturbingly frequent use of the footnote and the repeated inclusion of material which seems to have absolutely no bearing on the poem itself, Lenz has gone a little too far in his attempts to satirize Wieland's style? A comparison of *Menalk und Mopsus* with *Der neue Amadis* might actually persuade some readers that Lenz has not gone far enough; that indeed, if it were not for the earlier publication date and its enormous length, Wieland's work might be mistaken for a parody of *Menalk und Mopsus*. Wieland's *Der neue Amadis* is approximately 180 pages long and contains 112 footnotes which cover an additional 35 pages of extremely fine print. Written in German, French, Latin, Italian and English, the footnotes are at times very difficult to unravel. One example should suffice to indicate what exactly Lenz was
objection to in the works of Wieland and to touch upon the
problem of Lenz's justification in criticizing Wieland:

Ein Dichter ist berechtigt, bei seinen Lesern
einige Kenntnis der Mythologie und Geschichte, und
einige Belesenheit in Romanen, Schauspielen und
anderen Werken der Einbildungskraft und des Witzes
vorauszusetzen; und es würde daher unnötig sein, zu
allen solchen Namen Anmerkungen zu machen, die einem
den kleinsten Grad von
Belesenheit hat. Der eben so schöne als zucht- und
tugendreiche Schäfer Seladon, der Held des grossen
heroischen Pastoral-Romans Asträa, ist unstreitig
einer von diesen allgemein bekannten Namen in der
poetischen Welt; man sagt: zärtlich wie Seladon, wie
man zu sagen pflegt: schön wie Adonis, oder: tapfer
und höflich wie Don Quichotte; jedermann versteht,
was man damit sagen will, wiewohl in unsern Tagen
vielleicht in ganz Europa nicht drei Personen leben,
welche sich rühmen könnten, die Asträa des Marquis
von Urfé gelesen zu haben, die doch in der ersten
Hälfte des vorigen Jahrhunderts die ganze schöne Welt
bezauberte, qui faisoit les délices des personnes les
plus spirituelles et même des savants, wie der P.
Niceron sagt. Um eine solche Wirkung zu tun, musste
sie wesentliche, durch die Veränderungen, welche die
Zeit im Geschmack, in den Sitten und in der Ganzen
Vorstellungsgeschichte der Völker hervorbringt,
unzertörbaren Verdienste haben: und so urteilte auch
der Abbé Souchal, da er 1733 eine neue Ausgabe der
Asträa in zehn Duodezänden bei Didot in Paris besorgte,
worin er, ohne an dem Hauptwerk und an den Episoden
etwas zu verändern, bloss die allzu langen und spitz-
förmigen Konversationen abgekürzt und die etwas
altfränkische Sprache aufgefrischt hat. Aber auch zu
dieser modernisierten Ausgabe konnten wenige Leser von
Geschmack so viel Geduld aufbringen, als nötig ist,
sich von Herrn d'Urfés höfischen, ritterhaften,
gelehrten und platonisch verliebten Schäfern zehn
Bände durch-Langweile machen zu lassen. Um also solchen
Lesern zu Hülfe zu kommen, die mit so berühmten
Personen, als Seladon und Asträa gern Bekanntschaft
machen möchten, aber nicht Mut genug haben, sich durch
einen so voluminösen, mit so vielen Episoden durch-
webten und mit so viel Theologie, Philosophie, Politik
und allen andern Arten von Gelehrsamkeit überladenen Roman durchzuarbeiten: hat ein Ungenannter die Quintessenz aus demselben heraus gezogen und unter dem Titel der Neuen Asträa eine kleine Komposition daraus gemacht, die man im neunten Bande der Bibliothèque de Campagne (Genf, 1761) finden kann, und deren grösstes Verdienst ist, dass sie nur sechs Bogen einnimmt. Der Menschenforscher, der in einem einst allgemein geschätzten Werke dieser Art den Geist und Charakter der Zeit aufsucht---ein Zweck, in dessen Rücksicht ein Roman, wie die Asträa des d'Urfé, selbst für den philosophischen Geschichtsschreiber wichtig ist---wird immer lieber die vier dicken Bände der ersten Ausgabe durchlaufen, als seine Zeit mit Lesung einer Asträa in nuce verderben, die weder das Verdienst des Originals hat, noch durch ihr eigenes unterhalten kann.68

Lenz's objections to this type of footnote and this rambling involved style in general can readily be understood. Yet it seems that Lenz and the young poets of the Sturm und Drang and the Göttinger Hainbund were unable to appreciate what Wieland was able to accomplish, not only in his lengthy footnotes, but in his verse narratives as a whole. They failed either to see the humor and gentle satire contained in these works or to recognize the debt Wieland owed to Fielding and Sterne, and they were never able to overcome their outrage at the erotic elements of Wieland's Rococo style. This problem will be treated later on.

In his own footnotes, Lenz employs two devices to disorient the reader and parody Wieland's usage. Like

68Christoph Martin Wieland, Epen und Verserzählungen, ed. by Friedrich Beissner (Darmstadt 1964), p. 411.
Wieland, he includes many of them to provide the reader with information which is at best only tangential to the subject of his poem. At other times, he sets up a system of cross references within the poem which, on the surface, appears to function in a logical fashion. Upon closer examination, however, the system collapses. The reader suddenly realizes that there is no way to determine the precise intention of those notes which say, siehe oben or Siehe die vorhergehende Note because they could refer to any of the works mentioned in any of the preceding footnotes. Since Lenz has deliberately left out the points of reference, the reader would have to analyse every work in order to understand the allusion.

Menalk again attempts to demonstrate his talent, this time with a crude epithalamium in honor of his benefactor:

Begeistre meine Sinnen, Entzünde meinen Trieb und lass mir nichts entrinnen! (I, 81)

or in his next lines:

Begeistre meinen Sinn; flöss Feuer in mein Blut; Entzünde meinen Trieb- (I, 81)

Mopsus interrupts him to demonstrate the proper treatment of such delicate matters in the sokratischer Art, sokratisch, of course, being one of Wieland's favorite words:
Und endlich kommt die Nacht herangeschlichen, ***)
In der das grosse Werk vollendet werden soll.
Schon steht mit fliegender Haar um ihren weissen Nacken
Die Tochter Bamboes hoffnungsvoll
Im magischen Kreise, schon blasen aus vollen Backen
Die Sonnengeister in die Glut *)
Heir mach ich eine Note

***) Siehe oben. [This footnote refers to the footnote above dealing with Der neue Amadis.]

**) Siehe die vorhergehende Note. [This notation directs the reader back to the previous one which in turn refers to Der neue Amadis.] (I, 81-82)

All of the lines cited above, except for the last line referring to the footnote, are once again verbatim borrowings from Wieland's Der neue Amadis, joined together completely out of context and interspersed with ridiculous comments by Menalk.

The above quoted passage stems from the tenth Gesang of Der neue Amadis and deals with the adventures of one of Bamboes's six daughters, Dindonette. Quoted out of context, these six lines seem to refer to the approaching seduction of Bamboes's daughter, an impression which Lenz does his best to strengthen in the reader. The section refers in reality, however, to a mystical ceremony to take place that evening and requiring an innocent virgin to be present. Lenz then links this particular quote with material from the eleventh Gesang, a section devoted to the adventures of Schatulliöse, another of Bamboes's daughters:
Menalk
Das ist besser drum
Beinah als meins.

Mopsus
So steht doch nicht so krumm,
Ihr macht mich fast mein Lied vergessen
Für Lachen, hört doch grad; [my italics]
Das Fräulein mag indessen
Im Schutz der solarischen Geister und ihrer Unschuld stehen
Wir werden zu rechter Zeit schon wieder nach ihr sehen.

Menalk
Was sind mit Verlaub das für Geister?

Mopsus
Hört den Zusammenhang- [my italics]
Kaum trat der Neger in den grünen Gang,
Der an die Terasse führte, wo Amadis kürzlich gestanden,
So sah er die fremde Dame und unsern Helden, so lang
Sie waren, ihn auf die Nase, sie rückwärts nieder-
sinken
Et cetera (I, 82)

Mopsus first instructs Menalk to listen carefully and then ends this statement with an almost exact borrowing from the tenth Gesang of Der neue Amadis. Becoming increasingly annoyed with the constant interruptions of Menalk, Mopsus tells him to "listen to the connection." Up to this point all the material from Der neue Amadis has stemmed from the tenth canto but we are now suddenly directed to watch carefully the way that the eleventh Gesang will be grafted on to the tenth. This connection of the two unrelated adventures will, in keeping with Lenz's attempt to satirize Wieland, be in the most lubrrious manner possible. Menalk, when commenting on the latest of Mopsus' creations interprets
everything with obvious erotic glee:

Menalk       [my italics]
He, he was machten sie denn da?
Mopsus
Dies alles zu rechnen, vom Fall der keuschen
Schatouillöse,
Der unsers Helden Fall nicht ohne mancherlei böse
Vermutungen nach sich zog, begab aufs längste sich
In zwanzig Sekunden

Menalk
So? dauert das so lang?
Mopsus
Ich weiss nicht. Hört doch nur auf den Zusammenhang
-- Doch plötzlich aufzustehen,
Lässt nach der Sache Gestalt der Wohlstand nicht
geschehen
Und unter uns es war nicht falsche Scham,
Er hatte von zwanzig Sekunden zum mindesten sechzehn
vonmitten
Dem kleinen Zufall, worin der Neger ihn betreten,
Abhelfliche Mass zu geben. (I, 82-83)

The all-important passage immediately following the line
ending "... , begab aufs längste sich in zwanzig Sekunden"
has been omitted by Lenz. In Der neue Amadis the section
ends in the following manner:

Und Amadisen zum Ruhme
Bemerkt die Geschichte, er habe so züchtiglich
Wie eine Vestalin, die ihre jungfräuliche Blume
Gleich ihren Augen bewahrt, vom Busen der schönen
Madam,
Auf den im Fallen sein Mund zu liegen kam,
Zurück sich gezogen. Doch, plötzlich aufzustehen
Liess, nach der Sachen Gestalt, der Wohlstand
nicht geschehen.69

The inclusion of this section in the original Der neue Amadis

69 Ibid., p. 335.
precludes any possible misinterpretation of the meaning of the ambivalent German word *Fall*. In Wieland's work, Schatulliöse trips and pulls Amadis to the ground after her. With Lenz's careful editing, however, the reader is left with the idea that *Fall* is to be interpreted as a fall from chastity into immodesty.

Menalk continues his ribald comments heaping "praise" on Mopsus for his lack of real content and for the way in which he has clothed his song, continually pandering to the sexual curiosity of the reader with titillating glimpses of Priapus:

**Menalk**

He he he, ha ha ha!  
Das heisst sokratisch scherzen. Nun das ist beinah  
Doch besser als meins. Fast meine Ode  
Vom Tode gäb ich drum *). Welch eine Periode!  
Wie man voll Ungeduld sich drinn verirrt,  
Und doch am Ende nichts gereicht wird.  
Wie wisst ihr doch das Ding so zierlich zu verstecken,  
Und witzig den Priap bald auf bald zuzudecken.  

**Mopsus**  
Das ist nun mein Talent. Und Schussfrei doch zu sein,  
So kleid ich all das in Moralen ein **).  
Der Weiber Unbestand, das ist die güldne Lehre,  
Die aus der Fabel fliesst, (I, 83)

For the first time in the satire, Mopsus concurs with Menalk. Mopsus agrees that his talent does indeed lie in the area of the sexual innuendo, adding the one important qualification that, in order to remain free from possible prosecution, he legitimizes everything with a moral. Mopsus
explains that the moral to be drawn from his new fable is the inconstancy of women. This has, of course, nothing at all to do with Wieland's main theme in the Der neue Amadis, but seems, on the contrary, to be another example of the satiric license Lenz has allowed himself.

Mopsus further elaborates on his theory of art in reply to Menalk's reproach that he is too circumspect in his works:

*Menalk*

. . . Nur, Möpschen, seid ihr doch ein wenig zu versteckt.

*Mopsus*


Lenz implies here that Wieland has succeeded in gratifying the baser natures of his reading public without resorting to blatant pornography. His hints and innuendoes are sufficiently suggestive that his aroused readers have no trouble imagining the explicit details.
CHAPTER V

DER NEUE MENOZA AND SELBSTREZENSION

Der neue Menoza, written shortly before October 1774, is the earliest of Lenz's plays to contain satirical attacks against Wieland. It is a loosely-constructed, hastily written pièce-à-thèse in which an oriental prince from the mythical kingdom of Cumba tours Europe to see for himself the advanced level of civilization supposedly attained.

The story of an Eastern traveller in Europe and his somewhat naïve impressions of European politics, religion, ethics, customs, and characters was an inevitable outgrowth of the renewed interest in the Orient, and had been a popular literary form for nearly a century by the time Lenz wrote his play. In such works as Montaigne's essay, De l'expérience (1591?) and the Jesuit Athanasius Kircher's encyclopedic China illustrata (1670), the wisdom and good government of the Chinese were emphasized. Leibniz added his praise in Novissima Sinaica (1697) and urged the French government to increase the number of Jesuit scholars sent to study the state of affairs in the "Middle Flower Kingdom."
With the publication of learned and relatively impartial books on non-Christian religions, the travelogues of Tavernier (1670) and Chardin (1685), Galland's French translation of the Arabian Nights (Mille et une nuits, 1704-17), and the frequent appearance in Europe of the exotic retinues of Turkish ambassadors, enthusiastic interest in the Middle East was also sustained. One result of this increased knowledge of other civilizations was a new awareness of the relativity of customs and beliefs, morals and mores. In the face of religious and political absolutism, such free-thinkers as Bayle in the Dictionnaire historique et critique (1697) and Voltaire used information about oriental countries, which was at times exaggerated, to make embarrassing comparisons with the West. (e.g. Dictionnaire philosophique (1764)). In L'Espion du grand seigneur (1684) Giovanni Marana had created a fictitious Turkish spy who reported to his sultan on European life. Addison, Dufresny, Gueudeville, and Cotolendi imagined similarly provocative situations concerning foreign visitors in Europe. In the most famous work of this genre, Montesquieu's Lettres persanes (1721), the absurdities, discrepancies and iniquities of both France and the Persian Empire are treated ironically.

The novel of the Danish statesman Erich Pontoppidan, Menoza, ein asiatischer Prinz, welcher die Welt umher
durchzogen, Christen zu suchen, aber des Gesuchten wenig gefunden, appeared in a German translation in 1742, giving Lenz little more than a title to start with. Unlike Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes* and other works of this type, Lenz's *Der neue Menoza* offers intellectual rather than social criticism of a kind which is directed against what he considered the pernicious philosophical and moral atmosphere prevalent in contemporary Europe, and not against the political and religious establishment, the arbitrary codes of social behavior, or the injustices and inequalities of an anachronistic caste system. An examination of Prinz Tandi's specific complaints about this aspect of European life clearly indicates Lenz's departure from this literary tradition.

> In Eurem Morast erstücke ich - treib's nicht länger- mein Seel nicht! Das der aufgeklärte Weltteil! Allenthalben wo man hinriecht, Lässigkeit, faule ohnmächtige Begier, lallender Tod für Feuer und Leben, Geschwätz für Handlung . . .

> . . . - alles zugestanden, ihr wisst erstaunlich viel, aber ihr tut nichts - . . .

> Ich wollte sagen, ihr wisst nichts; alles was ihr zusammengestoppelt, bleibt auf der Oberfläche eures Verstandes, wird zu List, nicht zu Empfindung, ihr kennt das Wort nicht einmal; was ihr Empfindung nennt, ist verkleisterete Wollust; was ihr Tugend nennt, ist Schminke, womit ihr Brutalität bestreicht. (II, 268-69)

Tandi's statements represent Lenz's objections to what he
considered to be the effete, even deceitful, confusion of art and morality that Wieland and his followers had taken, in part, from Shaftesbury. In spite of their esthetic and moral pretensions, the Rococo writers had, according to Lenz, accepted superficial understanding, impotent desire, meaningless chatter, and illusory pleasures for real "Feuer und Leben." They echoed the English philosopher in saying that beauty is true and good and that virtue is the highest beauty, but, in reality, their own so-called virtues were mere decorations. Throughout the play, Lenz repeats and develops his dissatisfaction with the Rococo writers on these two levels, the esthetic and moral. In keeping with the seriousness of its theme Der neue Menoza displays intellectual satire rather than the biting, personally abusive, and sometimes scabrous satire of Menalk und Mopsus.

At the heart of Lenz's esthetic criticism of Wieland and the Rococo is his condemnation of their highly stylized and idealistic representation of the world. The somewhat ridiculous proponent of this non-realistic concept of art is first identified with Lenz's literary opponents, then allowed to extol and defend the principles to which they subscribe.

Zierau

Ein Bakkalaureus aus Wittenberg doch hab'
ich schon über drei Jahr in Leipzig den
Musen und Grazién geopfert. (II, 261)

The inflated rhetoric, the idea of sacrificing to the Muses
and the Graces, and the association with Leipzig—at that
time considered to be that German city which is most like
Paris—all these factors serve to classify Zierau as a
representative of the Rococo. His exaggerated praise of
the movement, punctuated by Tandi's monosyllabic lack of
enthusiasm, effectively discredits all those he mentions by
name.

Zierau

Die Verbesserung aller Künste, aller Dis-
ziplinen und Stände ist seit einigen tausend
Jahren die vereinigte Bemühung unserer besten
Köpfe gewesen; es scheint, wir sind dem Zeit-
punkt nah, da wir von diesen herkulischen
Bestrebungen endlich einmal die Früchte ein-
sammen, und es wäre zu wünschen, die ent-
ferntesten Nationen der Welt kämen, an unsrer
Ernte teilzunehmen.

Prinz

So?

Zierau

Wir haben itzt schon seit einem Jahrhunderte
fast Namen aufzuweisen, die wir kühnlich den
größesten Genies unserer Nachbarn an die Seite
setzen können, die alle zur Verbesserung und
Verfeinerung unserer Nation geschrieben haben,
einen Besser, Gellert, Rabéner, Dusch, Schlegel,
Uz, Weisse, Jacobi, worunter aber vorzüglich
der unsterbliche Wieland über sie alle gleich-
sam hervorragt, ut inter ignes luna minores,
besonders durch den letzten Traktat, den er
geschrieben, und wodurch er allen seinen Werken
die Krone scheint aufgesetzt zu haben, den
goldenen Spiegel – ich weiss nicht, ob Sie
schon davon gehört haben, meiner Einsicht nach
sollte er's den diamantenen Spiegel heissen. (II, 261–62)
Verbesserung and Verfeinerung are repeatedly emphasized by Zierau as the twin goals of the best of Germany's writers. Where the preoccupation with "improvement" and "refinement" of the arts actually leads, according to Lenz, is then indicated by Zierau's abbreviated synopsis of Der goldene Spiegel (1772). The book, he explains, describes the establishment of a perfect state whose "Bürger . . . alle unsere kühnsten Fiktionen von Engeln an Grazie übertreffen" (II, 262). Prinz Tandi, in search of practical information for the government of real people, rejects the utopian fantasies of Zierau's hero with disdain. "Ich nehme die Menschen lieber wie sie sind, ohne Grazie, als wie sie aus einem spitzigen Federkiele hervorgehen" (II, 262). Lenz's attack seems to be twofold in nature. First, there is the barb directed against the Rococo ideal of refinement which results in a distortion of the reality of nature and of human society. Without this contact with reality, Lenz maintains, art has lost its bearings and its usefulness. Secondly, the representation of utopias or of exaggeratedly beautiful situations has a bad effect on the mental habits of the readers, teaching them to be permanently dissatisfied and discouraging them from working for possible improvements. Zierau himself is an example,
in his abortive attempt to emulate Wieland because he dreams of writing a book called *Unvorgreifliche Ratschläge, das goldene Zeitalter wieder einzuführen*. Finding fantasy so much more beautiful than actual deeds, he is unable to write, lead a constructive life, or even keep from being bored.

Zierau

Lenz also suggests that suicide is a possible, albeit extreme, conclusion to a slavish adherence to the principles of the Rococo philosophy.

In his theoretical *Anmerkungen übers Theater* (1771) Lenz had already denounced as an unfortunate Rococo idée fixe the stylized and idealistic vision of the world.

... nach meiner Empfindung schätze ich den Charakteristischen, selbst den Karikaturmalen zehnmal höher als den Idealischen, hyperbolisch gesprochen, denn es gehört zehnmal dazu, eine Figur mit eben der Genauigkeit und Wahrheit
He much prefers that artist who attempts to represent the real world and not a beautiful unattainable ideal. Another section of the Anmerkungen übers Theater elaborates on this point:

Der wahre Dichter verbindet nicht in seiner Einbildungskraft, wie es ihm gefällt, was die Herren die schöne Natur zu nennen belieben, was aber, mit ihrer Erlaubnis, nichts als die verfehlte Natur ist. . . . Man könnte sein Gemälde mit der Sache verwechseln, und der Schöpfer sieht auf ihn hinab, wie auf die kleinen Götter, die mit seinem Funken in der Brust auf den Thronen der Erde sitzen, und seinem Beispiel gemäss eine kleine Welt erhalten. (I, 230)

Zierau’s failure to overcome indolence and finish his book, however, does not seem to discourage him from pontificating on the subject of good art. With reference to the puppet theater he exclaims, "Was die schöne Natur nicht nachahmt, Papa! Das kann unmöglich gefallen" (I, 323). The reference to "beautiful nature" does not mean that Zierau advocates mimesis or imitation of nature. On the contrary, the expression belongs to a platonistic tradition of enhanced, refined, improved nature, a nature that never existed except in the poetic imagination. In almost the same words Hume wrote, "Nothing can please
persons of taste but nature drawn with all her graces and ornaments, *la belle nature.* 70 This *belle nature,* explained Batteux, is not "le vrai qui est; mais le vrai qui peut être, le beau vrai, qui est représenté comme s'il exis
toit réellement, et avec toutes les perfections qu'il peut recevoir." 71

Materialistic philosophers such as Hobbes and Locke had maintained that the poetic imagination was nothing but a new and more pleasing combination of ideas and forms derived by the senses from a number of different experiences and held in the storehouse of memory. Wieland, however, belonged to an important trend in eighteenth century thought, in obedience to which men of letters rejected the idea of ordinary mimesis, looked on literature as a "heterocosm," a 'second nature,' created by the poet in an act analogous to God's creation of the world. 72 The poet's art was acknowledged to be a free and an original creation, almost *ex nihilo,* drawing its inspiration, significance and coherence from the imagination as well as the outside world. It is interesting to note that, even during his pietistic

72 Abrams, p. 272.
period with Bodmer, Wieland was exposed to a form of artistic idealism. M. H. Abrams observes that the writings of the Swiss friends, Johann Bodmer and Johann Breitinger, offered the "most extensive and influential application of cosmogony to poetry."

... the chief novelty is the emphasis on the productive powers of the poet and especially, the elaboration of the imaginative coming-into-being of the poetic marvelous, on the paradigm of Leibniz's description of the way God created the world in which we live ... This operation of the poet is "exactly the same as that by which things [in nature] which are merely possible are brought over out of this condition into the condition of real existence ..." 73

Bodmer distinguished between the actual world and the imaginative world, rational truth and poetic truth and ascribed value and meaning to both. Because the poet had transcended the level of the skilled craftsman who only imitates empirical reality to become a creative demigod, standing "highest among men on the Ladder of Being," 74 he deserves the respectful gratitude of the rest of humanity.

While Bodmer tolerated the marvelous, the supernatural, and the fantastic as products of the artist's imagination, another writer who had an enormous influence on Wieland stressed the creation of idealized but lifelike

73 Ibid., pp. 276-77
74 Ibid., p. 277.
human beings by the poet. Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, criticized outright fantasy and recommended the bringing-to-life of characters who seem real in every respect except actual existence.

The man who truly . . . deserves the name of poet, . . . can describe both men and manners, and give to an action its just body and proportion . . . Such a poet is indeed a second Maker, a just Prometheus under Jove. Like that sovereign artist or universal plastic nature, he forms a whole, coherent and proportioned in itself, with due subjection and subordinacy of the constituent parts . . . The moral artist ... can thus imitate the Creator.75

This definition does not imply imitation, for "They are mean spirits who live to copy merely."76 Instead, his esthetic doctrine, reinforcing his philosophical optimism, suggests that art evokes a partly intellectual, partly emotional intuition of an ideal world, just as natural phenomena symbolize with their many incomplete parts the ideal realm of the divine plan. For Shaftesbury, beauty, truth, and virtue are intimately interrelated. Good art can be produced only in a healthy society by a virtuoso who has made of his very life a work of art. Good art deals not with imperfect reality, but rather with the most healthy and perfect vision of life attainable by man. Anything

75Quoted, ibid., p. 280.
76Quoted in: Charles Elson, Wieland and Shaftesbury (New York 1913), p. 103.
less is neither good nor beautiful and cannot advance
character in the individual or the level of morality in
society.

It was necessary to give consideration to the philo-
sophical ideas of Shaftesbury because he represents the
single greatest influence in the literary career of Wieland,
greater than any native German influence, greater than Bodmer
or the pietistic thinkers, greater than the French Rococo
writers. Gruber states in his biography that Wieland equated
Shaftesbury's concept of the virtuoso with Socrates's
kalokagathia, and that everything Wieland produced thereafter
demonstrates Shaftesbury's influence in one way or another.
There can be no denying the fact that Shaftesbury's "moral
grace" is the source for Wieland's moral-esthetic philosophy.
There are countless references in Wieland's correspondence
and in his works themselves to the "moral Venus" of Shaftes-
bury. The doctrine of prime or divine beauty as a source of
all other beauty which was developed by Shaftesbury is also
much in evidence in Wieland's works. In Musarion, to name
just one example, Theophron talks of the first essential
beauty (vom Ersten Wesentlichen Schönen):

Wie das alles, was wir sehen
Und durch der Sinne Dienst mit unserer Seele gatten,
Von dem, was über sinnlich schön
Und göttlich ist, nur wesenlose Schatten,
Nur Bilder sind; wie wenn in stiller Flut,
Von Büschen eingefasst, sich Sommerwolken malen.77

All that we see in life is only a shadow of the first essential beauty, but the purpose of art is to suggest that ideal beauty and not gross reality.

Shaftesbury, while granting that man has a moral and esthetic nature, stresses the need for training in order to bring his talents to their highest development. This moral training comes mainly from appreciation of art and literature, for beauty is good and true, and the persuasive power of morality is its esthetic appeal. Wieland, too, subscribes to this doctrine when he expresses the idea that everyone is born with a feeling for the esthetic and moral which, however, never arrives at development without exposure to wisdom and science. Lenz uses Zierau in the Der neue Menoza to parody this point so essential to Wieland's art. He has been educated along the lines advocated by Wieland, he has studied the Graces and Muses at the University of Leipzig and yet he is a ridiculous failure in life. Wieland feels that youth must be educated to recognize virtue instantly as something beautiful and desirable and vice as hideous and abhorrent. The faculty which

77Wieland, Epen und Verserzählungen, p. 600.
allows man to distinguish between these two possibilities is taste; the purpose of education is to develop taste in the youth of a nation in the same way that Greek boys were brought up after the image of the kaloskagathos, a virtuoso or ideal man who strove for fullness of experience and excellence in all phases of life. Ideally, he is a cosmopolitan lover of art and culture, assimilating to himself the best that every civilization has to offer; a whole rich personality who lives intensely, who develops all his faculties; a "beautiful soul" who practices virtue for the beauty of it.

Wieland's Goldener Spiegel (1772) contains a program for the education of youth based on Shaftesbury and the Greek doctrine of kalokagathia. The Shaftesburian virtuoso is a product of this system of education.

To be a virtuoso is a higher step towards the becoming of a man of virtue and good sense than the being what in this age we call a scholar.

The virtuosi are the real fine gentlemen, the lovers of art and ingenuity; such as have seen the world and informed themselves of the manners and customs of the several nations of Europe, searched into their antiquities and records; considered their police, laws and constitutions; observed the situation, strength and ornaments of their cities, their principal arts, studies, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and their taste in poetry, learning language and conversation.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{78}Elson, pp. 36-38.
Lenz's Tandi provides an interesting parody of Wieland's educational aims. He too can be thought of as a virtuoso in the sense of Shaftesbury and Wieland because of his striving for knowledge and his attempts to learn about the morals and customs of the aufgeklärte Weltteil. The result of his quest for kalokagathia, however, turns into a complete rejection of Wieland's and, by extension, of Shaftesbury's proposals.

As will already have become apparent, Lenz's moral and ethical criticisms of Wieland are closely related to esthetic considerations. In Lenz's opinion, a preoccupation with idealistic visions, utopias or the "good old days" of the past precludes contributing to the moral edification of one's contemporaries. At the same time, Lenz exaggerates the aspect of pleasure in Wieland's eudaemonistic philosophy and ignores completely the moral intentions of his opponent.

Zierauf, the champion of Wieland and the German Rococo, is the shabby representative of the eudaemonistic philosophy in Der neue Menoza. With his egocentric search for personal pleasure as the highest good, he misrepresented the ideals of a philosophy that has its roots in classical antiquity. The goal or aim of all human activity was expressed by Aristotle, the Stoics, and the Epicureans in the concept of eudaemonia, the happy state of the daimon,
genius or soul when it conforms to the divine order of the universe. The idea involves pleasure, but of a high order, and is better translated by the word well-being. Pleasure, honor, and wealth are inadequate to bring the individual to this peak of existence. Instead, the Greeks thought of eudaemonia as coming from wisdom, virtue, and self-mastery, not accepted as passive attitudes but expressed dynamically throughout one's entire life. It is true that a minimum of external goods are required to achieve this ideal--good birth, financial comfort, health, pleasant appearance, friends--; but these goods are considered a means to the ultimate good, in which moral actions, intellectual excellence and spiritual pleasure coincide. Although the philosophy is expressed in terms of personal perfection, the individual cannot know well-being if isolated from other men. The active practice of virtue is accomplished through service to one's fellow human beings, by respecting their daimon and helping them to live in accordance with this divine spark. The only thing this philosophy has in common with Zierau's crass hedonism is its teleological outlook. Actions are judged according to their eudaemonistic results and not with reference to a preordained system of laws. Wieland combined this ideal with the related ideal of the kalakagathos and the virtuoso and made of it the standard
for his works and his personal life as well as the subject
matter of his poetry. Only the true cosmopolitan and virtuoso
can accomplish the task with which all men are entrusted.
The task is according to Wieland, to "cultivate, enlighten,
and ennoble the human race."\textsuperscript{79}

The clearest exposition of Lenz's opinion of Wieland
occurs in Act II, Scene VI, in the course of which the pseudo-
eudaemonist, Zierau, the reasonable prince, Tandi, and
Magister Beza, the pietistic opponent of all pleasures in
life, engage in a revealing philosophical dialogue. In con-
trast to Wieland's eudaemonistic philosophy which takes into
account social responsibility and a hierarchy of pleasure,
Zierau advocates a simplistic brand of hedonism, which bears
no resemblance to the humanistic ideas of his avowed hero.

\begin{quote}
Was ist Leben ohne Glückseligkeit? . . .
Wir handeln auch, uns Genuss zu erwerben, zu
sichern . . . Mich deucht, vernünftig leben ist
das beste System . . . Die echte Vernunft lehrt
uns glücklich sein, unseren Pfad mit Blumen
bestreuen. [Und wenn die Blumen welken und
sterben], so pflückt man neue. (II, 275-77)
\end{quote}

Either through misrepresentation for satirical purposes or
through a genuine lack of understanding of eudaemonism, Lenz
portrays Zierau as a man with no moral convictions or
scruples. It is perfectly consistent with his character that

\textsuperscript{79}Quoted in: Peter Gay, \textit{The Enlightenment: An Inter-
he does not hesitate to pander and procure for the lascivious Graf Caméleon. Ironically, as we have already observed above in the discussion of esthetic problems, this man who lives only for enjoyment, suffers from interminable boredom. Pleasure, we learn, as the unique goal in life rather than as an adjunct to worthwhile activity, soon turns stale.

Magister Beza, a scholar who has sacrificed his personal life to make an Arabic translation of Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ*, is at the opposite pole from Zierau with his condemnation of all forms of earthly pleasures. The still popular *Imitation of Christ* would be associated by Lenz's readers with the pietistic religious movement in Germany because of its emotional mysticism; its emphasis on inner spirituality, faith, and devotion above reason and good works. Pietism had been gaining ground in Europe since the second half of the seventeenth century in both Catholic and Protestant milieux, wherever Christians felt a need for a more intense religious experience. In contrast to worldly Jesuits and doctrinaire Lutherans, they cultivated individual ecstasies, mystical puritanism, and anti-intellectual millenarianism. Because they felt that the Second Coming and Armageddon were imminent, their manners were severe and their lives were pursued without pleasure. It is highly ironic that a scholar should be the exponent of this
non-rational movement, but, in fact, Beza's learning results in emotional pedantry rather than reason or common sense. He makes no objection when Zierau characterizes him as a doomsday prophet.

Der Magister ist wenigstens mit unsern Sitten noch weniger zufrieden als Eure Hoheit. Er behauptet, es könne mit uns nicht lange währen, wir müssten im Feuer und Schwefel untergehen, wie Sodom ... Die Welt liegt im Argen - ist ihrem Untergang nahe. (II, 275)

When Tandi argues that the world is no better and no worse than it has ever been, Beza expresses his unqualified pessimism in the face of so much ungodly activity.


Tandi tries to modify Zierau's extreme pleasure-is-everything philosophy by stating that pleasure for its own sake is empty, but that pleasure as an attendant result of good actions is "das einzige Glück der Welt." (II, 277) Beza, however, is such an enemy of human enjoyment that he cannot even admit that good feeling which accompanies virtue and good works. Anyone who claims that moral imperatives are not accomplished with a sense of stern duty must, perforce, be an advocate of freethinking—a label given to deists,
agnostics and atheists by puritanical religious groups.

Ja das ist die Freigeisterphilosophie, die Weltphilosophie – aber zu der schüttelt jeder den Kopf, dem es ein Ernst mit seiner Seele ist. Es ist alles eitel. O Eitelkeit, Eitelkeit, wie doch das die armen Menschen so fesseln kann, darüber den Himmel zu vergessen, und ist doch alles Kot, Staub, Nichts! (II, 276)

Zierau then explains that Magister Beza is a typical German, "der den Fehler aller Deutschen hat, er baut sich ein System, und was dahinein nicht passt, gehört in die Hölle." (II, 276) Beza replies with his condemnation of those who have abandoned themselves to the pursuit of pleasure.

Und ihr Herren Kleinmeister und ihr Herren Franzosen lebt immerfort ohne System, ohne Ziel und Zweck, bis euch, mit Respekt zu sagen, der Teufel holt, und dann seid ihr verloren, hier zeitlich und dort ewig. (II, 276)

The pleasure seekers will not only be lost in this life, but, in keeping with Beza's position as Pietist, in the hereafter. Tandi adds that anyone who erects a system that ignores the conditions of the real world, will either live his life as a hypocrite or will fail to live at all. During the course of the discussion it becomes apparent that Tandi is right about rigid systems, for Beza hates not only pleasure, but the whole human race and always considers even the best of human qualities under the worst possible light. When Zierau talks sentimentally of love, Beza asserts that love is good only to fill the bordellos.
Prince Tandi represents the middle way in this discussion, synthesizing the best aspects of the two extreme philosophies into a reasonable, mature and more or less comprehensive outlook on life.

Weniger Strenge, Herr! eins ist freilich so schlimm als das andere; wer ohne Zweck lebt, wird sich bald zu Tode leben, und wer auf der Studierstube ein System zimmert, ohne es der Welt anzupassen, der lebt entweder seinem System all Augenblick schnurstracks zuwider, oder er lebt gar nicht. (II, 276)

Neither optimistic nor pessimistic, Tandi recognizes the responsibility of each individual to make a worthwhile life for himself based on reason and faith in God.

... Vernunft ohne Glauben ist kurz sichtig und ohnmächtig, und ich kenne vernünftige Tiere so gut als unvernünftige. Der echten Vernunft ist der Glaube das einzige Gewicht, das ihre Triebräder in Bewegung setzen kann, sonst stehen sie still, und rosten ein, und wehe dann der Maschine! (II, 276)

He feels that life should not be a vale of tears, a long and dismal preparation for the day of judgment. Neither does he endorse unmitigated hedonism which loses sight of the higher pleasures derived from intellectual effort, the practice of virtue and service to others. The quest for pure pleasure is ultimately nihilistic, but the active moral life generates satisfaction as its natural adjunct. Tandi, therefore, does accept pleasure as a positive principle. It must, however, occupy a subordinate position in the
activity of any individual as one of the manifestations of a beneficial moral activity and never as the goal of an activity.

Genuss und Liebe sind das einzige Glück der Welt; nur unser innerer Zustand muss ihm den Ton geben. (II, 277)

This last comment of Tandi's introduces a dialogue on the subject of love. In response to Tandi's plaidoyer for love and Beza's complete rejection of the concept, Zierau proposes a system of education tantamount to free love.

Ich wünschte, wir könnten die Jugend erst lieben lehren, die Bordelle würden bald leer werden. (II, 277)

Tandi's reply contains an implicit counterproposal barely hinted at here in Der neue Menoza, but elaborated upon extensively in Die Soldaten (1774-75) another of Lenz's works from approximately the same period.

Aber es würde vielleicht um desto schlimmer mit der Welt stehen. Liebe ist Feuer, und besser ist's, man legt es zu Stroh, als an ein Ährenfeld. Solange da nicht andere Anstalten vorgekehrt werden - (II, 277)

Tandi's allegorical use of "Stroh" and "Ährenfeld" to represent respectively worn out and marriageable classes of womanhood is carried much further than this in Die Soldaten. Lenz actually believed that a group of self-abnegating women should be recruited to accompany the troops and spare the remaining young women from seduction,
abandonment and ruin at the hands of the soldiers. The Countess in Die Soldaten introduces the discussion which results in the formulation of Lenz's solution:

Gräfin
Ich habe allezeit eine besondere Idee gehabt, wenn ich die Geschichte der Andromeda gelesen. Ich sehe die Soldaten an wie das Ungheuer, dem schon von Zeit zu Zeit ein unglückliches Frauenzimmer freiwillig aufgeopfert werden muss, damit die übrigen Gattinnen und Töchter verschont bleiben.

Obrister
Ihre Idee ist lange die meinige gewesen, nur habe ich sie nicht so schön gedacht. Der König müsste dergleichen Personen besolden, die sich auf die Art dem äussersten Bedürfnis seiner aufopfernten, denn kurz um, den Trieb haben doch alle Menschen, dieses wären keine Weiber, die die Herzen der Soldaten feig machen könnten, es wären Konkubinen, die allenthalben in den Krieg mitzügen und allenfalls wie jene Medischen Weiber unter dem Cyrus die Soldaten zur Tapferkeit aufmuntern würden.

(III, 93)

Leonard Feinberg offers the following commentary on authors who present fantastical schemes for the solution of problems presented in their satires:

... satirists have always suspected that there is no utopian solution to men's problems. But they have usually been reluctant to confess that suspicion. It is advisable for satirists to restrain themselves from offering positive alternatives, those alternatives are usually prone to be either so abstract as to be useless, or so banal as to be childish.80

The appearance of Lenz's *Der neue Menoza* evoked widely varied opinions from its critics and readers. Schubart, a good friend of Lenz, was highly critical of the new work and bemoaned the squandering of talent. Wieland advised his circle of readers in the *Teutscher Merkur* (November 1774) to read only one scene at a time and never the entire work. The *Wandsbecker Bote* (October 14, 1774) called *Der neue Menoza* an excellent comedy. Merok, who had called *Clavigo* "Quark," wished that, in spite of the digressions and excesses, he had written *Menoza* himself. Herder wrote to Hartknoch November 19, 1774: "Die Leiden Werthers, den Hofmeister, Clavigo und den Neuen Menoza lies und giebs Deiner Frau." Goethe himself had arranged for the publication of the play, indeed many attributed the work to Goethe, indicating the position of Goethe with regard to *Menoza*. He could certainly have issued a disclaimer if he had held the work to be something far beneath his talents.

Because of these conflicting views, the authors can in no way be divided into two camps along literary lines (i.e. Rococo vs. Sturm und Drang), Lenz felt it incumbent upon himself to issue his *Rezension des neuen Menoza* as an explanation and defense of the work:

... damit man nun nicht etwa glaube, ich habe hinter seinem Namen [Goethe] Schutz gesucht, ...
... will ich hiermit jedermann sagen, was ich von meinem Stück selber halte. (II, 329)
Lenz was not surprised at the general public's rejection of his work. He expected nothing else for a work in which the protagonist so completely turns his back on Europe and Western civilization:

Mich wundert der Kaltsinn im geringsten nicht, mit welchem das Publikum meinen Menoza aufgenommen:

... Ein Prinz, der ohne den geringsten Anteil, mit dem kalten Auge eines Beobachters, aber eines Beobachters, dem darum zu tun war, Wahrheit, Grösse und Güte zu finden, von allen marktschreierischen Nachrichten, die ihm Jesuiten und Missionaren gaben, auf die höchste Erwartung gespannt, quer durch mein Vaterland reist und darinnen nun nicht viel find't, wenigstens das nicht find't, was er suchte, konnt' in demselbigen sein Glück nicht machen. (II, 330)

One of the main themes of Menoza, idealism versus realism, is treated again in the Rezension des neuen Menoza. An objection to the figure of Donna Diana in Der neue Menoza was that she was too savage, too wild to be credible, and that Graf Camäleon was also somehow "unnatural." Lenz replies to these objections in the following fashion:

Ich habe gegen diesen Menschen gewöhnliche Menschen meines Jahrhunderts abstechen lassen, aber immer mit dem von mir einmal unumstößlich angenommenen Grundsatz für theatricalische Darstellung, zu dem Gewöhnlichen, ich möcht' es die treffende Aehnlichkeit heissen, eine Verstärkung, eine Erhöhung hinzuzutun, die uns die Alltagscharaktere im gemeinen Leben auf dem Theater anzüglich, interessant machen kann. (II, 331)

It would seem at first that Lenz has contradicted one of his basic tenets with this statement. He is guilty of tampering
with "nature" exactly as Wieland does. A moment's reflection, however, reveals the difference between Wieland's evocation of Die schöne Natur and Lenz's Verstärkung or Erhöhung for the sake of the audience's interest. Lenz never tries to change what he finds in nature, but only to make it more interesting for his public. Whereas what Wieland offers is in no way an imitation, but rather an idealization, of nature. Lenz provides a definition of exactly what schöne Natur means for him:

... Ich habe nur den Grafen Camäleon erträgliche Farben geben wollen, um unser Auge nicht zu beleidigen. Das ist es, was ich schöne Natur nenne, nicht Verzückungen in willkürliche Träume, die nur der schön findet, der wachend glücklich zu sein verzweifeln muss. (II, 331)

It is permissible to improve on a negative figure who would be too objectionable to the audience, but to present characters who are so perfect as to have never existed is to expose the audience to despair because of the hopelessness of ever achieving such perfection.

A point common to the Rezension and to the Verteidigung des Herrn W. gegen die Wolken (1776) is Lenz's feeling that Wieland is unfairly attacking him where he is weakest: in his admiration for and imitation of Shakespeare's style and Shakespeare's disregard for the unities of the theater.

Mit alledem bin ich weit säuberlicher mit Herrn W. gefahren, als er mit mir, ich habe ihm nicht
an dem Flecken anzutasten gesucht, wo es ihm am wehesten tun musste, wie er wohl gegen mich,
. . . Er sah, dass ich mich durchaus in Shakes-
peare's Manier und die Komposition, die aufs Grosse
geht und sich auf Zeit und Ort nicht einschränken
Kann, hineinstudiert hatte, . . . (IV, 311-12)

The same argument is expressed more subtly in the Rezension
des Menoza:

Herr Wieland irret sich, wenn er glaubt, dass ich
in keiner andern Maske auftreten könne, um unsre
heutige theatricalische Kunst lächerlich zu machen,
als der des Bürgermeister in Naumburg. (II, 332)

The mayor's predilection for the Puppenspiel stamps him as
an advocate of a theater tradition characterized by raw humor,
rapid scene changes, violent emotions--not unlike the
Shakespearian tradition. Wieland, as evidenced by Lenz's
quote in the Rezension, immediately linked the Mayor of
Naumburg with an attack on the theatrical arts of the
period.

Lenz further objects to Wieland's description of his
language in the Ammerkungen übers Theater as Rotwelsch.
Wieland is here referring to Lenz's use of a style which
presented the reader with great difficulties. There are
numerous fragmentary sentences, frequent changes of subject
with little or no preparation and always an apparent dis-
regard for the reader. These techniques of the Sturm und
Drang were then carried over into their dramatic works and
in part explained and justified by Lenz in his Rezension.
The partially unfounded events in *Der neue Menoza* (the murder of Donna Diana's father, Gustav's suicide) stem from Lenz's abhorrence for "überhaupt alle Erzählungen auf dem Theater." (II, 333) In addition Lenz would like to allow "der geschwungenen Phantasie des Zuschauers auch was zu tun und zu vermuten, . . . und ihm nicht alles vorkäuen." (II, 333)

Lenz concludes his *Rezension des Menoza* with an explanation of his concept of comedy, an explanation which provides insight into the so-called tragicomedies *Der Hofmeister*, *Die Soldaten*, and, to a limited extent, into *Der neue Menoza*. Comedy is a presentation, "die für jedermann ist" (II, 333), whereas tragedy was intended for the more serious members of the public:

Komödie ist Gemälde der menschlichen Gesellschaft, und wenn die ernsthaft wird, kann das Gemälde nicht lachend werden. (II, 334)

This then is the reason for Lenz's juxtaposition of the comic and tragic elements in his comedies. The people for whom the works are written are not homogeneous, but rather, "ein solcher Mischmasch von Kultur und Rohigkeit, Sittigkeit und Wildheit . . .". (II, 334)
CHAPTER VI

PANDÄMONIUM GERMANICUM

Lenz's Pandämonium Germanicum is presented in the format of a play, with divisions into acts and scenes and numerous stage directions, but it is obvious that the satirical preoccupations of the writer have completely overshadowed the dramatic aspects of the work. If this play were to have been performed, not only would the stage manager have had to solve the serious physical problems of climbing mountains, travelling aloft in a balloon and metamorphosing critics into flies, but also the theater-going public would have been confronted with esoteric literary allusions that it had no way of understanding. In addition many of the explanations and humorous points are made in the stage directions and could not be appreciated without access to the script. Instead of a drama with a coherent structure and plot, Pandämonium Germanicum should be considered a series of vignettes. Lenz, appearing as himself, acts as an apostle of the God-like figure of Goethe, announces a new kind of literature, and attacks Wieland and other
writers who have used an effeminate, purely decorative art to preach a debased view of life. Lenz's caustic treatment of these "inferior" writers falls within the tradition of the pasquill, an anonymous form of parody and satiric attack, verging at times on outright slander, in this case meant to be circulated among the members of a select coterie.

To praise the *Sturm und Drang* movement Lenz relies heavily on biblical situations in which Goethe appears as the hero, the prophet, and the new God. Like Moses on Mount Sinai, or Christ on the mountain where Moses and Elijah appear to him, Goethe is seen climbing easily to the summit of a steep mountain where he in turn will be greeted by Klopstock, the almost legendary hero of the young *Stürmer und Dränger* whose *Messias* (1748) created a new image of the poet as a seer and divine creator.

Da -- o da steht Klopstock. Wie, dass ich ihn von unten nicht wahrnehm? Ich will zu ihm. Er deucht mich auszuruhen, . . . Edler Mann! (III, 4)

On other occasions throughout the work, Goethe chases the merchants from the temple and receives in the purified place his predecessors, Lessing, Klopstock, and Herder; confronts the Philistines with an ass's jawbone like Sampson; passes judgment on contemporary writers and is compared with God the true Creator. Continuing the biblical metaphor of Creation, Lenz draws a parallel between Satan and the
mediocre imitators of Goethe.

Kam der Teufel, sagte, ei was eine grosse Kunst ist denn das, solche Figuren zu machen, darf ich nur ein bissel MörTEL zusammenkneten und darauf blasen, wird's gleich herumgehen und leben und die Tiere in Respekt erhalten. Tät er dem auch also, pappte eine Menge Leim zusammen, rollt's in seinen Händen, behaucht' und begeiferte es, blies sich fast den Odem aus, fu fi fi fu-- aber geskizzen wor nit gemohlen. (III, 27)

In the struggle to surmount the giant mountain, break with the literary tradition of the Enlightenment and the Rococo, and create a new art, no one can compete with Goethe. At the foot of the mountain are clustered pusillanimous members of the Rococo, and shallow imitators of Goethe who think that grandiose rhetoric suffices to make a masterpiece. The gulf separating the new and vital works of the Sturm und Drang from the trivia of these dilettantes is so enormous, that those at the bottom need a telescope even to catch sight of Goethe and Lenz.

Hör, hast du nicht eine Lorgnette bei dir, ich kann sie nicht recht unterscheiden dort oben, ich möchte dem einen zu Leibe, der uns herabgerufen hat. (III, 5)

Frustrated in their literary velleities, they proceed to make themselves ridiculous with their jealous comments and childish behavior. At one point, they hurl stones from a sling in an attempt to slay Goethe, the genius who towers above them. According to Lenz, the attitude towards Goethe
is a mixture of hatred and admiration that betrays the universal esteem for the man they would like to destroy:

O weh! er zerstellt uns die Eingeweide, er wird einen zweiten Atma auf uns werfen. (Einige springen ins Wasser, andere kehren alle Vier in die Höhe, als ob der Berg schon auf ihnen läge. [stage direction]). (III, 6)

The craven fear of the imitators and Rococo writers is exaggerated for humorous effect, but the use of Classical allusions and elevated diction is close enough to the reality of their literary style to set the pasquill painfully on target.

By his own admission, not even Lenz himself can keep pace with the genius of Goethe. He catches up with the man at different stages of the climb having "einen beschwerlichen Weg gemacht" (III, 4), but finds himself in a state of exhaustion, dependent on his hero for help and encouragement. Lenz alludes to the period in the early 1770's when he and Goethe were in Strassburg together:

Ich weiss nicht, Goethe, ich komm erst hier an. . . . Wart doch, wo willst du hin, ich hab dir noch so manches zu erzählen. (III, 3)

Having met Goethe several times and admiring what his new friend had accomplished in Götz von Berlichingen, Lenz had hoped that his own work would profit from their association. Goethe, however, left Strassburg before they became fast friends:
Lenz always felt that his writing would have improved if he could only have worked more closely with Goethe. He did as a matter of fact, send some of his manuscripts to him before publication (e.g. Der Hofmeister, Der neue Menoza), but there was never any question of close collaboration, as was the case later between Goethe and Schiller in Weimar. It is interesting and touching to notice the oscillation of Lenz between self-deprecation and over-estimation of his talent, knowing how much he wanted a place as an important author within the new Sturm und Drang literature. It is in this spirit that the third scene unfolds. Lenz had taken great pains to disguise his identity when the Hofmeister and the Soldaten were published so as not to embarrass families he had known in Strassburg, but he was nonetheless embittered since his fellow-writers had failed to recognize the true author or understand the literary theories behind the works. The Hofmeister was widely attributed to Goethe, Klinger claimed the Soldaten for his own, and some of the Sessenheimer Lieder belonged unquestionably to Lenz rather than to the author of Götz. In this scene Lenz appears on the side of the mountain with a copy of his Hofmeister in
his arms and delivers an impassioned speech on the joys of fatherhood (i.e. authorship). He does not begrudge his son happiness if that happiness is predicated upon the assumption of a different name. If this parable is not sufficient to satisfy the doubts of the Philistines,


During the fourth and final scene of the first act Lenz emphasizes some of his literary principles. The journalists in the valley below attempt to flatter Goethe by comparing him with the historical giants of literature and thought:

Einer
Womit soll ich dich vergleichen? Alexander, Cäsar, Friedrich, o, das waren alles kleine Leute gegen dich. . . .

Zweiter
Wo sind die grossen Genien der Nachbarn, die Shakespeare, die Voltaire, die Rousseau? (III, 10-11)

Goethe answers them with an idea central to the teachings of Herder and subsequently, to the credo of the Sturm und Drang movement. Instead of imitating the traditions of other countries, the Germans must study their own history and literature and create an authentic expression of the
German soul:

Ihr Schurken, dass ihr euch immer mit fremder
Grösse beschäftigt und nie eure eigene aus-
studiert. Wie seid ihr imstande, zu fühlen, was
Alexander war, oder was Cäsar war, wie seid ihr
imstande, zu fühlen, was ich bin? (III, 11)

After touching on the idea of a native or "nationally approp-
riate" literature, Lenz reiterates his conception of the
artist as one who writes according to the conditions and
needs of contemporary human society. The artist should
neither copy the conventions of another time, however success-
ful they may have been, nor invent idealistic visions of
the way life ought to be, but rather he should recreate a
truthful picture of society at his particular time and place
in history. As I have already mentioned in connection with
the discussions of *Menalk und Mopsus*, *Der neue Menoza* and
the *Anmerkungen übers Theater*, Lenz entertains a moralistic
concept of art: literature can either debase the moral level
with its seductive misrepresentations of reality, or it can
face actuality honestly and with a sense of the moral
obligations of each man to others, but there can be no art
for art's sake. The sincere tone of concern is apparent in
all of Lenz's works, but is perhaps best illustrated by a
few lines from the *Verteidigung des Herrn W. gegen die
Wolken*:
Erlauben Sie, meine Herren Sokraten, dass ich Ihnen den Vorhang vor unserer gegewärtigen Welt aufziehe, und dann lachen Sie noch, wenn Sie das Herz dazu haben. Sehen Sie da alle gesellschaftlichen Bande unangezogen und ungespannt auseinandersinken, sehen Sie da junge Leute mit den Mienen der Weisheit und allen Waffen der Leichtfertigkeit versehen, in allen Künsten der Galanterie unterrichtet, auf die schwachen Augenblicke Ihrer Geliebten und Ihrer Töchter Jagd machen, sehen Sie da eben diese jungen Leute mit der größten Verachtung für das Geschlecht, das allein aus Männern Menschen machen und durch die Liebe ihren regellosen Kräften und Fähigkeiten eine Gestalt geben konnte, mit mehr als tierischer Ungebundenheit sich nicht allein für ihre künftigen Gattinnen, nein auch für ihre Freunde, auch für den Staat, der sie nähren muss, völlig entnerven und untüchtig machen. (IV, 314-15)

The second act presents the reader with a complete change of scene, but praise of Goethe continues and the attack on the representatives of the Rococo becomes increasingly personal and scornful. The action takes place in an imaginary Tempel des Ruhms where historical time is transcended to allow Shakespeare, Molière, Hagedorn, Lessing, Herder, Goethe and Lenz to confront each other and engage in a literary discussion. A further indication of the futility of attempting to perform on stage the Pandämonium Germanicum is the fact that most of the humor and satire contained in this act stems not from the dialogue, but rather from the extensive stage directions.

The first scene casts ridicule on those Rococo writers whose slavish imitation of French pastoral poets has led, in
Lenz's opinion, to a lack of personal originality and even outright plagiarism. A man is shown drawing animals on a blackboard; the stage directions identify him as Hagedorn and explain that he is being watched from behind a grille by a group of French writers that includes La Fontaine, the famous writer of animal fables in verse form. Although his conclusions are unsubstantiated, it seems likely that Lenz is suggesting that Hagedorn's *Versuch in poetischen Fabeln und Erzählungen* (1738) was very heavily indebted to La Fontaine's *Contes et nouvelles en vers* (1664) and to his *Fables* (1668). In a similar wordless situation, elucidated only by the stage directions, the poet Gellert slinks away from La Fontaine with great embarrassment and tries to hide in a corner to avoid being recognized by the man whose *Fables* he had plundered for his own *Fabeln und Erzählungen* (1746-48).

The second scene of the second act continues Lenz's attack against the Rococo school of writers. Rabener, a member of the Rococo movement, famous for his satirical writings from about 1751-55, parades about the stage, holding up a distorting mirror to the faces of the people around him. Those who have seen themselves in the distorted mirror unanimously agree, "So gefällt's uns doch besser, als nach dem Leben" (III, 14). The analogy of the mirror to represent
the mimetic function of art was common among literary
theorists from at least the time of Plato until the end of
the eighteenth century. Among the ways of becoming an artist,
wrote Plato in the Republic, there is

none quicker than that of turning a mirror round
and round - you would soon enough make the sun
and the heavens, and the earth and yourself, and
other animals and plants, and all the other things
of which we were just now speaking, in the mirror.81

According to M. H. Abrams, "The analogue was especially popu-
lar for comedy, the early representative of literary realism,
and a great many critics ... cited the words that Donatus,
writing in the fourth century, had attributed to Cicero,
that comedy is 'a copy of life, a mirror of custom, a reflec-
tion of truth.'"82 It should be obvious, then, why Lenz
has directed his ire against Rabener, a gentle man whose
only ambition was to please his readers. In Lenz's opinion,
this type of unserious writing was not innocuous, but pro-
ductive of the worst misunderstandings about life; corrupting
public morals with insidious eroticism disguised in "French"
finery. Much more honest and thus more praiseworthy from
Lenz's point of view are the extravagant, even pornographic,
burlesque satirists, Rabelais and Scarron, who are not


82 Abrams, p. 32.
afraid to "ôter la culotte" (III, 14). Rather than distort reality, Lenz claims, writers would do better to introduce a little naked realism in their work.

A group of critics, led by Christian Klotz, is then dumb enough to take Lenz's suggestion, "ôter la culotte," literally. Klotz, a disreputable estheticician of the Rococo period who had participated in famous literary feuds with both Lessing and Herder, was the founder and publisher of two journals, the Hallische Gelehrten Zeitungen and the Deutsche Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften, that he used to blackmail other literary figures. Recognizing him for what he was, Lessing and Herder refused to be intimidated. Lenz, who had a low opinion of critics in general, did not hesitate to disparage them at every occasion. In an earlier scene, he demonstrated his contempt for critics and other journalists by metamorphosing them into the subhuman form of bluebottle flies, which buzz incessantly and enjoy garbage more than any other kind of nourishment. After this metaphor has been suggested, they become little boys who beg to be taken up to the mountain by Goethe. Without the quasi-divine intervention of the true genius, they would be unable to have any experience of art at all. And yet, Lenz implies rather heavily, these are the men who presume to judge our artistic endeavors in the philistine forum of
professional journalism. The passage is reminiscent of Aristophanes and the Old Attic Comedy where there was plenty of fantastic and crude humor.

In complete accord with the degeneration of the action, someone suggests that the poets compose odes to the whores. The members of the Rococo are so eager to comply with the request that they do not scruple to use Anacreon's venerable lyre for their wanton compositions; Rost, Gleim and Uz each take a turn, followed by resounding applause. It is true that Wieland and his followers wrote of the convention of the hetaera, the highly educated female companion of ancient Greece. Wieland's Musarion is a hetaera, but she practices the art of living virtuously, graciously and in harmony with the concept of the beautiful soul that Wieland adopted from Shaftesbury. However, Lenz has given a completely exaggerated and unfair description of the ideas of the Rococo, suggesting that their personal behavior must be even worse if they dare to write such degenerate poetry. Reprehensible as the modern reader may find these tactics, he should remember that Lenz is writing in the ruthless tradition of Aristophanes, for whom no lie, no exaggeration, no misrepresentation was too brazen. Apparently, Lenz was able to justify to himself the use of questionable means in order to achieve ends that he considered both eminently
worthy and absolutely necessary.

During the performance of erotic poems, Chaulieu and Chapelle, two French anacreontic poets who had been models for Hagedorn and Uz, draw attention to a foolish Amor, dangling from a rope like Socrates in Aristophane's *Clouds* and enjoying the entertainment tremendously. "En voilà un qui ne dit pas le mot, mais il semble bon enfant, voyez, comme il se plaît à tout cela, comme il sourit secouant la tête" (III, 15). When he is lowered to the stage, the Cupid turns out to be Friedrich Jakobi. This pietistic writer had warned against the *Sturm und Drang* movement, feeling that the advocacy of liberated emotions and individualism by the new group would lead to anarchy. Lenz would have us believe that the real reason for his criticism of the *Sturm und Drang* was a taste for more titillating fare.

Wieland, of course, wants to take a turn in this public performance and offers to entertain the audience with any of his works that might interest them. Unfortunately the spectators do not seem particularly interested in anything he might produce. Finally, one of the women in the gathering asks for a new work rather than accepting a recital of an already existing poem. "Haben Sie nicht noch mehr Sympathien?" (III, 15) The original *Sympathien* (1754), written as advice for the domestic and sentimental problems
of a circle of patrician women in Zürich, was well-received by the ladies in question but considered trivial and monotonous by most literary people. Lenz tries to do damage to Wieland's reputation in two ways. First, by stressing a relatively unsuccessful work above all the others, he implies that this is the best that the Rococo poet can do; everything else is automatically relegated to limbo. Secondly, he practices a form of condemnation by association, insinuating that the Sympathien themselves must have a certain prurient attraction in order to appeal to an audience that has just applauded the erotic compositions of Rost, Gleim, and Uz. It does not matter to Lenz that the good women of Zürich considered Wieland a "halber Engel . . . ein Genius höher Art, der nicht zur Sinnlichkeit herabsteigen konnte," he relentlessly continues to grind his axe. Wieland is forced to admit that he has no more Sympathien available, but he will attempt to compose something on the spot. Far from being the sign of a spontaneous genius, this promise characterizes Wieland as a fool with insufficient respect for time and effort required by true artistic creation. Although it might seem that Wieland is just trying to be agreeable to the gathering, the actual

---

effect of the passage is to suggest that Lenz's adversary was too willing to pander his art to fickle public acclaim. Wieland's actual improvisation is apparently in such bad taste, that it is not even quoted, but the reactions that it provokes are unmistakeable. The audience begs for an end to the scandalous song: "Um Gotteswillen, hören Sie doch auf!" (III, 16), and the women cover their faces in embarrassment. This idea is reinforced in a left-handed sort of way by the immoral French observers who praise Wieland's rather dubious accomplishment: "Ah, le gaillard! Les autres s'amusoient avec des grisettes, cela débauche les honnêtes femmes." (III, 16)

The distortion of attitudes and tendencies is one thing, perpetrating outright lies is quite another; Lenz obviously has no scruples about either practice. After the failure of his impromptu poetry, Wieland is shown casting about for some means to repair his damaged reputation. Unseen by the other people, a young woman asks him for a critical opinion of a painting she has made. A sly look crosses his face as he decides to pass the work off as his own; the girl is too shy to explain to the admiring audience that their reinstated hero is a fraud. The meaning of this charade does not become clear until Goethe unmasks the villain in the fourth scene by holding up the painting,
taking the hand of the real artist, and announcing: "Seht
dieses Blatt, und hier ist die Hand, die es gezeichnet hat."
(III, 19) A stage direction identifies the painting as a
symbol for the sentimental novel *Die Geschichte des Fräuleins
von Sternheim* (1771), written by Sophie La Roche, who had
been at one time Wieland's fiancée. Not only does Wieland
plagiarize from foreign sources, claims Lenz, he even steals
unpublished manuscripts from people who trust him. As a
matter of fact, Wieland arranged to publish Sophie La Roche's
book and write an introduction for it himself, giving her
complete credit for the work, praising her character and
story-telling ability, and offering a few well-founded
criticisms on its artistic development. The *Stürmer und
Dränger* and the members of the *Göttinger Hainbund* never for-
gave Wieland this action, which they interpreted as stemming
from jealousy of a greater natural talent.

When Goethe first comes onto the stage, in Scene 2
he assumes the heroic post of Samson. Reference is made to
the jawbone of his hand as a relic of the ancestors of the
fools, Wieland, Gleim, Uz and Rost, who were already there.
The juxtaposition of the simpering figure of Wieland with
the magnificent Goethe is exaggerated, but effective.
Another comparison is established to Wieland's disadvantage
when Goethe picks up the discarded, and, by now broken,
lyre and begins a song so beautiful and moving that even
Wieland falls to his knees, exclaiming in spite of himself,
"Das ist göttlich!" (III, 17) The actions and comments of
the rest of the audience leave no doubt that Die Leiden des
jungen Werthers (1774) is the work which Goethe is perform-
ing. In his Briefe über die Moralität der Leiden des
jungen Werthers, written at approximately the same time as
the Pandämonium Germanicum but unfortunately lost, Lenz
offered another tribute to the novel that had been sharply
criticized in some quarters, notably Nicolai's Allgemeine
deutsche Bibliothek.

Some final barbs are launched in a scene that brings
together Christian Felix Weisse, Johann David Michaelis,
and a certain Herr Schmidt. Michaelis was the author of the
unpoetical verse rendition of the Bible that caused an
incensed Hamann to write his Kreuzzüge des Philologen
(1762). Weisse was credited with founding the German
Singspiel patterned after the Beggar's Opera (1728) of John
Gay, but Lenz held him in contempt for his crude borrowings
from French and English writers. When Michaelis hails
Weisse as the German Shakespeare, on the basis of his fright-
ful contortions and "Hell! Destruction! Damnation!"
(III, 22) speech, he demonstrates his complete lack of
critical discernment. By the terms of this implacable
syllogism, Michaelis' subsequent characterization of Schmidt as the German Aristarchus can only be considered proof of Schmidt's mediocrity as a literary critic. Weisse serves to effect the transition to the important sixth scene in which Lessing, Herder, Klopstock, Lenz, Goethe, Wieland and the spirit of Shakespeare appear.

Weisse's appearance on the stage has been marked by the reciting of ridiculous French doggerel accompanied by affected poses, simpering dance steps, and other "minauderies." Lessing attempts to set him straight on the nature of good art and the best sources of inspiration, but Weisse can only understand mindless imitation:

Wisst ihr, was die Franzosen für Leute sind? Lasst uns einmal ihr Bilderchen besuchen. (Tritt vor eine Galerie und examiniert.) Da zu hoch, da zu breit, da zu schmal, nirgends Zusammenhang, nirgends Ordnung, nirgends Wahrheit. Und das sind eure Muster? -- Nehmt doch lieber die Alten vor, da findet ihr was. (Crayonnirt flüchtig etwas nach Plautus und wirft's unter sie hin, sie fangens begierig auf, setzen sich auf den Boden hin und anstatt nach den Alten zu zeichnen, zeichnen sie seine Kopie nach und vervielfältigen, verändern und verstellen sie auf hundert Arten. Er ruft) So geht doch auf die menschliche Gesellschaft acht, mischt euch unter sie, lernt ab, was ihr schildern wollt und dann lernt den Alten ihre Manier ab. (Wirft Minna von Barnhelm unter sie; da geht das Gekritzeln noch ärger an. Er geht unmutig zu Klopstock zurück.) (III, 25)

Lessing advocates an art based on the observation of "human society," and he gives the ancient Greek masters as the best example of this practice. Herder, however, represents
the turning of the tide when he evokes the ghost of Shakespeare. The Stürmer and Dränger admired the Greeks, but considered the English bard a more appropriate and vital paragon for their new movement. The Rococo writers run from the room, unable to endure this breath of fresh air. The native French authors glance at Shakespeare with no particular interest and then continue their counterfeit Greek poems ad nauseam.

Wieland interrupts the praise of Shakespeare with the angry interjection, "Das ist Rotwelsch!" (III, 25)—an allusion to Wieland's review of Lenz's Anmerkungen übers Theater. Wieland felt that, in spite of all Lenz's pretensions, the Anmerkungen was just gibberish. Only a genius could follow the incoherent style, the lack of transition, the undeveloped ideas, the fragmentary syntax broken up by dashes; and no genius, claimed Wieland, would consider the article worth his while:

Der Verfasser der A.ü. Th. mag heissen wie er will, traun! der Kerl ist'n Genie, und hat blos für Genien, wie er ist, geschrieben, wiewohl Genien nichts solches nöthig haben ... Durft er doch schreiben, was gar niemand, was er selbst nicht verstunde! Wer konnts ihm wehren? Furs Publikum ist so was freylich nicht. Denn was soll dies damit machen? Wie soll es dem Genie seine Räthsel errathen? oder ergänzen, was der geheimnissreiche Mann nur halb sagt? oder ihm in seinen Gemssprüngen von Klippe zu Klippe nachsetzen? — Sein Ton ist ein so fremder Ton, seine Sprache ein so wunderbares Rothwelsch, dass die Leute dastehn, und's Maul aufsperrn, und
recken die Ohren, und wissen nicht ob sie süß
oder sauer dazu sehen sollen;84

This was not the first time that Lenz had protested Wieland's
judgment. In the Rezension des Neuen Menoza he wrote: "So
wie er sich irrt, wenn er Rotwelsch für meine Muttersprache
hält." (II, 332)

The Pandämonium Germanicum ends on a visionary note.
In response to Herder's curiosity about the future of art,
Lenz expounds on his concept of the new originality of the
Sturm und Drang that transcends all foreign models. Herder
examines some of Lenz's work and is struck by the fact
that they are too big for the age in which they were written.
In an interesting prefiguration of the idea of the Weimarer
Klassik, Lenz explains that art precedes and inspires human
growth:

Herder
Mensch, die sind viel zu gross für unsre Zeit.
Lenz
So sind sie für die kommende. Sie sein doch
wenigstens ähnlich. Und Herr! Die Welt sollte
doch auch itzt anfangen, grössere Leute zu haben als
ehemals. Ist doch solang gelebt worden. (III, 26)

Even though the Stürmer and Dränger disapproved of sentiment-
tal utopias, Prometheus rather than Everyman was the human
exemplar that they wanted to portray. As a result, their
works always contain heroes who are somehow larger than

84Quoted in: Lenz, Schriften, I, 538.
life; e.g. Götz, Die Räuber, Die Zwillinge. Lessing, Klopstock and Herder are visibly moved by Lenz's fervent plea for the future and comment in unison: "Der brave Junge. Leistet er nichts, so hat er doch gross geahndet." (III, 27) And Lenz, the author, perhaps sensing future events, has Goethe proclaim: "Ich will's leisten" (III, 27) apparently aware that he would be relegated by literary historians to the position of either Goethean epigone or as Goethe later judged in his Dichtung und Wahrheit the fourteenth book:

Man konnte in seinen Arbeiten grosse Züge nicht verkennen; eine liebliche Zärtlichkeit schleicht sich durch zwischen den albernsten und baroksten Fratzen, die man selbst einem so gründlichen und anspruchlosen Humor, einer wahrhaft komischen Gabe kaum verzeihen kann. . . . als ich seine Gaben wirklich sehr hoch schätzte und immer nur darauf drang, dass er aus dem formlosen Schweifen sich zusammenziehen, und die Bildungsgabe, die ihm angenehren war, mit kunstgemässen Fassung benutzen möchte. 85

85 Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Dichtung und Wahrheit, ed. by Ernst Beutler (Zürich 1948), pp. 655, 657, and 658.
CHAPTER VII

ZERBIN AND DER MAGISTER

Lenz's Zerbin, written sometime in the winter of 1775, describes the tragic destruction of two young lovers: Zerbin, a promising mathematician and scholar, and Marie, the vivacious servant girl in the house where Zerbin lived. Marie becomes his mistress but Zerbin refuses to marry her for financial reasons, even though she comes from a good family. She is beheaded for bearing a still-born child illegitimately, but bravely protects the name of her lover throughout the horrible ordeal of her imprisonment, trial, and execution. Filled with remorse for his part in the sacrifice of the noble woman, Zerbin commits suicide.

Franz Blei maintains in his notes to Zerbin\textsuperscript{86} that the plot for the work came from a well-known lawcase in Strassburg during this period. On the other hand, Elizabeth Genton has proposed, but not developed, the idea that "Zerbin . . . einige peinliche Anspielungen auf Wielands

\textsuperscript{86}Lenz, \textit{Schriften}, V, 389-90.
Vergangenheit enthält, "87 and there is indeed much in the short piece which bears a striking resemblance to an unhappy love affair in the life of Wieland. Viewed in this light, Zerbin becomes not just a tragic narrative, but the most vicious attack against Wieland up to this point. It is the first time that Lenz strikes at his enemy on such a personal level for actions in no way related to Wieland's position as an artist. The work is not a satire, for there is no trace of humor in the grim story, but Lenz continues to exercise his Aristophanic license to distort, lie and slander the man he execrated. The only justification for Lenz's having written this piece was his feeling an almost holy mission to stamp out the Rococo "philosophy."

It is only fair to Wieland that we examine the historical facts of his relationship with the twenty year old Christine Hagel. Sengel cites letters from Wieland to a few trusted correspondents such as Sophie La Roche and Johann Georg Zimmermann which speak of a veritable passion for Christine: "... dass er sie trotz seines Antiplatonismus so unbedingt liebt, als es nur möglich ist, und dass er noch

nie so herzlich und wahr geliebt hat.\textsuperscript{88} Everything known about the affair attests to Wieland's sincere love and intention to marry the girl in spite of her Catholic religion and poor education. Wieland promised his future mother-in-law in good faith that he would abjure his Protestant upbringing, marry Christine in a Catholic ceremony, and allow their children to be raised in the Catholic faith. Two complications, however, persuaded Wieland to change his mind on this matter. His father was the Protestant minister in Biberach, and his own position as \textit{Kanzleiverwalter} was dependent on his remaining a Protestant. In October 1763 Wieland decided on a Protestant wedding ceremony. It would have been impossible for him to retain his position in Biberach if he went through with the Catholic ceremony.

From December 1762 until September 1763 Christine lived with Wieland as his wife and became pregnant with his child, with her parents' knowledge if not blessing. When they learned of the new plans for a Protestant marriage, however, they placed their daughter in a convent and referred the frantic Wieland to Abbot Rot. Wieland again agreed to the Catholic ceremony, but it was too late for even this step, since Christine's parents were now aware that Wieland would

\textsuperscript{88}Sengle, p. 130.
lose his position if he became a Catholic. Wieland considered trying to secure a chair at the Catholic University at Erfurt, which would have enabled him to marry Christine and still have employment, but he did not have enough money to move from Biberach. No escape from the dilemma presented itself and his frustration and depression must have been enormous. Christine's mother prevailed upon her to leave Biberach permanently and, with her departure, Wieland's leidenschaftlichste und unbedingteste Liebe ended. He never permitted himself to fall in love to this degree again; he became a sceptic in affairs of the heart. When Wieland became the only surviving male heir in his family in 1764, the pressure to marry was increased by his parents. The search for a suitable wife was conducted by Wieland in an extremely efficient and business-like fashion. In a letter to Salomon Gessner, his friend and publisher in Switzerland, Wieland explained the situation in Biberach: "Hier findet sich keine für mich, denn ich sollte eine hübsche, gescheite, muntere und womöglich eine reiche Frau haben."\(^{90}\)

\(^{89}\)Ibid., p. 136.

\(^{90}\)Quoted, Ibid.
to Lenz. He undoubtedly knew that Christine Hagel had lived with Wieland for some period of time, had borne his child, and that eventually she had left Biberach without marrying him. It is doubtful whether Lenz knew any of the intimate family details concerning the marriage proposals and counter-proposals, or whether he was aware of the role of Christine's family in preventing the union. Lenz, with a single-minded determination to ruin Wieland's reputation, put the worst possible interpretation on the facts surrounding the affair with Christine Hagel.

Wieland's calculating attitude towards marriage after his love affair with Christine Hagel is imputed by Lenz to Zerbin during his affair with Marie:

Zerbins hohe Begriffe von der Heiligkeit, aufgesparten Glückseligkeit, von dem Himmel des Ehestandes verschwand. Die Augen fingen ihm, wie unsern ersten Eltern, an aufzugehen, er sah alle Dinge in ihrem rechten Verhältnis, sah bei der Ehe nichts mehr, als einen Kontrakt zwischen zwei Parteien aus politischen Absichten. (V, 95)

Lenz follows this clear reference to Wieland with an explanation of the Rococo concept of love. At the heart of their philosophy was the belief in the delightful but necessarily ephemeral nature of love and the conviction that marriage should be based on more substantial considerations, such as money, social position and political power.
Er hatte die Liebe seiner Marie zum voraus er- 
gerntet; Liebe schien ihm nun ein Ingrediens, das 
gar nicht in den Heiratsverspruch gehörte; die 
grosse Weisheit unserer heutigen Philosophen ging 
him auf, dass Ehe eine wechselseitige Hilfleistung, 
Liebe eine vorübergehende Grille sei; (V, 95–96)

Lenz claims that Wieland seduced Christine Hagel for 
the pleasure of the moment, with no intention of entering 
into a méassalliance by making their relationship permanent.

The moral of the story provides an ironic comment on the 
subtitle, Zerbin oder die neuere Philosophie; the acceptance 
of the ideas promulgated by the Rococo movement, the so-
called "new philosophy" leads only to immoral behavior and 
personal destruction.

... eine Missheirat schien seinem [Zerbin] 
aufgeklärten Verstande nun ein ebenso unver-
zeihbares Verbrechen, als es ihm ehemals der 
Ehebruch und die Verführung der Unschuld geschienen 
hatten ... In ein Dorfchen zu gehen und mit 
seinem freundlichen Mariechen Bauer zu werden – 
oder dem Vorurteil aller honetten Leute in Leipzig 
trotz zu bieten und seine schöne Bäuerin im 
Angesicht all seiner galanten Bekanntschaften zu 
heiraten – welch ein unförmlicher Gedanke für einen 
Philosophen, dem itzt erst die Beziehungen der 
Menschen, die Abweichungen der Stände, die 
Torten phantastischer junger Leute, die Irrtümer 
der Phantasie und das unermessliche Gebiet der 
Wahrheit im echtesten Licht übersah! (V, 96)

The connection between an immoral existence and the Rococo 
philosophy is explicitly emphasized by Zerbin's transforma-
tion from a rigorous mathematical thinker to a superficial 
sophist after having established his relationship with Marie.
... er fing hierauf an, statt der verdriesslichen Lehre von Potenzen und Exponenten ein Kollegium über die Moral und eins über das Jus naturae zu lesen das ihm gar kein Kopfbrechen kostete und ungemein gut von der Lunge ging. Er bekam einen Zulauf, der unerhoert war, und es währte kein halbes Jahr, so liess er für seine Lesestunden ein neues Kompendium der philosophischen Moral, gepfropft aufs Natur- und Völkerrecht, drucken, das in allen gelehrten Zeitungen bis an den Himmel erhoben ward. (V, 97)

About the same time, the winter of 1775, Lenz produced a three page fragment entitled the Magister. The plot is a familiar one with Lenz, concerning the cruel sexual exploitation of a woman by a man who considers himself too good to marry her. In the state of abject misery which his neglect leaves her and the illegitimate children, she is forced into prostitution. He condemns her for this and for the death of one of the children, but continues to extort favors from her under the threat of leaving her completely.

Lieschen
Aber was kann ich nun dafür, dass mein Herz mich so reden heisst? hätten Sie mich geheiratet, wie Sie anfangs tun wollten, so war alles besser gegangen. Und das Pulverchen, das Sie dem Kind eingaben, mag auch was dazu getan haben... um Gottes willen! nehmen Sie mir's doch nicht übel!

Magister
Kurz und gut, Ihr schlaft die Nacht bei mir, oder kommt mir mein Lebtag nicht wieder unter die Augen! und wenn Ihr auf dem Misthaufen verhungern müsstet! (III, 398)

The question is whether the Magister was intended to represent Wieland. There is no direct proof for this
interpretation in either the three short pages of the play or the correspondence of Lenz, but the similarity of theme and the time of composition—at the height of Lenz's torrent of abuse against Wieland—would seem to justify an examination of the work in this light.
CHAPTER VIII

DIE WOLKEN AND DIE VERTEIDIGUNG

Lenz's play Die Wolken was written during the period January-July 1775 and it represents the bitter culmination of the chain of attacks directed against Wieland. The earlier works in this development, Menalk und Mopsus and Der neue Menoza, were a continuation of the Göttinger Hainbund's campaign against the Rococo and were comparatively mild in nature. Zerbin and Der Magister marked an intensification in Lenz's program, characterized by personal invective totally divorced from artistic considerations. The final phase is represented by the three-page fragment that remains of the Die Wolken, a play which was according to some contemporary opinion an unjust and vicious personal attack unworthy of Lenz's talents.

The first indication on Lenz's part that a work of this nature was in preparation appears in a letter dated July 31, 1775, to Sophie La Roche, the former fiancée and long-time correspondent of Wieland:

Wie gesagt; er [Wieland] soll uns nicht Philosoph und Lehrer des menschlichen Geschlechts seyn
wollen, und seine Sachen für das geben, was sie sind. . . . Um Wielands willen bitte ich Sie auf meinen Knieen, sagen Sie mir alles, was zwischen ihm und Ihnen jemals vorgefallen ist. Ich möchte dem Mann nicht Unrecht thun, und wenn ich ihn zu hart gestossen habe, und er eher Mitleiden verdient, ihm gern wieder Genugthuung geben. 91

This allusion to Wieland as philosopher and teacher is an indication that Lenz had already cast him in the role of Socrates, the main figure in Die Wolken. The second passage from this same letter is perhaps an early intimation on Lenz's part that he may indeed have gone too far with his work.

In September of the same year Lenz sent the manuscript of Die Wolken to Lavater in Zürich so that he could see to the publication. Lenz explained in a letter to Lavater which accompanied the manuscript some of his reasons for having written Die Wolken. Reference is first made to a satire Masuren directed against Goethe, Lavater and Klopstock, and to slighting remarks of Nicolai's against Herder. After this introduction, Lenz describes the only way possible to counteract the derisive laughter that might be occasioned by the satire:

Einst ist kein Waffen dagegen, je ernsthafter man sich gebehrdet, desto lauter lachen sie. Es muss wieder gelacht werden, und lauter als sie ... Wehe über mein Vaterland, wenn die Wolken nicht gedruckt werden ... kühne Stricke sind nothwendig ... 92

One can conclude from Lenz's expression, "Bold strokes are necessary," that Die Wolken was to be something out of the ordinary in the field of laughter-provoking attacks. The importance of this work for Lenz, personally, is hard to overestimate. Hatred had been building up in Lenz over an extended period of time, and Die Wolken seemed to him to be the perfect way for exacting a long overdue revenge.

Es ist Gegengift Lavater! das mir lang auf dem Herzen gelegen und wo ich nur auf Gelegenheit gepasst es anzubringen. Diese Gelegenheit ist meine persönliche Schriftsteller Rache ... jetzt ausgelassen, ... 93

The people to whom Lenz sent copies of his Wolken, however, did not appear overly impressed by the work or particularly eager to have their names associated with it. In a letter to Herder towards the end of September, 1775, Lenz mentioned his difficulties with publication and money. "Es will und darf kein Mensch meine Wolken drucken lassen." Lavater, whom Lenz expected to arrange the publication of the new play, had serious reservations about committing such a

92 Ibid., p. 126.
93 Ibid., p. 127.
diatribe to print. Instead of embarrassing Wieland in public, he thought that Lenz might send him a copy of the unpublished work to persuade him to change his authoritarian attitude towards other writers. The suggestion was not a very good one, and evoked from Lenz the following violent reaction:

... wo ist euer Verstand, wo ist eure Freundschaft? ... Unsere Freundschaft [Wieland's and Lenz's] ist so ewig als die Feindschaft des Wassers und Feuers, des Tods und des Lebens, des Himmels und der Hölle.

On October 5, 1775, Lavater writes Lenz a further explanation of his initial reaction of Die Wolken:

Lenz! du bist 'n braver Junge! Lieb' dich noch 'n mal mehr seit den Wolken; kann's aber doch nicht finden, dass du durch Ungerechtigkeit gekämpfe handelst! ... Bitte, lieber Lenz - kämpfe, aber kämpfe mit Wahrheit, und unterdrücke das Gute nicht! ... Sei so streng du seyn willst; nur sey nicht ungerecht. ... aber du sollst dich, wenn du strafest, zehmalt fragen: Straf ich nicht ungerecht? ... freundschaftlich will ich dir weissagen: Du bereust's, wenn die Wolken gedruckt werden!

Lenz decided to ignore the good advice contained in his friend's letter and made other arrangements to have Die Wolken published. As the manuscript went to press during the winter of 1775-76 under the auspices of Boie, however,

94 Ibid., p. 133.
95 Ibid., p. 136.
Lenz's resolution in the matter seems gradually to have softened. Several reasons appear to have been at the bottom of this change of heart. Lavater's opinions probably began to have a delayed reaction, Lenz's correspondence with Sophie La Roche, Wieland's erstwhile financée, may have been another contributing factor:

Eben jetzt erfahre ich von Me. la Roche, was ich noch nie gewusst, dass sie einen Sohn bei Wiel. im Hause gehabt. Ein Donnerschlag hätte mir nicht empfindlicher kommen können als eine Nachricht, die so viel Beziehung auf meine Pasquinade hat, denn ich wollte eher alles in der Welt als diese Frau oder etwas das ihr angeht beleidigen oder kompromittiren.96

Had Lenz known that Sophie La Roche's son, Fritz, was a pupil of Wieland's he would never have written Die Wolken. Although nothing remains except the three-page fragment, it is possible to infer from Aristophane's Clouds, and from Lenz's correspondence, the source of Lenz's great consternation. The plot of the original Clouds, and undoubtedly that of Lenz's version, centered around a father, Strepsaides, who has sent his son, Pheidippides, to Sokrates to learn to employ the "unjust argument." The boy, however, is turned against his father and the love of virtue. Lenz, upon learning that Sophie La Roche's son was a pupil of Wieland

---

96 Ibid., pp. 173-74.
(Sokrates), realized immediately that Mme. La Roche would interpret his Wolken as a comment upon her having sent her son to Wieland for an education. She may have regretted ever having sent her son to him since, according to Sengle, Wieland cared little for the boy whom he considered singularly ungifted intellectually and far less intelligent than his mother. Nevertheless an attack on Wieland which, by implication, included Sophie La Roche would not have been appreciated.

A third and most important reason for the change of heart was his decision to make a trip to Weimar to petition for a subsidy at the court similar to the ones granted to Goethe and, more recently, to Wieland. Under these circumstances it would have been expedient to avoid antagonizing Wieland any further.

By the Fifteenth of February, 1776, Lenz had resolved to either halt publication of Die Wolken entirely or, if this were impossible, change the German names to Greek. Lenz's letter of the Twentieth of February to Boie is almost frantic. The publication must be prevented or else all copies, including the manuscript must be destroyed. For the first time Lenz admitted that Die Wolken was indeed a mistake: "Ich muss Ihnen bekennen, dass ich sehr mit den Wolken gefehlt habe." Lenz himself now referred to the work as a
"Missgeburt der Galle," bemoaning the fact that he had allowed himself to be unduly influenced by his reading of Aristophanes. Lenz's closing lines to Boie on this date emphasize the importance now of a reconciliation of sorts with Wieland or, at the very least, an immediate cessation of hostile acts on Lenz's part: "Ich bitte Sie um baldige Antwort Boie, weil eine mir sehr wichtige Reise davon abhängt." The trip indicated here can only be the forthcoming trip to Weimar.

To obtain some idea of the tone and contents of Die Wolken, it would be useful to examine at this time the remaining fragment and a short note by Lenz that was found attached to it. The note gives some indication of the theme of the play:

Wiel., der den Sokrates machen will, zu dem allerlei Leute kommen und sich Rats über ihre Seelenanliegen erholen. Sitzt der Esel da in der Löwenhaut. (III, 473)

Of the many incidents contained in the original play, only one partial episode remains. It deals with a subject that can only be termed a favorite of Lenz in his many attacks on Wieland: the sexual exploitation of women under the guise of a new liberal morality. A young pietist woman approaches Sokrates (Wieland) for advice. She is received with words reminiscent of the words which her secuder had
used. Sokrates keeps assuring her that love is not a sin and that feelings of guilt proceeding from love are wrong. He then announces that his one desire is to improve the young lady morally. The goal of this moral betterment is made quite explicit by the dialogue of Sokrates:

Sie hat eine gewisse Art von Schönheit der Seele, die mir doch an ihr gefällt, und dass solche Augen beständig weinen sollen, dass solch ein voller reizender Busen sich zu immerwährenden unnützen Seufzern heben soll, das ist unausstehlich! Wenn ich ihr nur die ersten Grundsätze der Moral beibringen könnte, das müsst' ein vollkommnes Frauenzimmer werden! ... Wenn doch die Frau moralisch gemacht werden könnte! -- He, wenn ich sie einmal aufs Bett hätte, ich wollte sie schon kürzen! (III, 376-77)

Lenz balks at nothing in this attack which aims at the destruction of Wieland's reputation as a man and artist. Another page in Lenz's literary remains yields the following statement about Die Wolken:

Die Wolken sind Waffe, die ich behalten muss, bis Wieland sich erst recht fest genistet und alle Pfeile des Hasses auf mich und meine kritischen Sachen sowie alle Journalisten abgeschossen hat. Dann aus hellem Himmel ein Schlag, der sie alle zu Grunde richtet. (III, 472)

Any discussion of the fragment Die Wolken must also treat the Verteidigung des Herrn W. gegen die Wolken, a work which occupies a peculiar position among Lenz's writings. The title, the introduction and other external trappings of the work suggest that the author of Die Wolken has felt
remorse over his unmitigated condemnation of Wieland and
wishes to make amends.

Der Verfasser dieser kleinen Schrift hatte mir
eine Handschrift zugesandt, deren Druck er nachher
aus wichtigen Gründen zu hintertreiben für gut
fand. Da diese Schrift aber doch durch ver-
schiedene Hände gegangen war, fürchtete er, sie
könnte bei einigen seiner Leser nicht nur widrige
Eindrücke gegen die darin vorkommenden Personen,
sondern auch wider den Verfasser selbst, der, als
er sie schrieb, seiner Einbildungskraft und seinen
Leidenschaften Zügel anzulegen nicht imstande war,
zurückgelassen haben. Diese auszulöschen schrieb
er folgende Verteidigung der in den Wolken vor-
gestellten Personen und seiner selbst, weil er
einen Schritt, den er im aristophanischen Spleen
zu weit getan, auf keine andere Art gut zu machen
wusste, um zugleich durch sein Beispiel allen sein-
en jungen Landesleuten, die in ähnliche Umstände
kommen könnten, einen Wink der Warnung zu hinter-
lassen. (IV, 294)

This introduction, whether written by the publisher at Lenz's
instigation or by Lenz himself, conforms to the ostensible
purpose of the piece. Elizabeth Genton, for one, accepts
these statements at face value and considers that the _Verteidigung_ and _Die Wolken_ were originally conceived as a
unified two-pronged work which was to promote a reconcilia-
tion between Wieland and _Stürmer und Dränger_. By recanting
the violent part of the work, Lenz would have the satisfac-
tion of lambasting his enemy, and then he would be able to
deny that he really meant such extreme criticism.

Die Bedeutung der Verteidigung liegt darin, dass
sie der künftigen Verständigung mit Wieland als
Voraussetzung zu einer Zusammenarbeit mit der jungen Generation den Weg bereiten soll.⁹⁷

The theory that Lenz actually wanted Wieland's friendship at this time is rather difficult to reconcile with the various passages from Lenz's correspondence, which express animosity, bitterness and the desire for revenge more than anything else. It is true that Lenz indicated in a letter to Boie, from November of 1775, that he had toyed with such an idea at first.

Ich habe ein Mittel alles das bey Wiel. und seinem Publiko wieder gut zu machen, das ich aber in petto behalte. Ableugnen werd' es gewiss nicht, so sehr ich vor der Hand meinen Namen verschwiegen wünschte.⁹⁸

At one stage of its development the Verteidigung might have gone either way. It could have been either an honest attempt at an apology or a continuation of the attack. The tone and content of the finished work, however, are too ironical and critical to suggest that he allowed himself to mellow towards Wieland during the composition of the Verteidigung. Another letter to Boie, received February 15, 1776, demonstrates effectively that any thoughts of turning the Verteidigung into an instrument of reconciliation were fleeting at best and that Lenz followed the familiar path of refutation,

⁹⁷Genton, Ein unveröffentlichter Brief . . . , p. 6.
⁹⁸Lenz, Briefe, p. 147.
excoriation and contempt in his latest work.

Lassen Sie, ich bitte Sie, wo möglich die Wolken nicht drucken, wenigstens verändern Sie die deutschen Namen dagegen soll und muss . . . die Vertheidigung Wiel. gedruckt werden, die seinen Hauptgesinnungen mehr schaden wird als alle Anschuldigungen. Ich kenne mein Publikum - und jetzt ist es Zeit. Wenn das Eisen ausgeglüht ist, fällt der Hammer zu spät.99

In a letter to Boie, received February 12, 1776, Lenz stressed the fact that Die Verteidigung "nicht an diese [Die Wolken] angehängt, sondern detaschiert gedruckt werden als Palinodie nicht als prämeditirte versteckte Apologie derselben."100

From this statement the reader might conclude one of two things: either (1) Lenz's original intention had been to publish the two works together, but he changed his mind after further reflection or (2) Lenz planned from the beginning to issue the two pieces separately and took this occasion to specify the plan to his publisher. In either case, it seems certain that in Lenz's mind the two works formed the complementary halves of a total strategy from the very moment of conception. The idea of courting Wieland's friendship was entertained briefly, but the need to attack and destroy the Rococo writer prevailed. Lenz's desire to publish the Verteidigung as a "Palinodie" or recantation rather than a

99Ibid., p. 175.
100Ibid., p. 174.
"premeditated hidden apology" would seem to refer to appearances. In order to be effective, the _Verteidigung_ must appear to be the product of later reflection and not that of a single inspiration. The telling point would be that even, here in an alleged letter of recantation, Lenz felt bound by his conscience to raise "certain" objections to Wieland. Having laid the psychological groundwork with a few trivial compliments, he would proceed to condemn every fault that he had ever found in Wieland. The final result would be as damaging to his opponent as an open attack and certainly more insidious in that it pretended to be objective. As improbable as it may seem, Lenz might also have felt that the clear, rational criticism contained in his _Verteidigung_ would be appreciated by Wieland as an improvement over _Die Wolken_, that extravagant excursion into the vicious satiric realm of the Aristophanic Old Comedy.

An examination of the _Verteidigung des Herrn W. gegen die Wolken_ reveals the skill with which Lenz developed his two-pronged attack against Wieland. In contradiction to the tone of humility, conciliation, and apology contained in the _Nachricht des Verlegers_ quoted above, the _Verteidigung_ begins with a justification and explanation of the excesses contained in _Die Wolken_. On closer examination this so-called defense of Wieland proves to be a none too subtle attack on
the power exerted by Wieland, his literary organ, the
*Teutscher Merkur*, and the literary alliance of Wieland and
Nicolai, dating from the spring of 1773. Nicolai's *Allgemeine
deutsche Bibliothek* was very effective in maintaining a
strangle-hold on the younger generation of writers in the
name of that which the *Aufklärung* held to be good taste.

Lenz concedes that had the motivation for his *Wolken*
been "bloss jugendlicher Kützel und Leichtsinn" or "Rache
für empfangene Beleidigungen" (IV, 296), he would have been
at fault. This, however, is not the case, since Wieland has
always, according to Lenz's *Verteidigung*, treated him justly.
The real problem lies in Wieland's treatment of his other
contemporaries:

Herr W. hat in der Tat seinen andern Zeitver-
wandten, denen doch die öffentliche Stimme der
Nation auch Gaben des Himmels zuerkannte, die
Luft ziemlich dünne gemacht, und in einer zu
subtilen Atmosphäre können nur Sylphen leben.
So viele sind unter seiner alles verzehrenden
Influenz ohnmächtig hingesunken, ohne einen
Laut von sich zu geben, . . . (IV, 296)

Therefore Lenz states that what he would never have done for
himself, "das tat ich für andere, deren stillschweigend
selbstübernommenes Los (was die galante Welt so gern Schicksal
nennt) mir durch die Seele ging" (IV, 297). What follows is
a scathing indictment of Wieland for destroying the power of
imagination so essential to young developing poets by
establishing a definite form of literature with the label of "good taste," and relegating every innovation to the limbo of "bad taste."

Sobald einer allein das Geheimnis besitzt, durch gewisse Reize, die sich andere oft nicht erlauben können, seine Seite zu ziehen, und sodann nur das Geschmack nennt, was in seinen Kram gehört, das heisst, was seine anderweitigen eigennützigen Ab-sichten befördert, so ist dieses Monopolium gerade der Untergang alles wahren Geschmacks und ein grässlicher Rabe, der dem nahen Winter entgegen-kräht. (IV, 297)

And in lines which seem somehow to be reminiscent of Antony's speech on the occasion of Caesar's funeral, Lenz declaims:

Man mache hier, ich bitte, nicht so geschwinde die Anwendung auf Herrn W., ich bin nicht da, ihn zu beschuldigen, sondern ihn zu rechtfertigen. (IV, 297)

Lenz grants for the sake of argument that perhaps it was only the circumstances surrounding the man which gave to him the appearance of a dictator interested exclusively in reigning on Mount Parnassus. But whether events or Wieland's personality are responsible for such behavior, the behavior itself is described without qualification as that of a dictator. Lenz's ruse consists of defending an irrelevant detail and casually letting the most damning of indictments slip by. The reader is continually made aware that the work is anything but a staunch defense of Wieland; every compliment is double-edged, every positive statement is offset by a more telling negative one. This technique
is employed by Lenz throughout the *Verteidigung*. A few examples should suffice to illustrate the subtlety of this form of attack, combined with flattery:

Mag er alsdenn für seine Person ein noch so trefflicher Mensch sein, er ist der Republik gefährlich, und um so gefährlicher, je hervorstechender und glänzender seine Talente sind, ... (IV, 297)

Er hat, dass ich so sagen mag, auf einer Seite unserer vaterländischen alten Steifigkeit, Langsamkeit und Pandererei, auf der anderen der glänzenden Unwissenheit vieler nach falschen Mustern gebildeten Gesellschaften von sogenanntem guten Ton mit wahrer deutscher Mannhaftigkeit und Mut die Stange gehalten, und selbst die Ausschweifungen seiner Muse von der äussersten, angestrengtesten Schwärmerei zu der zügellosersten Leichtfertigkeit waren zu diesen Endzwecken notwendig. (IV, 298)

Lenz repeatedly stresses that he is not trying to defend himself in his objections to Wieland, but rather the other poets, less capable than he to withstand Wieland's pervasive influence. The real crux of Lenz's opposition is now introduced with these lines:

... ich habe nichts wider W., aber alles gegen die W., die nach ihm kommen werden, ... ich liebe W. als Menschen, ich bewundre ihn als komischen Dichter, aber ich hasse ihn als Philosophen, und werde ihn unaufhörlich hassen. (IV, 298)

The correct interpretation of these lines was extremely important to Lenz. For the first time, he was willing to admit that Wieland was an artist of talent and originality. He wanted no one to think that he was trying to denigrate
Wieland's admittedly great achievements. Lenz felt, however, that Wieland should have stepped aside after achieving his goals and allowed other, younger poets to develop according to their own inclinations instead of attempting to codify art under his own laws of good taste. As Lenz put it, "Uneigennützigkeit der grosse, der ewige Probierstein aller wahren Dichter gewesen ist, ist und bleiben wird" (IV, 299), or later on he wishes:

... zugleich aber auch Herrn W. durch die gerechten Belohnungen seines Vaterlandes ein für allemal die Hände zu binden, dass er durch allzu lebhaften Anmassungen nicht Eingriffe in die Rechte anderer tue, sondern aufkommen und gedeihen lassen wolle, was dem Vaterlande gut und nütze sein kann, wenn es gleich nicht durch ihn gepflanzt und gesäet worden. (IV, 300)

Lenz next deals with the question, "Wer soll aber den Geschmack ausbreiten und der Verwildern oder Verwahrlosung desselben vorbauen, wenn es nicht die tun, die es schon selbst in einer Kunst zu einem Grad der Fürtrefflichkeit gebracht?" (IV, 300) It is difficult for those with a vested interest in the production of art, the poets themselves, to obtain the necessary objectivity to judge other poets, and yet someone must provide guidance, continuity, interpretation and standards of excellence if art is not to be dissipated into chaos. Lenz's answer is that true scholars and philosophers, who are imbued with the entire tradition of art and knowledge and who have acquired, as a
consequence, "die schärfsten und reichhaltigsten Einsichten und den feinsten Geschmack, aber auch . . . das unverdorbenste zärteste Gefühl, für alle Rechte der Menschheit" (IV, 301-02), are the only men capable of rendering this service. In ancient times Solon, Lycurgus, Democritus, and Pythagoras had the wisdom to give direction to the arts and to pass judgment on artistic achievements. Only men such as these may carry, "den heiligen Namen der Rezensenten" (IV, 302). There was, according to Lenz, a time in Germany when conditions such as these did indeed reign, when men such as Abbt, Mendelsohn and Hamann were active. His generation of thinkers, however, represented a falling off of quality and his was the voice in the wilderness crying for new leaders to replace puny, self-interested demagogues like Wieland.

The following section deals with Wieland's associate, the Berlin publisher and critic Fr. W. Nicolai, who had a tremendous influence in maintaining the Rococo standards of taste.

Was soll man aber zu einem Dichter sagen, der mehr Buchhändler als Dichter auf diesen Grund fortabaute, das heisst Kunstrichter aus ganz Deutschland zusammenmietete, um endlich auf diesen ungeheuren Obelisk sein Bild mit desto mehrerer Sicherheit aufstellen zu können, der alle Offizinen und Druckerpressen auf gewisse Art in Anspruch nahm, um nichts in seinem Vaterlande ans Licht kommen zu lassen, das nicht von ihm und seinem Geschmacksrat vorher war gestempelt worden. (IV, 302)
Lenz's treatment of Nicolai is in no way tempered with any of the respect or admiration which characterized his attitude towards Wieland in this work. It was actually Nicolai who united the critics in support of the Aufklärung and who published the most virulent attacks against the Stürmer and Dränger. Although he had little artistic talent, he was interested in the continued success of his publishing house which dealt exclusively with Rococo writers. Lenz's hatred of the man was constantly renewed by the carping reviews that his works received in Nicolai's Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek.

This difference in the treatment of Wieland and Nicolai in the Verteidigung was noticed by contemporaries: Schubert, for example, wrote in his Teutsche Chronik July 18, 1776:

Vor einiger Zeit ging eine Komödie, Die Wolken betitelt, im Mscet. herum, worinnen Wieland und Nicolai mit Aristophanischer Bosheit misshandelt wurden. Da entschuldigt sich nun dessfalls der Verfasser in einem Bogen und legt sein Glaubensbekenntnis von Wieland und mit unter auch von Nicolai ab, so, dass der erste damit zufrieden sein, der letztere aber schreien muss über den harten schmerzhaften Angriff eines Mannes, der ihm an Genie so weit überlegen ist.\textsuperscript{101}

With a diatribe against Nicolai and, to a lesser extent, Wieland's "kritische Bude von ähnlicher Art, wiewohl

\textsuperscript{101} Quoted in: Lenz, Schriften . . . , Vol. III, 473.
doch mit mehrerem Geschmack" (IV, 303) Lenz brings to an end his introductory section of the _Verteidigung_, the section devoted to the motivation for writing _Die Wolken_. Lenz had promised to begin his actual defense of Wieland at this point, but instead he introduces a section which criticizes his foe for considering himself an intellectual "reincarnation" of Socrates. The reader is first presented with a detailed paragraph charting Socrates' contributions to mankind and Lenz's reverence for his memory. Lenz apparently felt that Wieland had set himself up as a modern Socrates, with his tutoring of boys and his didactic writings. He was inconsistent, however, with his philosophical pretensions, allowing the main character of his _Der neue Amadis_ (1771) to appear in many ridiculous and risque situations. Lenz has nothing against frankly humorous writers such as Rabelais or Fielding. He does consider the disrespectful treatment of morally upstanding figures a degrading portrait of man and an immoral example for young readers—as if to say that even heroes are not above unworthy actions and that virtuous ideals are risible.

... sobald er sich aber neben Sokratessen stellt, und doch der Hauptheld seines Stücks eine lacher- liche Rolle spielt, so müssen wir dafür ärger warnen, als für das korrosivste und beschleunigendste Gift, das jemals von einem Menschenfeinde in den Eingeweiden der Erde ist zubereitet worden. (IV, 311)
Lenz again promises to return to his alleged objec-
tive, a defense of Wieland. Instead of the long-awaited
defense, however, the reader is presented with a comprehensive
attack of the Rococo-Enlightenment philosophers, who have
seduced Wieland. Without them, claims Lenz in a strange
mood of generosity, Wieland might never have used his great
talent in an attempt to hold the youth in a state of sub-
servience. These are the men who have found Goethe unworthy
of "Aufmerksamkeit, Widerlegen" or "Bestraften"—they find
him simply "belachenswert" (IV, 313).

As usual, Lenz goes beyond the immediate faults of
style or effect to examine and castigate the long-range
moral implications of literature. The result of the Rococo
outlook, he feels, will be a destruction of all the ties
holding society together:

... sehen Sie die junge Leute mit den Mienen
der Weisheit und allen Waffen der Leichtfertigkeit
versehen, in allen Künsten der Galanterie
unterrichtet, auf die schwachen Augen-Blicke Ihrer
Geliebten und Ihrer Töchter Jagd machen, sehen Sie
da eben diese jungen Leute mit der grössten
Verachtung für das Geschlecht, das allein aus
Männern Menschen machen und durch die Liebe ihren
regellosen Kräften und Fähigkeiten eine Gestalt
geben konnte, mit mehr als tierischer Ungebundenheit
sich nicht allein für ihre künftigen Gattinnen,
nein auch für ihre Freunde, auch für den Staat,
der sie nähren muss, völlig entnerven und untüchtig
machen. (IV, 314-15)

Religion too will be powerless to counteract the effect of
this philosophy as long as it remains \textit{jenseits-orientiert}. He asks his reader to consider the contractual nature of most marriages. What has happened to love? What will become of those women who have no dowry, whose families have no political power? People are blaming luxury for the failure of marriages; it is not luxury, maintains Lenz, but rather, "die Pestbeule in Ihrer Brust, die Verderbnis der Sitten, die Geringschätzung höherer Wonne für einen tierischen Augenblick, der Ihnen freilich heutzutage leicht genug gemacht wird" (IV, 316). The exploitation of women, the emphasis on physical pleasure rather than spiritual virtue, the basic immorality of the \textit{Graziensphilosophie}; these are the same themes which Lenz attacked in his \textit{Zerbin} and, to a lesser extent, in all of the works of the period 1774–76.

Lenz approaches the end of his \textit{Verteidigung} with the hypothetical statement that if Wieland could have been a martyr to the philosophy of the age, if he had only recanted the "Schwärmerei, die seine Jugend so unglücklich machte" (IV, 319), then he would have set an example for the youth, and Lenz would have been able to call to him: "liebenswürdiger Freund! reichen Sie mir Ihre Hand, und ich will Ihr Herz so sehr verehren, als ich Ihren Geistesgaben meine Bewunderung nie habe entziehen können" (IV, 319). Wieland, however, would never take this step and Lenz
concludes his Verteidigung with the following judgement of Wieland. Your punishment will be "Dichterruhe auf Lorbeern" (IV, 320).
CHAPTER IX

RECONCILIATION WITH WIELAND AND REAPPRAISAL OF HIS WORK

The relentless condemnation and bitterness in Lenz's literary treatment of Wieland, which we have traced from *Menalk und Mopsus* to the *Verteidigung*, disappeared abruptly with Lenz's arrival in Weimar in April of 1776 and his almost instantaneous reconciliation with the Rococo writer. It seems incredible that a sincere and well-motivated hatred of Wieland as a philosopher could be metamorphosed so easily into friendship. This complete reversal of attitude must necessarily affect our evaluation of the series of satires which Lenz produced.

Lenz seems to have been overwhelmed by the warm reception accorded him by Wieland. In spite of all Lenz's acrimonious articles, Wieland welcomed him as a friend, entertained him in his home, and omitted all reference to the attacks he had sustained from the author of *Die Wolken*.

Sie werden begierig sein zu wissen, wie Wieland mich empfangen hat, ... Als ich ihn das erste-mal sahe, machte die zutrauenvolle vergnügte Bewegung, mit der er mich grüsste, mich schon wirre;
es war als ob's ihm jemand gesagt hätte, ich sey um seinetwillen gekommen, ... 102

Lenz's desire to impress the Duke of Weimar, and Wieland's position of favor with the Duke, may have been an additional stimulus for Lenz to accept Wieland's overtures.

The first poetic evidence of Lenz's change occurs in the *Epistel eines Einsiedlers an Wieland*, written towards the end of June, 1776. The lavish, fawning, almost servile prose contained in this panegyric demonstrates Lenz's characteristic, compulsive, swing from one extreme of behavior to another.

O komm, mein Wieland! werde mein Lehrer,
Nicht im Gesang - wer sänge nach Dir?
... Komm, schliesse dich mit Goethen an,
Melpomenens Liebling, mich zu bilden, ... (I, 192)

In the letter to Graf Friedrich Leopold Stollberg in April of 1776 Lenz finally admits that he had indeed misinterpreted the works of Wieland: "... Wieland, der einzige unter allen Menschen, den ich vorsätzlich und öffentlich beleidigt habe."103

Even a cursory examination of Wieland's work corroborates the idea that Lenz had either misinterpreted or misunderstood the meaning of such books as *Der neue Amadis* and 102

---


Der goldene Spiegel. First of all, the question of Wieland's so-called plagiarism should be considered in the light of contemporary standards of originality. René Wellek has emphasized the often over-looked fact that, until modern times, the variations in plot, themes, images, devices, characterization, etc. formed a kind of literary pool from which authors drew the raw materials of their art. "No author felt inferior or unoriginal because he used, adapted, and modified themes and images inherited from tradition and sanctified by antiquity." Classical writers such as Plautus, Ovid and Horace reworked mythological themes. La Fontaine, one of the Rococo idols, was celebrated for his trenchant poetic adaptations of Aesop. Even Shakespeare, the new hero of the Stürmer und Dränger, found inspiration in Plutarch, the Holinshed Chronicles, and contemporary dramatists. To be sure, Wieland acknowledged his lack of originality and gave credit in his footnotes to all of his sources. The important thing is that Wieland's transformation of borrowed material resulted in new artistic creations.

Der Stoff, der aus Quellen zu schöpfende 'Grundstoff!', ist ihm etwas, das man 'finden', das jeder 'finden' kann, für das er nichts zu'erfinden'  

104 Quoted in: Charlotte Craig, Christoph Martin Wieland As the Originator of the Modern Travesty in German Literature (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1970), p. 121.
braucht; denn die dichterische Gabe der 'Erfindung' wendet er an Höheres und Wesentlicheres; er nennt es schlicht 'die Bearbeitung des Stoffs' - die gilt ihm allein als 'die wahre Erfindung'. Das ist seine Poesie des Stils'.

As a matter of fact, Wieland felt that the Sturm und Drang insistence on absolute originality, was incompatible with the position of the European man as a product of a long-term evolution. Wieland held culture to be an accumulation of common standards that had developed over many centuries; any attempt to deny this heritage was bound to result in a caricature of life and not the desired uniqueness of the Sturm und Drang movement. A rejection of the humanistic legacy combined with an overemphasis of individualism on the part of irresponsible artists could lead to an anarchy of human values.

Den kriegerischen, blutdürstenden Geist und die patriotische Wut dieser alten Barbaren durch die Magie der Dichtkunst verschönern und zu Tugend und Heldentum adeln, heisst einen Gebrauch von dieser edeln Kunst machen, der bei allem, was er Blendendes hat, nicht weniger gefährlich ist, als wenn sie zum Werkzeug der Üppigkeit und ausschweifender Lüste missbraucht wird.

The war-like and bloodthirsty spirit that Wieland opposes was prevalent in the Bardendichtung so popular with the

---


106 Quoted in: Sengle, p. 302.
young Stürmer und Dränger.

Charlotte Craig has pointed out another reason for Wieland's frequent literary borrowings. Miss Craig presents convincing evidence for the consideration of Wieland as a mildly humorous writer, who borrows from well-known works in order to create travesties or poems with parodic elements. Both the parody and the tragedy depend necessarily on a humorous or incongruous distortion of an existing literary model for their effect. Indeed, this reworking of familiar plots and themes is not only characteristic of Wieland's art, but actually a source of added charm. Although some confusion exists in the use of the terms "travesty" and "parody" by critics, careful definitions tend to distinguish between the two satiric sub-genres on the basis of whether it is the form or the content which is altered. The Deutsches Wörterbuch of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm declares, "... die travestie ist das entgegengesetzte von parodie; dort wird der inhalt beibehalten, aber durch eine verdrehte behandlung ins lächerliche gewandt (bei der parodie umgekehrt)."107 Abrams in his Glossary of Literary Terms, and the modern German Kleines literarisches Lexikon observe the same distinction.

107Quoted in: Craig, p. 4.
Der Unterschied zwischen beiden besteht darin: P. belässt die Form der verspotteten Dichtung, ändert aber den Inhalt, der nun zur Form nicht mehr passt; T. belässt den Inhalt, gibt ihm aber eine andere, unpassende Form. Beide Arten können episch, dramatisch, ja auch lyrisch sein.108

Whether motivated by the desire to discredit hypocrisy in society or by the sheer aesthetic pleasure of refashioning an existing work, it is evident that Wieland "favored the technique of following the basic plot outline of his sources while altering the manner of presentation; for example, adapting prose works into verse narratives."109 In her discussion of the development of Wieland's art, Miss Craig offers examples of travesty and parody used in Der Anti-Ovid, oder die Kunst zu lieben (1752), Die Abenteuer des Don Sylvio von Rosalva (1764), Die Komischen Erzählungen (1765), Idris und Zenide (1767), Der neue Amadis (1771), Der goldene Spiegel (1772), Die Geschichte der Abderiten (1774–81). In the period from 1777 to 1780, Wieland creates his finest travesties, drawing elements from English, French, German and Oriental sources. Oberon (1780), for example, is derived from the old French epic Huon de Bordeaux, Chaucer's "The Merchant's Tale," and Shakespeare's

108Quoted, ibid., p. 5.
109Ibid., p. 8.
A Midsummer-Night's Dream. It is probable that Lenz, like Herder, Lessing, and Gerstenberg, failed to recognize that these works were deliberate travesties.

Because of his rigid moralistic outlook and his personal involvement in the Sturm und Drang movement, Lenz was also unable to appreciate the gentle irony contained in Wieland's writings. Miss Craig considers that "Wieland rendered a valuable service to German literature as a whole when one considers the relative paucity of humorous works."\(^{110}\) Lenz, however, took himself, his campaign for a new sense of virtue, and his fight against the exploitation of women and other unfortunates much too seriously to accept the philosophical legitimacy of the light touch. Lenz favored heavy dramatic situations and impassioned pleas to make his points. When Lenz uses comedy it is generally of the heavy Aristophanic variety: slapstick, distorted characterization, crude language, fantastic situations. An interesting comparison could be made between the amusing but thoroughly human portraits of Wieland (cf. Amadis, Phanias) and the grotesque caricatures that Lenz created in the name of a higher human morality (cf. Menalk, Mopsus, Sokrates).

Wieland was skeptical of absolute values and exposed extremism

\(^{110}\)Craig, p. 4.
and dehumanizing institutions of all kinds with his humorous irreverence. Lenz thought that it was almost sacrilegious to portray the weaknesses and foibles of a literary hero, but Wieland was a more accurate psychologist.

The fact is that Wieland's witty and urbane style is the reflection of a disabused but not disillusioned philosophy. Like his Musarion, Wieland advocated a reasonable enjoyment of pleasure, combined with a realistic appreciation of the vicissitudes of life. His ideal of the Kalo-kagathos stressed the harmonious integration of the physical and intellectual, the interest in self and others, the complete development of potential, and the making of one's life a work of art, replete with beauty and virtue. Above all, "It is Schwarmerei, that is uncontrolled enthusiasm, prejudice, superstition, and gullibility which Wieland takes to task."\textsuperscript{111} Wieland himself characterized his personal outlook by a comparison with Musarion.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., p. 24.
Unvollkommenheiten der menschlichen Natur—welche
... mit allen ihren Mängeln doch immer das
liebenswürdigste Ding ist, das wir kennen.\textsuperscript{112}

It should be obvious to the unbiased reader, although it was not obvious to Lenz until the reconciliation, that Wieland's work contains a strong didactic tendency. Lenz thought of him as a seducer and perverter of German youth, as a man who lauded pleasure and expediency (e.g. the marriage of convenience) at the expense of sentimental ideals, as a reactionary autocrat who attempted to defeat the progressive ideas of the \textit{Stürmer und Dränger}. We have already seen how a different philosophical orientation brought about this misunderstanding, but it is important to emphasize again that Wieland considered himself an exponent of a new secularized humanism, which is in touch with man's classical heritage but free from inhibiting social and religious myths. Miss Craig concludes that Wieland

\textit{... was less concerned with sublime issues of religion or political enlightenment or even virtue (Tugend) than with the harmony of head and heart, the aesthetic education of man, and the problems involving earthly happiness.}\textsuperscript{113}

The question of whether or not Wieland sought to build a reputation on the erotic inmunendo, as Lenz alleged in \textit{Menalk und Mopsus}, can only be given a relative answer. To a man

\textsuperscript{112}Quote, \textit{ibid.}, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{113}Craig, p. 26.
of Lenz's background, many situations and conversations would seem risqué. On the other hand, the majority of the reading public was charmed by Wieland's delicate presentation of provocative subjects. It should be remembered, that erotic French literature was popular at this time, and that Wieland's own patron, Graf Stadion, practically demanded such reading fare. The period of greatest eroticism occurred with the *Komische Erzählungen* (1762), but even Lenz was able to accept these stories after the reconciliation in Weimar:

Man wirft ihm vor, dass seine komischen Erzählungen zu reitzend, gewisse Scenen darinn zu ausgemahlt sind. Ein besonderer Vorwurf! Eben darinn bestand sein grösstes Verdienst, und der höchste Reiz seiner Gemähle ist der ächteste Probierstein für die Tugend seiner Leser.\(^{114}\)

A final point should be considered in this discussion of Lenz's misunderstanding of Wieland's position vis à vis the *Sturm und Drang* movement. There was never a plot among Wieland and the Rococo writers to discredit all the *Stürmer und Dränger*. Indeed, there was never anything like unanimity among Wieland, Uz, Gleim and other Rococo writers. For the most part, Wieland kept his own counsel rather than becoming intimately associated with any literary group. Although he

\(^{114}\)Lenz, *Briefe*, p. 239.
cooperated intermittently with Nicolai from 1773-75, the relationship broke up over Nicolai's satire of Goethe's Werther (Die Freuden des Jungen Werther, 1775). Lenz's claim that Wieland had failed to recognize Goethe's talent is thus patently false. Sengle provides a representative collection of quotations attesting to Wieland's admiration for the creator of Götz:

Goethe, der König der Geister, der liebenswürdigster, grösste und beste Menschensohn, den ich jemals gesehen habe. Göthe ist bald da, bald dort, und wollte Gott, er könnte wie Gott allenthalben seyn.\textsuperscript{115}

All the evidence that we have today in the form of letters, poetic works, and contemporary accounts testifies to Lenz's complete change of opinion concerning Wieland's writings. Even the Komische Erzählungen, the most openly erotic of all Wieland's works, found justification in the eyes of this new friend and admirer. It is useless to speculate about any further evolution or reversals on Lenz's part. Shortly after his reconciliation with Wieland, he began to suffer increasingly frequent spells of the mental illness that would incapacitate him and make the remaining sixteen years of his life a nightmare. He wandered throughout Europe, produced meaningless poetry and died sick and

\textsuperscript{115}Sengle, p. 311.
penniless in Moscow in 1792. Because of this tragic ending to his life, he was never able to survey the entire corpus of Wieland's writings.
CONCLUSION

Modern scholars, not to mention the average reader, have confirmed Lenz's worst fears regarding his work; that he would be neglected, forgotten, overshadowed by the enormous genius of his contemporary Goethe. Although interest in Lenz has been renewed somewhat during the last ten or fifteen years, the entire subject of his satiric writing has so far been overlooked. This critical omission is all the more surprising and serious in view of Lenz's sudden resuscitation of a violent comic tradition in German literary history that had never been given much attention until very recently.

Before Lenz, the two interwoven strands of satire—burlesque comedy and aggressive criticism—had always come unraveled, with the emphasis going to one aspect or the other, depending on the times and the philosophy of the writers. But Lenz was the first German writer whose mood and intentions coincided so perfectly with those of Aristophanes that he adopted the Athenian's use of strong language, extravagant comic situations, and violent invective as well as his dogmatic disregard for fairness. In spite of the frequently crude and obscene material incorporated into Aristophanes'
plays, it should be remembered that he was one of the most moralistic of all the ancient Greek writers, constantly advocating the decency and good sense of the average man and attacking the political and philosophical ideas which undermined these virtues. His attack against Socrates, for example, was motivated by the sincere belief that the moral fiber of Athens was being destroyed by the idle teachings of "irresponsible" men.

Like Aristophanes, Lenz was thoroughly imbued with an almost monomaniacal sense of self-righteousness that served to justify, in his mind, the distortion of truth and the unscrupulous manipulation of emotions. The enemy was Wieland, and Lenz was determined to discredit him by any means and on any level possible. The reason for this hatred of Wieland was not personal rivalry, but rather the conviction that the Rococo writer represented a decadent form of art, an immoral example for young people in the realm of love and sexuality, and an opponent of artistic innovation, especially that of the Stürmer und Dränger.

The first of the series of attacks against Wieland came with Menalk und Mopsus, a relatively harmless poem which poked fun at Wieland's literary style, use of the pastoral genre, alleged plagiarism and preoccupation with erotic innuendoes, and self-appointed position as a lawgiver for
young writers. Parody is the main comic device used to belittle the writer of the recently published *Der neue Amadis*. Lenz combines actual passages from Wieland out of context, suggests dubious interpretations for these passages, imitates Wieland's rambling footnotes and use of foreign words, and claims that the moral of the work is the faithlessness of women. A fat, lazy, lecherous figure, who has absolutely nothing in common with the real Wieland, goes simpering through the play, expostulating on his hypocrisy and cheap artistic tricks. Additional humor is provided by the "fool," Menalk, who cuts away the remaining pretenses of Mopsus-Wieland with his bold statements and oversimplifications.

*Der neue Menoza* continues the satiric attack with the principal objective of disparaging Wieland's "idealized" style of writing and eudaemonistic philosophy. In keeping with the serious philosophical purpose of the play, the satire takes an intellectual form and derives its effects mainly from the ridiculous inconsistencies in the personality of Zierauf, who is used to represent Wieland's thinking. Nowhere does Lenz give a fair interpretation of eudaemonism; instead he equates it with selfish hedonism and immorality and demonstrates that Zierauf is a burden to himself and to society. He does not acknowledge any didactic purpose in Wieland's other work, claiming that the author of *Der neue*
Amadis lived in a fantasy world, was out of touch with social realities and was concerned only with frivolous pursuits. The whole topic of the *virtuoso* is missed or glossed over, in spite of its importance as the moral core of everything Wieland ever did or wrote.

The *Pandämonium Germanicum* comes closer to the comedy of Aristophanes than any other work except the fragmentary *Wolken*. The plot is as disjointed and incoherent as that of the Old Attic Comedy, providing a bare framework for a series of satiric portraits that range from French imitators to mercenary journalists, from Gellert to Wieland. In scenes designed to discredit Lenz's opponents altogether as human beings and as poets, a group of literary critics is turned into flies, journalists hurl rocks at Goethe as ineffectually as they hurl epithets in the exercise of their profession, and a well-known pietistic writer swings from a suspended basket in the costume of Cupid. Maintaining that the Rococo poets wrote nothing but "odes to whores," Lenz proceeds to prove the basic depravity of their character. Such men have scruples about nothing; Wieland is shown trying to steal a novel from his former fiancée.

With *Zerbin* and *Der Magister*, Lenz has left the realm of satire to indulge in purely vicious criticism and defamation. There is nothing humorous in the account of a young
girl who is executed for bearing a still-born illegitimate child, a scholar who commits suicide, or the sexual exploitation of a poor woman with sick children, but Lenz uses the morbid situations to assail once again the philosophy of Wieland and the Rococo. There is even evidence that Zerbin, the weak and heartless lover, was meant to represent Wieland himself.

Although Die Wolken exists today only as a three-page fragment, it seems, according to contemporary reports, to have represented a peak of satiric viciousness. The plot is as slanderous as that of Zerbin, but the element of humor has been reintroduced. In the episode that remains a salacious old teacher tries to seduce a young woman who comes to him for advice, promising that this experience will solve her problems.

The satire of the Verteidigung is the most subtle of the entire series. In the same way that Antony contributed to the downfall of Brutus with his ironic funeral oration in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Lenz tries ostensibly to praise and vindicate Wieland, but in reality deals him one blow after another. He blames the other man for acting as a dictator of the arts, who tried to impose his standards on all the young writers of Germany, and ignored the fact that only through innovation and the authentic expression of the
individual can art retain its vitality and significance. He assails the whole Rococo movement for what he sees as the progressive moral disintegration of society which he considers an inevitable consequence of their esthetic philosophy.

An unbiased examination of Wieland's career gives the lie to the most extreme criticism that Lenz directed against his temporary arch-enemy. It would seem that Lenz himself, after his reconciliation with Wieland, had made a more honest evaluation of the Rococo writer. Aristophanes, too, was wrong in his evaluation of Socrates, but there remains the element of art, the fusion of form with content, the spark of life, which makes the Clouds worth reading today. To a lesser, but not insignificant extent, the same is true of the satiric writing of Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz.
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