

ANMERKUNGEN

¹ Ludwig Wolff, 'Die Iwein-Handschriften in ihrem Verhältnis zueinander.'—Zuerst erschienen in: *Festschrift Helmut de Boor zum 75. Geburtstag*, Tübingen, 1966. S. 111-135.—Wieder erschienen in: Ludwig Wolff, *Kleinere Schriften zur altdutschen Philologie*, Berlin, 1967. S. 165-184.—Zitiert wird nach letzterer Veröffentlichung.

² Ludwig Wolff, a.a.O. S. 171-174.—Die Iwein-Handschriften verzeichnet jetzt Hansjürgen Linke: *Epische Strukturen in der Dichtung Hartmanns von Aue*, München 1968. S. 173-177 und 178-179.

³ Ludwig Wolff, a.a.O., S. 174 (erstes Zitat) und S. 172 (zweites Zitat).

⁴ Ludwig Wolff, a.a.O., S. 171 und 173.

⁵ Benutzt wurde der Variantenapparat der neuen Iwein-Ausgabe: *Iwein. Eine Erzählung von Hartmann von Aue*. Herausgegeben von G. F. Benecke und K. Lachmann. Neu bearbeitet von Ludwig Wolff. Siebente Ausgabe. Band 2. *Handschriftenübersicht Anmerkungen und Lesarten*. Berlin: de Gruyter 1968.

Um die Zuverlässigkeit des Apparats zu prüfen, wurden einige Handschriften (in Kopien) stichprobenweise mit dem Apparat verglichen. Fehler und Lücken wurden gefunden, so daß sich eine Nachvergleichen des Apparats mit der gesamten Überlieferung empfahl. Es gibt jetzt ein berichtigtes Exemplar des Apparats; dieses ist Grundlage der im vorliegenden Aufsatz veröffentlichten Ergebnisse. Kopien der gesamten heute bekannten und noch erhaltenen *Iwein*-Überlieferung waren verfügbar dank dem freundlichen Entgegenkommen der Bibliotheken.—Die Handschrift u, direkte Abschrift von B, durfte unberücksichtigt bleiben.

⁶ Ludwig Wolff, a.a.O., passim.

⁷ Ludwig Wolff, a.a.O., S. 174.

⁸ Über den Zusammenhang der Handschriften E und I mit den Handschriften a, p und r schreibt Ludwig Wolff a.a.O. S. 172-174.

⁹ Ludwig Wolff, a.a.O., S. 165-168.—Vgl. auch Hansjürgen Linke, *Epische Strukturen* S. 19-20 und die dazugehörige Anmerkung 16 auf S. 209 mit einem Zitat aus einem Brief von Ludwig Wolff.

Korrekturnotiz: Ausführliche Darstellung jetzt von Lambertus Okken, *Ein Beitrag zur Entwirrung einer kontaminierten Manuskripttradition: Studien zur Überlieferung von Hartmanns von Aue Iwein*, Diss., Utrecht 1970.

FUNCTIONAL IDEALISM IN GERHART HAUPTMANN'S *EINSAME MENSCHEN*: AN INTERPRETATION

BY E. M. BATLEY

ALTHOUGH Wilhelm Bölsche and Bruno Wille modestly denied having exerted any particular influence on Hauptmann during the years 1886 and 1892,¹ the philosophical undercurrent of their writings on religion and of the former's quasi-scientific essays reveal an outlook of idealism which casts further light on the aesthetic import of *Einsame Menschen* (1891).² Their idealism offered a degree of optimism which could be seen as a counter to Schopenhauer's deterministic philosophy of the tragic and its influence on the playwright. Schopenhauer's view of tragedy could not admit the relevance of 'Lösung', as Hauptmann was aware,³ but in *Einsame Menschen* he did not surrender his aesthetic sense completely to Schopenhauer and 'Gesetzmässigkeit'. On April 22nd, 1887 Bruno Wille summarised Leo Berg's lecture to the 'Durch' association on the concepts of Naturalism and Idealism in the form of concise definitions; Ruprecht notes the frequency of similar discussions in those years.⁴ The definition of Naturalism described one of its distinctive qualities as 'tendenziöse Färbung', manifest in the play in the 'verfluchte Konvention' of prejudgement, while the latter one of Idealism

identifies very closely with Johannes's rôle and thus becomes descriptive of the aesthetic function of the play:

'Idealismus ist eine Richtung der künstlerischen Phantasie, welche die Natur nicht, wie sie ist, darstellt, sondern wie es irgend einem Ideal gemäss sein sollte; (Anstandsideale der alten Griechen, des höfischen Rittertums, des modernen Salons.)'⁴

Johannes, because he is an idealist, fails to perceive the distinction which the definition makes. The three leading female persons of the play, Frau Käthe, Frau Vockerat and Fräulein Anna Mahr are all aware of the latter's emotional involvement with Johannes, an awareness which is manifested in the three parties in different ways and which on account of its potentially tragic intensity in Act IV motivates Fräulein Anna's voluntary and self-effacing decision to leave finally the family environment to which she had become deeply attached. A close examination of the conversation between Johannes and Fräulein Anna in Act IV,⁵ where she determinedly announces her immediate departure for Zürich, reveals the extent of her sacrifice. Throughout the scene Fräulein Anna is careful to avoid revealing her feelings towards him. She strives to divert Johannes's attention from their personal relationship towards a form of philosophical optimism which hinges on the eventual realisation of an ideal, and to impose on Johannes a critical independence of judgement which had been hers on arrival, but which, ironically, becomes engulfed in the course of the action in a deeply emotional attachment to the family and Johannes. Her fate and Johannes's are, in her own words, if one believes their import as Johannes is intended to, 'petty'. Johannes is too distracted by her simple statement that she would like to depart, to understand the full implications of her next utterance:

'Herr Johannes! Wir fallen auch in den Fehler schwacher Naturen. Wir müssen den Blick ins Allgemeine mehr richten. Wir müssen uns selber leichter tragen lernen.'

Oblivious to the dangers of their increasingly introspective relationship, largely because he is still the idealist and as such believes wholeheartedly in the purely intellectual nature of it, partly distracted by the suddenness of her announcement, Johannes reacts lamely, voicing his shock and selfish concern⁶ and showing no indication that he understands the nature of her heroic gesture:

'Wollen Sie wirklich reisen? . . . Da werd' ich von nun an zehnfach einsam sein.—(Pause)—Ach, reden wir wenigstens jetzt nicht davon.'

Johannes assumes that her action is motivated by the conventional demands of the society from which he has sprung and from which, in his idealism, he is seeking to escape.

Thus the 'tendenziöse Färbung' is embodied in the ingrained attitudes of Frau Vockerat towards her son's relationship with Fräulein Anna, as, for instance, when she intrudes upon them as they are sitting together in the dark and responds conventionally with:

'Na, Hannes! Du hättest doch wirklich Licht machen können. Das ist doch nicht . . . So im Dunkeln . . . [...] Kannst du mal mitkommen? Ich möchte dir was sagen.'

It is witnessed also in Herr Vockerat's more straightforwardly vindictive and emotional reaction to, and prejudgement of, the suspicions which Frau Vockerat casts upon their son with the pointed words: 'Unser Sohn . . . unser Johannes—war nahe daran . . .' and the skilfully turned phrase: 'Das Fräulein geht ja nun bald wenigstens aus dem Hause.' Herr Vockerat makes his judgement on the spot, despite his wife's attempts to moderate his outcry:

'Die Hand hätt' ich mir abhauen lassen, Martha, ohne Bedenken.— Mein Sohn—Martha! mein Sohn—pflicht- und ehrvergessen?!'

Even Braun, the radical and uncompromising art-student, albeit 'Kopfinaler' of the first act, motivated here by his jealousy at being rejected by Johannes in favour of a female intellectual companion, succumbs to the same convention, as his tortuous attempts to persuade Anna to leave culminate in the climactic phrase which echoes the same standpoint and judgement as Herr Vockerat is to utter at the end of the act:

'Fräulein Anna, (nun ernst) Ach so! Das ist es also. Nun, weiter, weiter!

Braun: Ja, und—ja—und Ihr Verhältnis zu Johannes.'

Significantly, Anna refuses to listen to one word more from him.

As an indication of the essential truth behind the façade Hauptmann carefully determines the order of events and motives which lead to Fräulein Anna Mahr's final departure. Because Anna resolves to depart before Braun's and Frau Vockerat's exhortations to do so, it is clear that it was not conventional considerations in the first instance which at that moment motivated her decision, for they had existed for some time already, rather the fear that she would reveal her true feelings to Johannes, thus giving further vindication of the conventional standpoint and undermining utterly Johannes's idealistic hopes. Both Frau Käthe and Frau Vockerat have considerable sympathy and understanding for Fräulein Anna's plight. Even Frau Vockerat, though this is but indirectly expressed ('Und Sie sind ja auch noch so jung, so jung, Fräulein. In Ihrem Alter überwindet man ja noch so leicht'), realises that Anna is guilty of no sin in the eyes of the church, merely of being in love with an older, married man. Anna Mahr's love for Johannes is not stated directly, but it is on several occasions clearly inferred,

for example, when she is moved to ask Käthe for a photograph of Johannes to take with her to Zürich.⁷

Fräulein Anna chooses not to dissuade Johannes from his view that she is yielding to what he terms this 'verfluchte Konvention'. She in fact re-states it in the following terms:

'... Sie werten anders, als Ihre Eltern werten. Ihre Eltern werten anders, als Frau Käthe wertet. Darüber lässt sich gar nichts sagen, meiner Ansicht nach.'

Fräulein Anna prefers to state the obvious and conceal the less obvious when she infers that the more specific motive for her departure is that Frau Käthe is entirely dependent upon Johannes, not because she has made herself so, but purely because she is. Frau Käthe is not named even here and Johannes, still the egocentric idealist, assumes that the epithet 'abhängig' refers merely to his own dependence on Fräulein Anna as the sole intellectual companion and therefore fellow-idealist that he has. For Johannes the very fact that the ideal is shared between them, man and woman, is its own vindication.

This remains to him now as the sole prop for his being, for the action repeatedly shows him to be dependent on others. Nor is he the brilliant scholar that he and others would have him and accordingly displays an immature approach to the work which Braun, with accidental appropriateness, describes as: 'psychophysiologische . . . Schreibung.' Hauptmann is lightly and consistently ironical of Johannes's pretensions to scholarship, as when it is revealed in Act I how proud he is of peripheral considerations such as his attack on the famous electrophysiologist Du-Bois Reymond, and the twelve pages of source material. Johannes's expressed desire to live in an extensive park surrounded by high walls is symbolic of the idealist: at the beginning of the play Johannes is perpetually seeking confirmation from those unqualified persons around him of the success and importance of his work, from Käthe who has the good will but neither the time nor the intelligence to understand it, from Braun who does not understand it either but who is therefore jealous of it, and from his mother who, as an exponent of 'Plüschi- und Gartenlaubekultur' and of simple Pietistic faith, regards it as evil because it upsets her son's previous serenity of mind. In Fräulein Anna Mahr, Johannes is provided with a companion who has both the time and the intellectual capacity to share his interest in his work. Thus it is an interesting, if incidental feature of the development of the plot, that Johannes's idealism which was first expressed in the context of his research shifts gradually to his relationship with Fräulein Anna and hers with him.

Fräulein Anna refers to this relationship almost exclusively in a general sense in Act IV. She leads Johannes along these lines in the conversation:

'... Sie haben mir oft gesagt, Sie ahnten einen neuen, höheren Zustand der Gemeinschaft zwischen Mann und Frau.'

Johannes's reaction is the nearest he comes to naming his ideal: the animal relationship indicates perhaps a Freudian slip which probably gives an answer to Frau Käthe's despondent query in Act V when she recalls her first meeting with her future husband:

'Siehst du, Mutterchen, mein erstes Gefühl, das ich damals hatte, als Hannes zu mir kam und mich holen wollte, das war doch ganz richtig. Ich weiss, den ganzen Tag drumselte mir's im Kopf rum: was soll denn nur ein so geistreicher und gelehrter Mann mit dir anfangen? Was kann er denn an dir haben? Siehst, du, das war ganz richtig gedacht.'

Does Johannes see his own marriage being founded on little more than animal desires—if one may add a conventional platitude, Käthe was very young at the time—or is it meant in the broader sense that so few marriages of the day are marked by qualities of intellectual companionship between partners? Whatever his precise meaning, it is clear that in his ideal he sees an intellectual relationship with another woman forming the complement to a man's relationship with his wife. Johannes does not, however, deny Käthe: at worst he infers by a subliminal Freudianism that it is the animal part of their relationship which predominates. He reproaches his wife for her intellectual limitations and dependence on him but is at the same time concerned to deepen her education and understanding of matters related to his own interests. Thus he sincerely believes that Käthe too can only gain from the continued presence of Fräulein Anna in the household. At this point it is clearly his idealism, conditioned by outward determinants or not, which is in the ascendant and which is, ironically, also sincerely encouraged by Fräulein Anna in order that he might retain an impersonal perspective of the value of the ideal:

'Johannes (mit Wärme und Leidenschaft.) Ja, den ahne ich, den wird es geben, später einmal. Nicht das Tierische wird dann mehr die erste Stelle einnehmen, sondern das Menschliche. Das Tier wird nicht mehr das Tier ehelichen, sondern der Mensch den Menschen. Freundschaft, das ist die Basis, auf der sich diese Liebe erheben wird. Unlöslich, wundervoll, ein Wunderbau geradezu. Aber ich ahne noch mehr: noch viel Höheres, Reicheres, Freieres—'

This wrings a smile from Fräulein Anna as she expresses a slight cynicism towards his high-sounding words. She takes up the argument from his previous statement, significantly regarding the purely intellectual nature of their relationship as hypothetical only: 'Nehmen wir aber einmal an: es hätte wirklich etwas Neues, Höheres gelebt—in unsern Beziehungen.' The doubt which she has hereby expressed, occasions deep concern in Johannes, as he strives to prove to Fräulein Anna that their relationship is 'geläutert':

'Johannes (mit Betrübnis) Zweifeln Sie daran? Soll ich ihnen Unterschiede nennen? Empfinden Sie zum Beispiel etwas andres für Käthe als herzliche

Liebe? Ist mein Gefühl für Käthe etwa schwächer geworden? Im Gegenteil, es ist tiefer und voller geworden.'

In questioning the nature of this triangular relationship there is, however, one problem which Johannes never raises. He is right in naming Fräulein Anna's feelings towards Käthe as love: the converse is equally true although Johannes does not mention it. His feelings for Käthe—note he does not use the term 'Liebe'—have not diminished either, although it is questionable whether they have thereby been deepened. These are, of course, in this particular situation all obvious questions: the less obvious one to him because of the blindness of his idealism, is that concerning the nature of Fräulein Anna's feelings for him and this he fails to ask of her. At this point Anna prefers to keep her distance and continue the pretence that she is leaving because of appearances, because of a conventional outlook which is contrary to the idealism embodied in Johannes:

'Aber wo ist ausser mir ein Mensch, der Ihnen das noch glauben kann?—Und wird Frau Käthe weniger zugrunde gehen?—Ich möchte nicht gern von uns beiden reden . . .'

On the surface this appears to Johannes that both of them participate in their belief in the ideal. But the deeper and dramatically ironical import is that Anna is beginning to realize how vital it is that at least Johannes should continue to believe in the ultimate realization of the ideal, where she, unbeknown to him, does not. Over and above her concern for Frau Käthe she reveals a determination to appear to be yielding before conventional attitudes. In the last phrase of the above quotation Anna clearly shuns discussion of their personal relationship underlying the importance of the omission in Johannes's questioning of the triangular relationship. This is virtually what Alexander describes as the 'Ohnmacht der Sprache', that is, in positive terms, Hauptmann's ability to express the high drama of the situation in what is unsaid rather than what is said.⁸ The remainder of the same speech voices Anna's feelings that Johannes is premature in his idealism. She warns Johannes that the young plant of idealism, because of its prematurity and therefore delicate health, cannot grow to fruition in their lifetime. The most important thing to be done, she continues, is for someone to make it his duty to bring the seed of the ideal of intellectual relationships between man and woman to posterity. She infers even that there are two distinct stages in this process. 'We can pass it on to posterity' which suggests, contrary to the doubt which she has expressed immediately prior to this, that in the past we have shown that it can exist. Her final sentence, however, where she expresses her view that she could imagine someone making it his duty to pass the ideal on to posterity, is deliberately in the singular person, the inference being clear:

'... Nehmen wir mal an—ganz im allgemeinen—ein neuer, vollkommenerer Zustand wird von jemand vorempfunden. Dann ist er vorläufig im Gefühl—eine überzarte, junge Pflanze, die man schonen und wieder schonen muss.—Meinen Sie nicht auch, Herr Doktor?—Dass das Pflänzchen sich auswächst, während wir leben, das dürfen wir nicht hoffen. Wir können sie niemals gross werden sehn, ihre Früchte sind für andre bestimmt. Auf die Nachwelt den Keim bringen, das können wir vielleicht. Ich könnte mir sogar denken, dass sich jemand das zur Pflicht macht.'

This hope can provide Johannes with a worthwhile aim after Anna has departed. She expresses her opinion of the moment that the 'altes Ziel' is no longer the path for her—and condemns it as '... zu unbedeutend für uns—zu gewöhnlich, offen gestanden!' She has had a glimpse of something deeper—'Ich habe eben auch etwas wie eine Ahnung empfunden'. On occasions Hauptmann uses images which have a deep, emotive and even philosophic function and Anna chooses such a way to describe the shift in her attitude which has taken place during the action of the play: conversely to Johannes, she sees the closeness of family life and emotional ties as something real and fundamental:

'—Es ist gerade so, als ob man aus hohen Bergen mit weitem, weitem Ausblick heruntersteigt und nun alles so eng und nah findet im Tal.'

Idealism becomes tainted, as Anna descends from speculations on the infinite ('posterity') to commitment to the finite ('love'). Now she can realistically appraise first her true feelings for Johannes and second the destructive effect of their relationship on Frau Käthe.

Hauptmann's *Die abgekürzte Chronik meines Lebens* (1920)⁹ shows the symbolic value which the mountain had for him as a boy. Perpetually contemplating it, he believed it signified the limitation of the world, a point from which one could climb into Heaven. Receiving no answer to the question of what might lie beyond, the boy had had to satisfy himself with the vaguer thoughts of infinity:

'... Da es keine erhält, begnügt es sich mit den Schauern des Grauens, mit den unbestimmten Vorstellungen von endlosen Räumen und leeren Abgründen... Der Winter ist eine Zeit der Besinnung...'

This is not unrelated to the plight of the idealist of the play at this particular moment in the development, as it is the less restricted and determinate aspects of that idealism for which he is striving. He also needs a response to it, for he cannot survive as an idealist in isolation, as is seen from the development of this theme as an underlying foundation of his character. Anna uses

the description of being on top of a high mountain with distant views, to demonstrate her previous affinity with Johannes's idealism. In Johannes, within the context of the play, his idealism as seen in itself is the only strong and positive point of his character and even that is undermined by his isolation. In the *Chronik* Hauptmann does not see the boy's unheeded question necessarily as cause for despondency, for he then derived strength from an inner source, which acted as 'more than a substitute' for the knowledge of what lay beyond the mountain. This is the positive strength he has drawn from his situation which will not be dislodged except under the exigencies of a particularly despondent thought:

'Die Lebensfreude, die selige Kindheit, nimmt es [äusseres und physisches Leiden] ihm nicht. Das tut eines Tages, allerdings nur für Stunden und hin und wieder in der Folge für Augenblicke, ein Gedanke. Es ist der Gedanke seiner Alleinigkeit, seiner Einsamkeit.'

It is not merely an emotional response to loneliness which Hauptmann is recalling, but also the philosophical and more fundamental one, that man as an individual is losing his identity in so far as he becomes merely the victim of environment specifically or of the laws of determinism generally. He is deeply disturbed by his loneliness, but his psyche is shaken irreparably by the thought that life for him, as an individual deserted by men and God—a close parallel with Johannes' predicament—, is like being on a drifting ice-flow, which is moving towards its destruction, at the mercy of powers over which he has no control. The knowledge that all other men and animals on the ice-flow are similarly condemned, affords no solace. His nocturnal visions seemed to him of a nightmarish quality, for in them he saw himself having no meaning as an individual, no identity, a thing subjected to scientific, sociological, psychological 'Gesetzmässigkeit' and as such having no free will. Both Alexander and Bölsche write of the situation of the characters in Hauptmann's early plays as being closely and deliberately allied to chemical action and reaction. The meddling intrusion of old man Vockerat undoubtedly has a catalytic effect on the development towards the final catastrophe in making Johannes wholly dependent, before his own parents, on the rightness of his idealistic viewpoint. Similarly, as Alexander explains, Anna Mahr's arrival can be taken as the introduction of a foreign body which causes all other elements in the family and near-family environment to react in a virtually predetermined manner. This acceptance of deterministic laws was no doubt the true cause for Hauptmann's despondency in the *Chronik* as also for Johannes' urgent need to prove his identity through the realization of his ideal. Moreover, it is important that in this he should be the first and should be successful. His alternative is to be as nothing, the nightmare which Hauptmann recalls in the *Chronik*:

'In seinen Träumen sieht er sich als ein verlorenes 'Nichts' an Kleinheit, an einen mit stereoskopischer Klarheit erblickten riesigen Mondball geklebt und rotierend durch die allseitigen Abgründe des Weltraums mitgerissen. Es kam ihm vor, als sei es ihm gegeben, unter unendlichem Grauen mit Augen zu sehen, wovon für gewöhnlich ein geringes Teil schon zu ungeheuer für den menschlichen Gesichtssinn ist. In welches furchtbar seltsame Rätsel ist man hineingestellt? . . .'

In the penultimate sentence of the above, near infinite vision is accorded to the individual who at the same time perceives his impotent non-identity. This is still the forlorn pessimism which underlies Schopenhauer's philosophy of the tragic as also the fundament of Johannes's character. Its gloomy emptiness accounts for the urgency of Johannes's striving and gives overwhelming proportions to the importance of his establishing the ideal. The older Hauptmann, still beneath the spell of Schopenhauer, had, however, succeeded in gleaning something of positive value from such thoroughly deterministic views:

Wenn nach Schopenhauer der Widerstreit des Willens gegen sich selbst der Quell alles dem Leben eigenen Leidens ist, so muss, da dieser Widerstreit auf Vernichtung des Willens hinausläuft und diese Vernichtung auch das Streben des Weisen ist, ihm etwas wesentlich Gutes eigen sein, wie einem immerwährenden, immererneuerten Versuch zur Erlösung.¹⁰

Thus the ideal for which Johannes is striving has an eternal and Christian—not specifically Pietistic—validity. The striving is his spiritual salvation on ethical grounds. He is morally right in his belief in the ideal. That he fails to realise the ideal in tangible terms of his relationship with Fraülein Anna, is a personal tragedy for him, for being as he is a dependent character he needs a real share in the vindication of the ideal. He does not have the strength to survive as an idealist in isolation.

In the *Chronik* Hauptmann reveals his awareness that as the boy grows older so does the mountain lose its earlier if vain promise of new horizons. Inevitably it came to signify the demarcation of the world, in Hauptmann's words: '... die Erkenntnis der Unentrinnbarkeit, durch die der Mensch mit dem Tode verbunden ist. . . .' He depicts in the *Chronik*, in the same inevitable way in which Johannes is driven methodically, stage by stage, towards suicide, man's helpless movement towards his total eclipse:

'... War das seligste Jugendgefühl bisher zugleich ein Gefühl von schrankenloser Freiheit, so bemerkt der Knabe jetzt eine Schlinge, mit der er gefesselt, eine lange, unzerreissbare, dunkle Schnur, die in der Ferne verschwindet und durch die er mit der eisernen Faust des Todes ein für allemal fest verbunden

ist. Nicht mit dem leiblichen Auge, aber im Geist sieht er Hände, die jene Angelschnur gleichsam aufwickeln, an deren Haken er unrettbar hängt . . .'

Johannes's last rejoinder to Anna is to suggest that there would be no problem, if Käthe could also attain to fulfilment of the ideal. Anna replies in a manner which reveals the nature of her feelings towards Johannes, but Frau Vockerat's sudden entry brings the scene to a timely conclusion and Johannes, as previously, fails to perceive the true import of what Anna admits:

'Wenn es Käthe gelänge zu leben neben mir, dann . . . dann würde ich mir selbst doch nicht trauen können. In mir . . . in uns ist etwas, was den geläuterten Beziehungen, die uns dämmern, feindlich ist, auf die Dauer auch überlegen, Herr Doktor. Wollen wir nun Licht machen?'

The prophetic song by Anna indirectly declares the 'Erlösung', virtually the death and consciously unacknowledged martyrdom of Johannes.

The scene between Johannes and Anna Mahr in Act IV¹¹ serves the external function of enabling the latter to announce her decision to depart, which Johannes certainly argues about vehemently but which, knowing his disposition, he takes relatively calmly. The final scene between them in Act V, however, shows him on the point of collapse as Fräulein Anna takes her leave. By the extreme nature of the intervening altercation with his father, Johannes has been brought face to face with the severity of his hereditary ties and has, accordingly, promised to allow Fräulein Anna to leave. As Johannes becomes more and more distraught, he inevitably turns to Anna for comfort in his loneliness to be. At the present moment he feels that everything he holds dear has been denigrated and the only prop remaining to him is the thought of what their relationship was:

'Helfen Sie mir, Fräulein Anna! Nichts Hohes, nicht Stolz ist mehr in mir. Ich bin ein anderer geworden. Nicht einmal der bin ich in diesem Augenblick, der ich war, eh Sie zu uns kamen. Ich habe nur noch Ekel in mir und Lebenswiderwillen. Mir ist alles entwertet, beschmutzt, besudelt, entheiligt, in den Kot gezogen. Aber ich fühle, dass ich etwas war, durch Sie, Ihre Gegenwart, Ihre Worte, und wenn ich das nicht wieder sein kann, dann—dann kann mir auch alles andre nichts mehr nutzen. Dann mach' ich einen Strich unter die Rechnung und schliesse ab . . .'

The 'Anhalt' or 'Stütze' which Anna offers him at his request is in the form of the ideal which they had already discussed. Only this—'das eigene Gesetz'—can bind them together. Johannes is well aware of it but he also voices his dependence quite explicitly at this stage: he needs a guarantee that he is not chasing a vain and empty ideal:

'Ich fühle wohl, dass mich das halten könnte. Ich könnte auch arbeiten, ohne Hoffnung, das Ziel zu erreichen. Aber wer bürgt mir? Wo nehme ich den Glauben her? Wer sagt mir, ob ich mich nicht abquäle für ein Nichts?'

Anna argues that strength can be gained from the fact that the knowledge of their ideal, of their predicament, is shared with each other. She will, she insists, think of Johannes whenever she feels that her will is weak, an almost Romantic outburst but one which thereby emphasizes how much they are seeking to be anti-conventional. Thus Johannes commits himself to the final prop of his ideal, namely, that, whatever might happen in the future to the ideal, it will continue to burn within him, because it has in the past existed within both of them. That is the tangible vindication for the idealist of the rightness of his beliefs, the last vestige of hope for personal identity which is remaining to him:

'Fräulein Anna!—Nun gut, ich will! Ich will!—Die Ahnung eines neuen, freien Zustandes, einer fernen Glückseligkeit gleichsam, die in uns gewesen ist, die wollen wir bewahren. Was wir einmal gefühlt haben, die Möglichkeit, die wir gefühlt haben, soll von nun an nicht mehr verlorengehn. Gleichviel, ob sie Zukunft hat oder nicht, sie soll bleiben. Dies Licht soll fortbrennen in mir, und wenn es erlischt, so erlischt mein Leben. (Beide stumm und erschüttert.) Ich danke Ihnen, Fräulein Anna!'

At this point Johannes appears to gain in calmness in the face of her immediate departure, whereas Anna becomes more and more unsettled. She is still afraid that they can founder on each other, despite the fact that she has instilled some final, hopeful confidence into Johannes: as she gives him her mother's ring, as a token of their mutual loyalty to the ideal, she does so 'mit Überwindung, bleich und rot werdend, zuweilen verlegen, immer tief bewegt'. Clearly the ideal which has now become a source of comfort for Johannes is no comfort at all for her in her present predicament. The doubt permeates through to Johannes; he wonders whether he can bear not seeing her again, where Anna's view is much more precise: 'Wenn wir uns wieder-sehn, haben wir uns verloren.' About to leave, she states concisely the true conflict of the drama, namely the individual's struggle against powers greater than him: 'Was uns nicht niederwirft, das macht uns stärker. (Sie will gehen)' Johannes recalls her with a cry of 'Anna! Schwester', the first time he has called her by anything but the more formal Fräulein Anna and the first time he has called her sister, which after all is in keeping with the ideal they have proclaimed. Johannes now lives up to this ideal, where it comes to the parting kiss, or at least he intends to to the very last moment, whereas at this point Anna fails to do so and reveals unmistakably to Johannes her true feelings towards him:

'Johannes: Anna! Schwester.

Fräulein Anna: (immer unter Tränen) Bruder Johannes.

Johannes: Soll ein Bruder seine Schwester nicht küssen dürfen, bevor sie sich trennen, auf ewig?

Fräulein Anna: Hannes, nein.

Johannes: Ja, Anna! ja, ja! (Er umschlingt sie, und beider Lippen finden sich in einem einzigen, langen, inbrünstigen Kusse, dann reisst Anna sich los und verschwindet. Ab über die Veranda.)

(Johannes steht einen Augenblick wie betäubt, dann geht er mit grossen Schritten umher, fährt sich durch die Haare, seufzt, seufzt stärker, bleibt stehen, lauscht . . .)'

The moment of the kiss and Johannes's reaction to it is the moment when the guarantor for his ideal ceases to exist either *in absentia* or *in corpore*, for she has now irrevocably given herself away and therewith confirmed Johannes's significance to himself as being a non-identifiable 'verlorenes Nichts an Kleinheit'.⁹ This is the nature of the personal tragedy for Johannes, but on the philosophical plane *Einsame Menschen* shares Bölsche's and Darwin's view that scientific determinism and aesthetic idealism are not in principle opposed to each other. Four years before the première of the play, Bölsche unwittingly indicated the function of Johannes's idealism:

'Das Ideale, von dem wir nach Vernichtung so vieler Illusionen noch zu reden wagen, liegt nicht hinter uns wie das Paradies der Christen, nicht nach unserer individuellen Existenz in einer persönlichen Fortdauer im Sinne der Jünger Mohammeds, nicht ganz ausserhalb des praktischen Lebens in den Träumen des Genies, des Poeten: es liegt vor uns in der Weise, dass wir selbst unablässig danach streben und in diesem Streben zugleich das Wohl unserer Nachkommen die Erfüllung derselben im Ideale anbahnen helfen. Das soll uns die Dichtung zeigen.'¹²

NOTES

¹ F. W. J. Heuser, *Gerhart Hauptmann*, Tübingen, 1961. I, 7 ff. XII, 247 f.

² *Literarische Manifeste des Naturalismus 1880-1892* ed. E. Ruprecht. Stuttgart, 1962. pp. 85 ff, 103 ff. Heuser op. cit., p. 23.

³ N. E. Alexander, *Studien zum Stilwandel im dramatischen Werk Gerhart Hauptmanns*. Stuttgart, 1964. p. 45.

⁴ op. cit., p. 143, fn.

⁵ *Einsame Menschen* ed. C. Jolles. London, 1962. p. 85 ff.

⁶ cf. W. Bölsche, *Charles Darwin und die moderne Ästhetik* (... 'die scheinbar so selbstlose Idealwelt' ...) Ruprecht op. cit., p. 103.

⁷ Evidence of her deep affection for Johannes occurs frequently in Act III, which was omitted at the première in the 'Deutsches Theater' in Berlin, 1891. Jolles op. cit., xviii.

⁸ op. cit., p. 59.

⁹ Quoted in Heuser, op. cit., p. 8 ff.

¹⁰ GW.17, 384 f. *Ausgabe letzter Hand*, 1942. Quoted by Alexander p. 36 f.

¹¹ Jolles op. cit., p. 104 ff.

¹² Ruprecht op. cit., p. 103.