Arnold Heidsieck

On Judaism, Christianity, Anti-Semitism in Kafka's *The Castle,* his Letters and Diaries

[*Abstract*: In his writings Kafka scrutinized, encouraged by his friend Max Brod, the early 20th-century German-speaking disputes on the ancient Jewish origins of Christianity and attempted an explication of the Christian-Germanic ideology of anti-Semitism.]

The rural customs, the monoethnic communal cohesiveness, and the feudal-administrative paternalism portrayed in *The Castle* could very well represent a remote Central or Eastern European backwoods region before the turn of the century. Most characters display unenlightened beliefs, ignorance of legal basics, passive, even submissive civic attitudes — all remnants of a feudal-authoritarian tradition. Other features, however, — a sent-for foreign professional, widespread ideological (postreligious) prejudice, a well-organized civil service, airtight administrative procedures — suggest that this community could be connected to an ethnically diverse, centrally governed early modern state such as Austria-Hungary at the turn of the century. The novel also employs an array of religious, ethnic, and legal motifs — the ancient strife between Judaism and nascent Christianity, the competing cultural anthropological assumptions underlying Jewish assimilation and Zionism, and the Jews' threatened legal equality within the German-speaking, increasingly anti-Semitic environment. These motifs capture the individual anxieties and the collective paranoia of a community threatened by the social and political transition to modernity.

Compared to Karl Roßmann and even to Josef K., K. in *The Castle* deals with less tractable problems and faces more baffling explanations. On the night of his arrival in the village the castle administration appoints him land surveyor. It apparently believes that K. is the person who, as he himself claims, previously had been offered the job and whose arrival it has been expecting. The mayor maintains that K. had been made the offer due to a partly erroneous, partly well-considered administrative decision but also that it can no longer be ascertained whether the letter of appointment had been sent or not. It turns out later that K. was well informed about the castle before his arrival.[1]

[1]S 10; C 7. S 60; C 78. S 62; C 80. S 69; C 89. S 73; C 95. S 177; C 241. Contrary to this textual evidence Beda Allemann argues that K. could not have been hired before his actual arrival (“Scheinbare Leere: Zur thematischen

Two divergent — religious and sociohistorical — allusions illuminate Kafka's reasons for making K. a land surveyor. The first is the more important, as it brings out a hidden ethnic-ideological dynamics in the village. In Hebrew the word for surveyor closely resembles *Messiah*, and, thus, the figure of K. may be seen to reflect Jewish Messianism — an oppressed minority's periodically recurring hope for divine political intervention. Many of the village inhabitants appear to expect great things from K.s arrival, but his persistent outsider status and occasional fumbling make it clear that their hopes are misplaced. Second, Kafka had read about corrupt land surveyors in nineteenth-century Russia whose surveying activities struck the fear in many peasants that they would be cheated out of their lands.[2] In that vein, and perhaps also due to their antimodern beliefs, the tanner Lasemann and the mayor look at K.s surveyor role with suspicion; they see no need for him in this village.

Upon learning of his appointment as surveyor, K., in a rush of thoughts, concludes that the castle is well informed about him and perceives him as an aggressor and that, due to the official appointment, he has greater freedom to maneuver than he could have hoped for. He intends to fight and considers the mere pursuit of his self-interest as an attack on the castle. His assessment may be based on the assumption that a newcomer to this tightly knit community will necessarily fare badly. K. wants to get ahead socially — or at least desires a home, a position, a wife, and membership in the community — but, paradoxically, also believes that he has come here not to lead an honored and trouble-free life. As he becomes more frustrated, he decides to win by any means possible, including lies and cunning. Whatever his quest, he comes to identify its success with meeting Klamm, the highest castle official, face to face, either to talk to him about Frieda, to talk to him as a private person, to let him know his, K.'s, wishes, to explain the actual work he is doing for the village, to seek reconciliation with him, or to justify to him his actions up till now. At one point K. defiantly waits for Klamm in the official inn's courtyard, which is supposed to be off limits to him. Though he

---

Struktur von Kafkas *Schloß*-Roman," *Mélanges offerts à Claude David,* ed. Jean-Louis Bandet [Bern: Lang, 1986] 17, 28).

[2] W. G. Sebald, "The Law of Ignominy: Authority, Messianism and Exile in *The Castle*," *On Kafka,* ed. Kuna, 42–58. S 29; C 34. S 145; C 197. S 216–17; C 294–95. S 273; C 377. Robertson stresses the novel's allusions to the historical critique of Messianism and unmasking of Messianic pretenders within Judaism (*Kafka* 228–35). S 17; C 17–18. S 60-72; C 77–94. See Axel Dornemann, *Im Labyrinth der Bürokratie: Tolstois "Auferstehung" und Kafkas "Das Schloß"* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1984) 102.

knows that his wait will be in vain, his defiance gives him a gratuitous sense of freedom and invulnerability.[3]

After this incident both Gardena, the landlady of the Bridge Inn, and Klamm's village secretary, Momus, tell him that a meeting with Klamm is completely unattainable, that his pursuit is futile, his hope empty. This news can only fortify K.'s sense of an epistemic, and possibly ontological, gap separating him from the castle. For instance, the mayor had claimed that, despite the appointment letter from Klamm and K.'s telephone call to the castle, K. has not come into contact with any real authorities. K. is also told that Klamm never speaks to anybody in the village and nobody in the village can ever speak to Klamm. Even worse, it is said that Klamm never reads the reports his secretaries file about the village, and K. has it firsthand that Klamm is completely misinformed about K.'s current employment. To K., Klamm appears like an eagle who draws his incomprehensible circles high above, although presumably he observes the world below with a downward-pressing, penetrating gaze. K., on the other hand, is compared to a blind-worm who does not understand what is going on. Olga claims that the villagers never understand fully the smallest matters concerning themselves in relation to the castle, and never would, even if they took a lifetime trying to do so.[4]

After K.'s failed attempt to meet and communicate with Klamm in the courtyard, his further attempts become somewhat delusional. He believes that the village officials are interfering with his access to the castle. His talk with the boy Hans Brunswick raises hopes in him that he can no longer forget but that are, admittedly, completely groundless. He absurdly believes that a surreptitious meeting with the boy's mother could open a way to Klamm. He recalls a recent message to Klamm "word for word, not however as he had given it to Barnabas, but as he thought it would sound before Klamm." K.'s attitudes and actions toward villagers and officials range from interest in economic security and membership in the community to arrogance, legally improper behavior, lying, and gross

[3] S 10; C 7–8. S 58–59; C 74–75. S 40–41; C 50. S 154; C 210. S 190; C 258. S 147; C 200. S 159; C 217 ("all the guile of which he was capable"). K.'s aims: S 49; C 62. S 154; C 209. S 51; C 65. S 84; C 112. S 107 ("mit seinen … Wünschen an Klamm herankam"); C 145. S 115–16; C 155–56. S 151; C S 163; S 103. The inconsistency of some of these aims is discussed by Richard Sheppard (*On Kafka's "The Castle": A Study* [London: Croom Helm, 1973] 140–47).

[4] S 109–11; C 148–51. S 72; C 93. S 50; C 64. S 49; C 62. S 111; C 151. S 114–5; C 154. S 112; C 151. S 56; C 72. S 205; C 279. Henry Sussman sees an ontological difference of realms: K.'s presence "is literally the condition for Klamm's absence and vice versa"; "Klamm cannot be met because he embodies the condition of absence itself" (*Franz Kafka: Geometrician of Metaphor* [Madison: Coda, 1979] 118, 131).

opportunism. For instance, he trespasses by climbing into Klamm's sleigh and seeks admittance to the Brunswick household under false pretenses. He lies to gain Hans's trust and pretends to share Frieda's antipathy toward the Barnabas family. Above all, it appears that he gets involved with Frieda largely because of her intimate relation with Klamm.[5] Yet despite these questionable character traits K. achieves, for the reader, independent moral authority by analyzing the castle's illegal conduct and insisting on individual rights denied him and others by the village and castle administrations. Initially, K. believes that the castle is lenient with him, letting him slip through at his own discretion, and he even suggests at one point that this bureaucracy might be legally and morally acceptable. But Olga's tales point him to the castle's arbitrary and immoral power. With the villagers' consent, she and her whole family are being punished for Amalie's refusal to respond to an official's obscenely worded request to share his bed as well as for her alleged insult to his messenger. K. describes this summons to Amalie as an abuse of power, a crime, a crying injustice.[6]

In many ways the castle functions like a secret court system: the officials decide and carry out policies that are conceived as stipulations of law; they lean on their law books, try to serve the law, and know the clandestine ways of law. Many decisions are arrived at arbitrarily and remain secret; even legal actions such as an official indictment can be kept hidden for some time. Amalie's father has been unable to prove that the family has been indicted or is being blackballed by the castle for his daughter's noncompliance: "Before he could be forgiven he had to prove his guilt, and that was denied in all the departments." The sanctions against them are as elusive and reiterative as the admissions procedure to the castle service is for someone who has fallen out of official favor: "for years he waits in fear and trembling for the result … then after years and years, perhaps as an old man, he learns that he has been rejected, learns that everything is lost and that all his life has been in vain." Whereas in *The Trial* it was never resolved whether Josef K.'s past or present behavior was on trial, here, evidently, K.'s current rather than past conduct matters to the officials. The landlady, Gardena, tells K. that she went to see Klamm's secretary, Momus: "I have come here to Herr Momus … to give the office an adequate idea of your behavior and your intentions."[7] Echoing legal

---

[5] S 144; C 195. S 146; C 199. S 154; C 210. C 162; S 121. S 100; C 133–34. S 151; C 206. S 141–42; C 191. S 235; C 321. S 132; C 179. S 151–52; C 206.

[6] S 74; C 96 (I want "my rights"); K.'s insistence on such rights is argued by Richard J. Arneson ("Power and Authority in *The Castle*," *Mosaic* 12 [1979]: 99–113). S 58; C 74–75. S 175–76; C 239 ("fear of the authorities is born in you here"). S 184; C 251 ("abuse of power"). S 186; C 253 ("Sortini's criminal actions"). S 189; C 257 ("crying injustice").

[7] S 212 ("sie müssen sich sehr fest an die Gesetzbücher halten"); C 288. S 248; C 340. S 251; C 345. S 68; C 88. S 166;

positivism, Secretary Bürgel construes the bureaucrats' ruthlessness in dealing with the villagers as a kind of rigid impartiality, as consideration in the petitioner's favor. Actually, official goodwill is a mere facade, since the aim always is to disadvantage the petitioners, to render their demands futile. When Frieda, having left K., returns to her former job as a bartender and, concurrently, the castle orders K. to return Frieda to this job, the coincidence of these causally unrelated events drives home to him that orders from the castle, no matter whether favorable or unfavorable, are issued without any regard for the individual concerned. This bureaucracy never acknowledges any errors and, ultimately, shows no gaps in its total system.[8]

Many episodes in the novel are linked metaphorically to important events in the Hebrew Bible and especially to the New Testament. K.'s first lovemaking with Frieda is described in ways similar to the biblical account of the Fall. Although K. experiences it as the breathing of air so unfamiliar that it becomes suffocating, he soon shares Frieda's view of their sexual union as providential. K.'s arrival in the village alludes beyond the mere Messianic to the birth of the Messiah-Christ: K. was "at the very first hour of his arrival … quite helpless on his sack of straw … at the mercy of any official action." During his visits at the castle offices Barnabas has doubts, similar to the Apostle Thomas's doubts about the Resurrection, about the true identity of the official who is designated as Klamm: "it's a matter of life and death for Barnabas whether it's really Klamm he speaks to or not".[9]

The allusions to Christ hint at a more extensive network of New Testament references: issues and attitudes addressed by the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians. They are connected to those of the novel's events and concepts that define criteria for social inclusion and exclusion, accepted and unacceptable behavior, the notions of cleanliness and dirtiness. More specifically, they refer to disputes between Jews and the earliest Christians over the meaning of the Messiah and

---

C 226–27. C 275–77 ("Since he had failed in proving his guilt"); S 203–4. C 287–88; S 211–12; other entry procedures are postponed indefinitely and broken off at the applicant's death; the Austrian code stipulated that a criminal trial cannot be continued or appealed after the defendant's death: "The ability to be party to a trial expires with the defendant's death …. Against a dead person you cannot start a criminal trial nor continue it on the initial or appeals level" (Lohsing, *Strafprozeß* 197). C 146; S 108.

[8] S 247; C 338. S 248; C 340. S 253; C 348 ("futile demands"). S 258; C 355. S 65; S 250; C 343 ("the foolproofness of the official organization"); S 253; C 347 ("the incomparable sieve"). Kafka himself is aware of bureaucracy's absurd unresponsiveness to human needs (B 377; L 327). He also echoes contemporary critical analyses of bureaucratic power (see Dornemann, *Im Labyrinth der Bürokratie* 106–57).

[9] S 43–44; C 54 (see also Hulda Göhler, *Franz Kafka: "Das Schloß." "Ansturm gegen die Grenze": Entwurf einer Deutung* [Bonn: Bouvier & Grundmann, 1982] 90–91). K. fears suffocation: breathable air is one of Kafka's metaphors for desire beyond sexuality: T 348, 353, 357; D 2: 206, 215, 220). S 52 ("gesegnet, nicht verflucht sei die Stunde"); C 67. C 216; S 158. S 168; C 229. Cf. John 20:25–29. C 231; S 170.

definitions of religious group membership, communal rules, and ritual law — and then show modern anti-Semitism's expropriation of these definitions. A castle official who occasionally acts as Klamm's deputy is called Galater (the German word for *Galatians*). The messenger who carries letters and oral messages between K. and the castle is named after the Apostle Barnabas, who, together with Paul, founded the Christian congregations in Galatia. The Hebrew name Barnabas means son of consolation; Klamm's second letter promises K. consolation. K., however, rejects this letter because it reveals Klamm's ignorance about K.'s situation. Paul's epistle urges the replacement of the Torah with the faith in Christ; it lashes out against Jewish-Christian missionaries in Galatia who insist that gentiles must adopt circumcision and obedience to the Jewish law as preconditions for their Christian faith.[10] He points out that the Apostle Peter acted with duplicity when he shared meals with his gentile-Christian brothers but broke off table fellowship with them when members of the Jerusalem congregation were present. Paul accuses Barnabas, a born Jew, of the same hypocrisy. His point is that many Christian Jews do not yet fully accept his belief that faith in the redeeming significance of Christ's death invalidates all of the Torah.[11] After the turn of the century, in the wake of pioneering philological and archaeological research into the origins of the New Testament writings, Jewish and Christian theologians engaged in debates over the continued role of Jewish law and faith for Christianity. For the Christian side, as seen by a present-day scholar, Paul's break with Judaism was "his argument that the covenant *skips* from Abraham to Christ, and now includes those in Christ, but not Jews by descent." "What is wrong with the law, and thus with Judaism, is that it does not provide for God's ultimate purpose, that of saving the entire world through faith in Christ."[12] On the Jewish side, the orthodox-nationalist and liberal-assimilationist theologians

---

[10] Acts 4:36. S 115–16 ("seien Sie getrost"); C 154. Consolation alludes to both the Jews' Messianic hope and the Christian gospel. When Klamm calls out for Frieda (he sounds like God calling Adam after the Fall), K. experiences the interruption of his lovemaking (the Fall) as a "tröstliches Aufdämmern," a glimmer of consolation (S 44, C 54). Paul thinks that the Jewish-Christian preachers have bewitched the Galatians (Gal. 3:1). Analogously, K. notices that he is being bewitched by Barnabas (S 34; C 40), that Frieda is bewitched by the assistants (S 239; C 328).

[11] Gal. 2:12–13; 2:16. See the conceptual similarity of Kafka's wish at a sanitarium, ostensibly because of his vegetarian food, to be served separately: "I asked to be served at a separate little table in the common dining room" (L 233; B 270). Kafka apparently knew the anti-Jewish *Letter of Barnabas* (included in an early version of the New Testament canon), which admonishes Christians to read the Jewish dietary laws spiritually and allegorically (Barnabas 10:1–10; cf. John 6:26–27). Two of the novel's passages satirize the desire to mistake linguistic meanings for foodstuffs: "He licked his lips as if news were [a nourishment]" (C 33; S 29). "Wenn Sie nur nicht immer … wie ein Kind alles gleich in eßbarer Form dargeboten haben wollten!" (S 111; C 150).

[12] E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (London: SCM Press, 1985) 207, 47. For the then available knowledge of Paul's life and his writing of the epistles see Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1900).

perceived the ancient strife between the Jews, the Jewish Christians, and Paul differently. The former tried to show that everything Jesus and the earliest Christians taught can be traced to the Hebrew Bible and its rabbinical interpretations.[13] The latter diminished the differences between the particularist, nationalist Jewish law and the universalist Christian gospel (or its alleged philosophical successors). For instance, Ignaz Ziegler reinterprets the Talmud in the tradition of German Idealist philosophy, seeing it as an ethical guide for any individual to raise himself or herself up to God. This position was a departure from his orthodox insistence, only five years earlier, on the irreducible significance of Jewish law, arguing that if the Jews had gone along with Paul and abandoned circumcision and the dietary laws Christian monotheism would have succumbed to Christian paganism. Even so, instead of making the Jewish faith universal (Christian), Paul made it merely Greco-Roman, replacing monotheism with the Trinity.[14] For Moriz Friedländer, Judaism does not have to fall back on the continuing importance of the Jewish law, let alone Idealist-universalist ethics. He radically historicizes the Christian critique of Talmudic Judaism: Paul's opposition to the law merely continues the non-Talmudic moral, spiritual, and universalist reading of the Torah favored by Jews of the Greek-speaking diaspora before and during the life of Jesus. Paul's mission to convert gentiles to Christianity grows out of the Hellenistic Judaic faith that dismissed the ritual meaning of the Torah and gave religious equality to all converted gentiles. Jesus himself taught a Hellenistic (antipharisaic) spiritual law, addressing it not to a nation but each individual.[15]

Kafka's religious views at first are close to such Judaic-universalist reinterpretations of the Torah. In 1916, pointing to upbringing, inclination, and environment, he professes his indifference to the Talmudic faith and ritual observance.[16] He begins to acknowledge, however, that within a

[13] Joseph Eschelbacher, for instance, argues that no Hellenistic Jew would have dismissed the Torah. Thus, the Apostle Paul's so-called epistles are falsely attributed to him; they issue from a much later (second-century) pagan Christianity: *Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums: Vergleichende Studien* (Berlin: Poppelauer, 1908) 143–46.

[14] Ignaz Ziegler, *Die Geistesreligion und das jüdische Religionsgesetz: Ein Beitrag zur Erneuerung des Judentums* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912) 82, 99. Kafka owned this book. Ziegler, *Der Kampf zwischen Judentum und Christentum in den ersten drei christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Berlin: Poppelauer, 1907) 73–75, 53, 78. This historical assessment is similar to the Zionist insistence on the Jews' separate cultural and religious identity, such as Jakob Klatzkin's (see notes 22, 24, 29).

[15] Moriz Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu* (Berlin: Reimer, 1905) viii–xiii, 4–21. Kafka owned this book also. Friedländer has been called an "irreconcilable adversary of pharisaic Judaism" and "antirabbinical" (Gösta Lindeskog, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* [Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1938] 149, 156).

[16] See F 700; FE 502–3. On the other hand, Kafka would not subscribe to Paul's substitution of the Torah with Abraham's "Christian" faith (Gal. 3:16). Abraham cannot have faith since he has no way of knowing that it is he who is

Christian (often anti-Semitic) environment Jews advert to religious and even ritual differences as a means of maintaining their identity. His 1917 story "Jackals and Arabs" portrays the irreconcilable hatred between jackals (Jews) and Arabs (non-Jews) in terms of their oppositional use or expropriation of a core element of Judaism, the Talmudic dietary and purity laws. The jackals consider themselves clean while labeling the Arabs unclean. They feed on the carcasses of camels under the pretense that they have to rid the world of them.[17] In turn, the Arabs barely tolerate the jackals as useful but unclean (carcass-eating) parasites. The story furthermore alludes to Jewish Messianism and the anti-Semitic propaganda about Jewish ritual murders of gentiles: for ages the jackals have been waiting for someone to help them cut the Arabs' throats and take their blood.[18]

As suggested earlier, Kafka employs cleanliness and dirtiness as value concepts with regard to literary and sexual matters. In his letters to Milena from 1920 he attributes impurity to himself as a westernized Jew, largely based on his existential self-doubt and feeling of sexual insufficiency. Less personally motivated, however, he derives this self-ascribed quality from both the Zionist critique of the assimilated western Jew and the Austrian cultural anti-Semitism. According to these two structurally similar views, assimilation and urbanization have estranged the Jews from their historical and national roots and made them culturally degenerate.[19] Kafka's self-criticism as a Jew and experience of anti-Semitism gradually suggest to him what will become an important subplot of *The Castle*: concepts of ethnic difference such as impurity can be used as instruments of social exclusion.[20] At

---

called upon ("[kann nicht glauben,] daß er gemeint ist" - B 333; L 285).

[17] E 132–35; CS 407–11. Jens Tismar shows that many German writers portrayed (originating with Jer. 9:10) the Jews as jackals ("Kafkas *Schakale und Araber* im zionistischen Kontext betrachtet," *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 19 [1975]: 306–23). He and Robertson (*Kafka* 164) see the jackals as referring to the westernized Jews whom the Zionists painted as parasitical. They can also be seen, however, as orthodox eastern Jews who cannot, due to their exile, keep all ritual laws and who thus see themselves as unclean (see Helen Milful, "*Weder Katze noch Lamm?* Franz Kafkas Kritik des *Westjüdischen*," *Im Zeichen Hiobs: Jüdische Schriftsteller und deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Gunter Grimm and Hans-Peter Bayerdörfer [Königstein: Athenäum, 1985] 184–86). About the Arabs representing all non-Jews cf. Gen. 16:10; about the uncleanliness of camels cf. Lev. 11:4; 17:10.

[18] Kafka knew about the charges of ritual murder against the Jews (M 68; MI 51). In his diary of a trip to Egypt, Flaubert describes Arabs around a campfire in the presence of jackals (Gustave Flaubert, "Tagebuch des jungen Flaubert," *Pan* 1 [1910–11] 187). Flaubert appears to have served as a model for Kafka's emotionally removed European narrator.

[19] For the Zionists' (e.g. Martin Buber's) critique of the westernized Jew see Robertson, *Kafka* 146, 161–65. *Cultural* anti-Semitism refers here to the culturally (not politically) motivated polemics against Jews by conservative (antiliberal, antimodernist) journals such as *Der Brenner*. Kafka was a reader of this journal and owned several issues.

[20] M 294; MI 217–18 ("I'm the most Western-Jewish of them all … everything must be earned, not only the present and the future, but the past as well. If the Earth turns to the right … then I would have to turn to the left to make up for the past"). M 25 (the western Jew as problematic marital partner for a "clean" Christian woman); MI 19. Kafka does not attribute impurity to all assimilated Jews. For example, the courage, independence, and truthfulness of his sister Ottla or Ernst Polak merit the description *clean* (F 730; FE 525. M 47; MI 36). He was alarmed and warned by personal

the same time, despite his increasing national self-assertion as a Jew[21] and doubts about Jewish-German assimilation he retains a strong sense of belonging within the Western cultural and ethical tradition. For instance, he is unconvinced by his friend Max Brod's oppositional construction of Judaism and Christianity and his religious critique of non-Jewish German culture in his *Paganism, Christianity, Judaism*. Brod boldly declares that Christian theologians merely allege the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, that it is conceptually inferior to Judaism. Somehow at odds with the Jewish-nationalist stance against diluting Judaism down to a universal ethical idea or spiritual identity,[22] Brod claims that Judaism is the more universalist, Christianity the more particularist religion. The former gives open individual access to God, the latter allows one way only, mediation through Christ, excluding all non-Christians. In contrast to the alleged Christian universalism, Jewish universalism preserves and tolerates national distinctions. Brod uses Kafka's parable "Before the Law" — about the door to the law that, against all appearances, is meant for one person only — to illustrate that God reveals his grace to the chosen individual unconditionally, without mediation.[23] To assert a modern Jewish identity completely divorced from Christianity, Brod argues that in antiquity a mutual exclusion of Judaism and Hellenic paganism existed that has continued into the present. Greek religion and culture, concerned exclusively with the visible world, eschewed anything that might transcend it. During the war Brod taught ancient literature to Jewish teenagers, refugees from Galicia, and found them unable to take the Homeric gods seriously in the slightest.[24] Kafka finds his friend's appraisal of the Hellenic tradition inconsistent. In light of Brod's repeated celebrations of existential and sexual joy in his letters and in this book, Kafka even suggests that next to Judaism Brod's spiritual home is paganism. He himself strongly sympathizes with the

---

encounters with anti-Semites (M 26, 288; MI 20, 213. B 275, 298; L 237, 256) and (see below) the increasing groundswell of anti-Semitism in the Austrian press (B 273; L 235–36).

[21] Starting with his interest in the Yiddish theater in 1911 and then especially since 1915 (Binder, in *Kafka-Handbuch* 1: 390–95, 468–72, 499–510. Robertson, *Kafka* 12–37, 141–84).

[22] See Jakob Klatzkin, "Grundlagen des Nationaljudentums. Erstes Kapitel: Irrwege des nationalen Instinkts," *Der Jude* 1 (1916–17): 534–36. Max Brod, *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum: Ein Bekenntnisbuch,* 2 vols. (Munich: Wolff, 1921) 2: 66–159 ("Die falsche Grundkonstruktion des Christentums"), 2: 160–232.

[23]Brod, *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum* 1: 242–4; to fight off Paul's gospel and to preserve their national identity, however, the Jews initially had to exercise a narrow ritual observance (2: 132, 204). 2: 71–72; Brod ignores the parable's paradoxical appearance of promise, and ultimate denial, of legal absolution.

[24]Brod, *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum* 2: 258–73 ("Vom Heidentum einst und immer"). Brod's claim of "Unvermischbarkeit" [the inability to mix (2: 263)] echoes Jakob Klatzkin's critique ("Deutschtum und Judentum," *Der Jude* 2 (1917–18): 246–50) of Hermann Cohen's booklet *Deutschtum und Judentum* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1915) which insisted on important links between Judaism and Hellenism (5–11). Brod, *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum* 2: 263.

Hellenic religion since it concedes to the individual the possibility of happiness in the everyday world without his needing to strive for the divine. Above all else, Kafka remains unconvinced of Brod's plea for cultural segregation of Jews from Germans based on the differences between the Judaic and the Christian faiths.[25]

Several months into the writing of *The Castle*, Kafka took a serious interest in Hans Blüher's just-published *Secessio Judaica*. It claims that both Zionism and German anti-Semitism are comparable expressions of the Jews' eventual and unavoidable racial segregation from the German people. No one can be both German and Jewish; the two races are opposed to each other. Through Darwinian adaptation and mimicry the Jews vainly try to blend in with their German hosts. Intermarriage is against the Germanic blood law; Jewish blood, sexual attitudes, and economic outlook are unclean. The complete secession of the Jews from the Germans, the unmasking of their mimicry, has begun and is irreversible.[26] Beneath the book's seeming objectivity Kafka suspects in Blüher an "enemy of the Jews."[27] And yet, somewhat taken in by the philosophically dressed racist speculations, Kafka does not think him a traditional anti-Semite but someone who points up insurmountable ethnic differences. To him Blüher's employment of segregationist vocabulary approximates certain aspects of Jewish religious and national thought. His suggestion that a critique of Blüher should be undertaken by a Talmudist and "after the fashion of the Jews" illustrates, like "Jackals and Arabs" and *The Castle*, his understanding of how firmly ethnic and cultural value

[25] B 279; L 242 (7 Aug. 1920). Cf. Brod's "Von allen Boten Gottes spricht Eros am eindringlichsten. Er reißt den Menschen am schnellsten vor das Angesicht der Herrlichkeit Gottes" ["Of all of God's messengers eros speaks most forcibly. It snatches man most quickly before the face of God's glory"] (Brod, *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum* 1: 34).

[26] Hans Blüher, *Secessio Judaica: Philosophische Grundlegung der historischen Situation des Judentums und der antisemitischen Bewegung* (Berlin: Der Weiße Ritter, 1922) 15–16, 37–38, 42–43, 63–64. The book exploits Hegelianism ("law of pure history"; the *idea* of a people), claims that the Jews have lost their "historical substance" (are sick as a people and as individuals) from early on because they were fated to produce Christ from their midst, kill and reject him (19–20); cf. also Blüher, *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth: Philosophische Grundlegung der Lehre und Erscheinung Christi* (Prien: Kampmann, 1921) 304–6. *Secessio Judaica* has been placed squarely within the increasing anti-Semitism in the political parties on the far right as well as the professional and trade associations in Germany during and after the First World War (Werner Jochmann, *Gesellschaftskrise und Judenfeindschaft in Deutschland 1870–1945* [Hamburg: Christians, 1988] 149, 152, 168).

[27] "Judenfeind" (T 363–64; D 2: 231). Blüher insisted that his anti-Semitism was objective, without ill will against individual Jews. As late as 1933 the Jewish assimilationist critic — and, with Brod, editor of the first edition of unpublished Kafka stories *Beim Bau der chinesischen Mauer* (1931) — Hans-Joachim Schoeps labeled the book *judengegnerisch* (antagonistic towards the Jews) as distinct from anti-Semitic (Hans Blüher and H. J. Schoeps, *Streit um Israel: Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch* [Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1933] 7).

differences and exclusions are based on religious concepts.[28] He eventually recognizes a certain facile prejudice in Blüher's thesis when he recalls it upon browsing in a chauvinist German literary history by Friedrich von der Leyen. This work claims that even mediocre German (non-Jewish) writers are distinguished by their being rooted in their respective Germanic tribal traditions and regions, a distinction Jewish authors (such as Jakob Wassermann) can only strive for in vain. "And even if Wassermann should rise at four in the morning day after day and his whole life long plow up the Nuremberg region from end to end, the land would still not respond to him and he would have to take pretty whisperings in the air for its response." Despite the scorn Kafka pours over this blood and soil presumption, he himself previously had adopted a self-critically segregationist stance with regard to the most important aspect of his life — literature. He suggested that Jewish-German writers such as himself appropriate somebody else's possessions, perform a mimicry of German language and literature.[29] Blüher's call for radical segregation appears to confirm Kafka's feeling that Jewish assimilation to German culture is doomed, hopelessly nonreciprocal.[30]

Kafka incorporates motifs from the Epistle to the Galatians into *The Castle* almost from the beginning. As the new critical edition shows, the author introduces the castle messenger by titling

[28] B 380; L 330 (30 June 1922); the Zionists stressed cultural and religious segregation: cf. Richard Lichtheim, *Das Programm des Zionismus* (Berlin: Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland, 1913) 14–16, 33 [Kafka owned this book]; Jakob Klatzkin, "Grundlagen des Nationaljudentums," 610, 613; Felix Weltsch, *Nationalismus und Judentum* (Berlin: Welt-Verlag, 1920). For Arnold Zweig all modern nations engage in mutual rejection ("Abstoßung"); Zionism merely reciprocates and duplicates the anti-Semitic rejection of all (even assimilated) Jews by their host nations ("Der heutige deutsche Antisemitismus," *Der Jude* 5 [1920–21]: 373, 629); he did not construe Blüher's rejection of Jews as anti-Semitic (6 [1921–22]: 142). The fact that Kafka refers to Brod's *Heidentum, Christentum, Judentum* when speaking of the fateful assassination of the German foreign secretary Walther Rathenau by anti-Semites suggests that he has become more aware of how the perception of religious differences between Germans and Jews can be perverted into racial exclusion and rejection.

[29] B 400; L 346–47 (von der Leyen's book as an "accompanying music to the *Secessio Judaica.*"); B 336–68; L 287–89 (the German spoken by many Jews is an "appropriation of someone else's property … it remains someone else's property, even though there is no evidence of a single solecism").

[30] B 479; L 410 (Jewishness within German culture as an "incurable" affliction). Two years earlier he felt that through their accelerating modernist influence on traditional German culture the Jews had helped to create anti-Semitism (B 274; L 236). In direct response to *Secessio Judaica* Felix Weltsch argued, in a letter to Hugo Bergmann, that anti-Semitism is caused by the Jews' disproportionate influence on German society, and, thus (from his Zionist perspective), rejection by the Germans is understandable, segregation desirable (*Max Brod: Ein Gedenkbuch 1884–1968*, ed. Hugo Gold [Tel-Aviv: Olamenu, 1969] 102). In an obituary for Walther Rathenau in *Selbstwehr* Weltsch wrote that the assimilationist Jews never received reciprocating love ("Gegenliebe") from the Germans (quoted by Hartmut Binder, "Franz Kafka und die Wochenschrift *Selbstwehr*," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte* 41 [1967]: 294).

the second chapter "Barnabas."[31] Through the figure of Barnabas the missionary role of the historical Barnabas, his wavering between adherence to the Judaic law and faith in Christ, becomes a symbol for K.'s crossing of quasi-ethnic borders and for the Barnabas family's outsider status within their own society. The foreigner K. suspects that the family must have committed some sin to be so despised by Gardena, the proprietress of the Bridge. At this point her reservations about the family look like an exclusion on moral or religious grounds — like an orthodox sanction against mixing with gentiles, a Christian ban on dealing with infidels. Chapter 16 suggests[32] that Olga views her brother's castle service in the light of the Messianic hope that underlies both Judaism and the gospel. She sees Barnabas "entrusted with relatively important letters, even with orally delivered messages." She cautions K., however, not to take the Messianic meaning of her brother's service too literally, so as not to "pin too many hopes on him and suffer disappointment"; it may yet turn out to be a "completely vain hope." K.'s request that Barnabas deliver his messages without delays conflicts with the castle's views of what his service requires. According to Olga, despite his doubts Barnabas must pretend to K. that his messenger role is officially approved. If he were to express doubts about its legitimacy, it would mean "to undermine his very existence and to violate grossly laws that he believes himself still bound by." Furthermore, Barnabas dares not ask the officials at the castle what goes on there "for fear of offending in ignorance against some unknown rule."[33] All three remarks echo the Christian Jews' attempts to reverse Paul's dismissal of the Jewish law, as well as his scorn for his fellow apostles' (Peter's, Barnabas's) backsliding.

At this point in chapter 16 (CHar) Kafka composed (and immediately crossed out) a long speech by Olga that reveals the delusional and prejudicial — in fact, anti-Semitic — nature of the villagers' reservations about her family. He appears to have written it under the direct impact of *Secessio*

[31]According to Malcolm Pasley (SKA 2: 81, 88), editor of the critical edition of *Das Schloss*, the title "Barnabas" appears to have been conceived together with the first chapter's title "Ankunft" ("Arrival" [a Messianic notion]). S 55; C 70–71. The recent translation by Mark Harman (Schocken Books, 1998) [= CHar] follows Pasley's chapter count.

[32] Chapter 16 (CHar) was written before Kafka's departure for Planá on June 23, 1922 (see Pasley, SKA 2: 68). It is identical with the first part of a very extensive chapter 15 in the long-standing standard translation (*Schocken Kafka Library*, 1982 [1946]) [= C] -- on which all *Castle* quotes in the present essay are based.

[33] C 226; S 166. C 229; S 168. C 234; S 172. The fact that Barnabas is not permitted to pass certain barriers in the castle offices (S 168; C 228–29) echoes the parable "Before the Law." It turns out later (S 222; C 302) that it was Galater who assigned the two assistants to K. to dissuade him from thinking that having settled in the village was a big deal. C 230; S 169 ("Gesetze … unter denen er ja noch zu stehen glaubt"). C 238; S 175 ("Verletzung unbekannter Vorschriften").

Judaica.[34] Frieda considers it intolerably shameful that K. returns from his visits to the family with their domestic odor in his garments.[35] In other words, the Barnabas family suffers the kind of prejudice a Jewish family might experience within a turn-of-the-century Christian environment. K. asks Olga why the villagers have so much contempt for them. He recalls his own initial antipathy toward them, which was not based on any particular thing one could explain. "How revolting all that had been, and all the more revolting because this impression could not be explained by details, for though one listed the details in order to have something to hold on to, they [the Barnabas family] were not bad, it was something else about it all that one could not put a name to."[36] Only after the whole family had, for him, broken up into individual persons, some of whom he could understand and feel friendly toward, did his revulsion subside. K. recognizes that the antipathy against the Barnabas family, a contempt mixed with fear, grips all the villagers, and that they have no rationale or explanation for it, either:

> I am now convinced that you are all being done an injustice. But though I don't know the reason, it must be difficult not to do you an injustice. One must be a stranger in my special situation in order to remain free of this prejudice. And I myself was for a long time influenced by it, so much influenced by it that the mood prevailing where you are concerned — it is not only contempt, there is fear mixed with it too — seemed a matter of course to me, I did not think about it, I did not inquire into the causes, I did not in the least try to defend you all … one has to get to know you all, particularly you, Olga, in order to free oneself from the prevailing delusion [*the delusion*]. What is held against you is obviously nothing but the fact that you are aiming higher than others.

[34] S 332–37 (initially composed for and stricken from S 175); SKA 2: 352–67; C 438–69. The passage was deleted immediately: prior to it Olga speaks of Barnabas's fear, right after it K. criticizes this fear (S 175). See Pasley about Kafka's habit of making immediate deletions and corrections (SKA 2: 73–77). Kafka recorded his first comment on Blüher's book on 16 June (T 363; D 2: 231), his second on 30 June (B 380; L 330). Chapter 15 was written prior to 23 June (SKA 2: 68). Rathenau was assassinated on 24 June.

[35] S 234 ("den Geruch ihrer Stube in den Kleidern"); C 320 (chap. 18 in C; chap. 22 in CHar). This anti-Semitic reproach was well-known. Arthur Schopenhauer, e.g., characterized the Jews and Jewish tradition with the term *foetus Judaicus* (Jewish odor). See his *Parerga und Paralipomena*, vol. 2, sections 177, 184 [Kafka owned a copy of this work]. See also the corresponding term *anrüchig* (for *disreputable)*, in this context (S 211–12) applied to people out of official favor. Cf. also "Jackals and Arabs": "ein bitterer … Geruch entströmte den offenen Mäulern" (E 133; CS 408). Brod passingly suggested that the Barnabas family's ostracism represents anti-Semitism (*Der Prager Kreis* [1966] 108); similarly Gerald Stieg, "Wer ist Kafkas Bote Barnabas?," *Austriaca* 17 (1983): 153.

[36] C 463; S 333. This phrase refers to Blüher, who argued that the Germans had to make a universal break from the Jews because the old anti-Semitism's reliance on specific reproaches against Jews could always be refuted by specific counterexamples: "to each particular charge the anti-Semites make, the Jew will be able to give a particular answer in justification. Blüher makes a very superficial survey … of the particular charges" (D2 231; T 364).

Only a foreigner such as K. can see beyond the prejudice, can get to know the individual family members well enough not to succumb to this delusion. The deleted passage also reflects on the Messianic hope. Barnabas's phrase, “A Land-surveyor has arrived, he seems to have come for our sake,” sounds both the Messianic motif of rescue from one's enemies and the Christian one of God's becoming man to atone for mankind's sins. The prevailing prejudice makes it plain, however, that such hopes are futile. The old letters Barnabas carries to K. are “no good to anyone and only [cause] confusion in the world.” In the text that follows (or rather, replaces) the deleted passages Kafka steers away from an overt portrayal of anti-Semitism. K. cautions Olga not expect too much from Barnabas's messages, not to scrutinize “each single word of his as if it were a [word of] revelation, and base one's own life's happiness on the interpretation.” Barnabas may not be able to recognize Klamm, and the letters he carries are discarded old ones, yet there is something of value offered to him at the offices. [37]

Olga's second deleted speech explains that the villagers' prejudice is so strong that if they did not despise her family, they would despise themselves.

> You won't learn anything definite about us from anyone in the village; on the other hand, everyone -- whether he knows what it is all about or whether he knows nothing and only believes rumors ``he despises us; obviously he would have to despise himself if he did not do so.

K. assures her that he will try to treat her and her family exactly the way he himself wants to be treated by others. [38] The best way to understand K.'s role is to see him as an assimilated Jew. He is well aware of the significance of his marrying Frieda, a “local woman,” as a means of overcoming his outsider status and becoming an accepted member of the community. His remarks that as long as he is not married to Frieda and settled down in the village he is still free to choose his own company, and that he might consider a more intimate connection with Olga's family, show that he feels more at home with them than he does with the villagers. And yet he respects the force of the villagers' prejudice (almost that of an inviolable law) enough to consider avoiding any unnecessary contact

[37] C 463–64; S 333–34. C 467; S 336 (“für uns gekommen”). C 462; S 332. C 239; S 176. S 176–77; C 240–41.

[38] S 338–42 [deleted from S 178]; SKA 2: 369–77; C 470–76. This deletion also happened instantly because prior to it K. reproaches Olga, and right after it Olga responds to the reproach (S 178; C 242); Olga's deleted phrase “Du verstehst unsere Not noch nicht” (S 336; C 467) is almost verbatim repeated in the passage that follows the deleted text (“Du kennst nicht unsere Not” - S 178; C 242). K.'s behavioral precept echoes Rabbi Hillel's summation of the Judaic faith and law: “What is hateful to you, do not do to your neighbor” (referred to by Eschelbacher, *Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums* 31, 74).

with the family.[39] Whereas the deleted passages try to explain the social sanctions against the Barnabas family through racial prejudice, the chapter following them (chap.17: *Amalia's Secret*) reinterprets the casting out of Amalia's family as a social exclusion or, rather, obscures it by making it a consequence of her disobedience to Sortini's illicit request. Frieda is the first of the villagers to spread the news about the incident involving Amalia and, along with Gardena, repeatedly justifies the ostracism. The villagers dread Amalie's refusal of the official's sexual request as if the refusal equaled some moral uncleanliness; they do not want to be "touched" by it, want to keep clear of it, want to preserve the purity of their institutions by excluding her family. Frieda calls Amalie the "most shameless of them all," unsuitable for marrying anyone in the village.[40] Kafka's initial portrayal of anti-Semitism reflects his own experience in Austria, intensified by Blüher's polemic, its immediate erasure his strong reserve toward lament over ethnic discrimination.[41] Pride in one's Jewish identity distinguishes his generation from "an older generation which mistook differentiating for exclusion."[42] Olga feels that it is necessary to speak of her family's misery but also realizes that their lament over being discriminated against feeds on itself. As has been pointed out already, the community's bias against the family is abetted by the elusive castle. The administrative (and, implicitly, constitutional) protection of their rights is undermined by an unspoken officious bias that Olga's father is unable to prove: "Could he perhaps refer to some official decree that had been issued against him? Father couldn't do that. [Or did an official agency commit an infringement? Father

[39] S 74 ("eine Hiesige"); C 96. Cf. S 323 ("Gemeindemitglied — Rechte und Pflichten — kein Fremder"); C 447. According to Frieda, as a foreigner K. is treated here with severity and "injustice," he needs permission from the authorities to get married (S 329–30; C 457–58); in Austria before 1849, only the oldest son of a Jewish family could get a license to marry. Kafka's grandfather had been subject to this law (Wagenbach, *Franz Kafka* 16). S 340–41; C 474.

[40] Olga says: "Three years ago we were [middle class] girls and Frieda an [orphan], a servant" (C 259; S 191). Olga's description of the menservants' lust ("ruled by their insatiable impulses instead of by [the laws]" - CS 285; S 210) matches Paul's admonition that Christian freedom from the law does not license fornication and lasciviousness (Gal. 5:19); Sortini's request can be seen in this light. S 198–99 ("in keiner Weise von ihr berührt werden"; "auf das sorgfältigste fernzuhalten"); C 268–69. S 194; C 264 ("the spotlessness of its reputation"). C 319; S 233. S 241; C 330.

[41] He is well aware of the lament's familiarity, speaking of the "howling" and "plaintiveness" of the jackals — "they were all lamenting and sobbing" — but his reaction against it is excessive. He chastises (L 410) Arthur Holitscher's Jewish lament which is really minuscule (*Lebensgeschichte eines Rebellen: Meine Erinnerungen* [Berlin: Fischer, 1924] 108).

[42] Gustav Krojanker, preface, *Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays über zeitgenössische Schriftsteller*, ed. G. Krojanker (Berlin: Welt, 1922) 7–16; 12 [Kafka owned this book]. The remark was directed at Jakob Wassermann, who had just given a vivid account of the poisonous and pervasive German anti-Semitism in the late nineteenth century (*Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude* [Frankfurt: Fischer, 1921]), 38-39, 46-47, 117-23.

knew of none.] Well then, if he knew of nothing and nothing had happened, what did he want?" The father's hope of proving his innocence is as delusional as K.'s desire to penetrate the castle. During the distribution of files to the officials residing at the inn, one of the officials "did not want consolation, he wanted files." The bureaucracy is governed by its own self-preserving rationality; it rules out consolation, a term for Messianic hope.[43] Calling the quasi-social racial prejudice "the delusion" (C 464), K. insists on distinguishing between false belief [44] or deception — which the author put forth in the parable about a man expecting to be admitted to the law though he never would[45]— and delusion as a persistent (in *The Castle*, collective) disregard for veridical evidence. In his own encounters with anti-Semitism Kafka considers the question of veridical evidence decisive. Reading in 1920 in a Meran newspaper a lead article about Zionism and the anti-Semitic pamphlet *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, he notes that the article goes to a suspicious length to insist that the Russian scholar who published the secret protocols "really exists." [46] By the time of writing *The Castle*, he has realized that anti-Semitic hatred is beyond rational comprehension and cure. Contemplating the fateful assassination of Rathenau, he admits that this matter goes far beyond his mental horizon and later indicates that he has given up on the conflict-ridden Jewish-German relationship and on assimilation as "incurable." In *The Castle*, especially in several deleted passages, he brings together the cognitive and juridical themes found in his earlier works with religious-social techniques of inclusion and exclusion. As a puzzling deflection from his life-long struggle to free himself from an all-powerful law perceived as unjust, he realizes that exclusion from the community means to be left out of the law, without all legal protection. The novel portrays a community in which officials and citizens are incapable of veridical cognition and belief, instituting just laws and applying them equally, or accepting a common humanity.

[43] S 190 ("fangen wir zu klagen an, reißt es uns fort"); C 259. C 275; S 202. C 358; S 260.
[44] See my essay on Kafka and Husserl on this [ssrn.com] website.
[45] See also my reading of the *Trial's* "Before the Law" in my essay on Kafka's ethics on this [ssrn.com] website.
[46] L 235–36; B 273; the article reviewed a book by Friedrich Wichtl that quoted from the *Protocols* [later discovered to be a forgery]. During the same stay in Meran, confronted with rumors about Jewish soldiers infecting themselves with gonorrhea to avoid serving at the front, Kafka asks Brod whether this could possibly be true (B 275; L 237). A rigged 1916 survey by the Prussian War Ministry alleged that many Jews were shirking their military duty in the war (Jochmann, *Gesellschaftskrise und Judenfeindschaft* 110–11; Helmut Berding, *Moderner Antisemitismus in Deutschland* [Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988] 168–70, 184).

List of Abbreviations

A	Franz Kafka, *Amerika*, trans. Willa and Edwin Muir (New York: Schocken [1946] 1962) [Kafka Library].
B	Franz Kafka, *Briefe 1902–1924*, ed. Max Brod (Frankfurt: Fischer [1958] 1975) [Fischer Taschenbuch 1575].
BK	Franz Kafka, *Beschreibung eines Kampfes. Novellen, Skizzen, Aphorismen aus dem Nachlaß*, ed. Max Brod (Frankfurt: Fischer [1954] 1980) [Fischer Taschenbuch 2066].
BN	Franz Kafka, *The Blue Octavo Notebooks*, ed. Max Brod, trans. Ernst Kaiser and Eithne Wilkins (Cambridge, Mass.: Exact Change, 1991).
C	Franz Kafka, *The Castle*, trans. Willa and Edna Muir (New York: Schocken [1946] 1988) [Kafka Library].
CHar	Franz Kafka, *The Castle*, translated by Mark Harman (New York: Schocken Books, 1998).
CS	Franz Kafka, *The Complete Stories*, ed. Nahum Glatzer (New York: Schocken [1971] 1988) [Kafka Library].
D	Either D1 or D2 when given in the running text. The accompanying T reference determines the volume: (T 9–217) matches D1; (T 218–425) matches D2.
D1	Franz Kafka, *The Diaries 1910–1913*, ed. Max Brod, trans. Joseph Kresh (New York: Schocken [1948] 1965) [Schocken Paperback].
D2	Franz Kafka, *The Diaries 1914–1923*, ed. Max Brod, trans. Joseph Kresh (New York: Schocken [1949] 1965) [Schocken Paperback].
E	Franz Kafka, *Sämtliche Erzählungen*, ed. Paul Raabe (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1970) [Fischer Taschenbuch 1078].
EF	Max Brod and Franz Kafka, *Eine Freundschaft*, ed. Malcolm Pasley, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1987–89), vol. 2: *Ein Briefwechsel*.
EF1	Max Brod and Franz Kafka, *Eine Freundschaft*, ed. Malcolm Pasley, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1987–89), vol. 1: *Reiseaufzeichnungen*.
F	Franz Kafka, *Briefe an Felice und andere Korrespondenz aus der Verlobungszeit*, ed. Erich Heller and Jürgen Born (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1967; 1976) [Fischer Taschenbuch 1997].

FE	Franz Kafka, *Letters to Felice*, trans. James Stern and Elisabeth Duckworth (New York: Schocken, 1973).
GW	Franz Kafka, *The Great Wall of China. Stories and Reflections*, trans. Willa and Edna Muir (New York: Schocken, 1964).
H	Franz Kafka, *Hochzeitsvorbereitungen auf dem Lande und andere Prosa aus dem Nachlaß*, ed. Max Brod (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1953; 1980) [Fischer Taschenbuch 2067].
K	Franz Kafka, *Beschreibung eines Kampfes. Die zwei Fassungen. Parallelausgabe nach den Handschriften*, ed. Max Brod, text-critical edition by Ludwig Dietz (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1969).
L	Franz Kafka, *Letters to Friends, Family, and Editors*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Schocken, 1977).
LF	Franz Kafka, *Dearest Father. Stories and Other Writings* (New York: Schocken, 1954) [contains Kafka's "Letter to His Father" 138–96].
M	Franz Kafka, *Briefe an Milena,* ed. Jürgen Born and Michael Müller (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1983; 1986) [Fischer Taschenbuch 5307].
MA	Anton Marty, *Desciptive Psychology. Nach den Vorlesungen des Prof. Dr. Marty*, a 333-page mimeographed course transcript on microfilm, in custody of the "Forschungsstelle und Dokumentationszentrum für österreichische Philosophie" (Graz).
MI	Franz Kafka, *Letters to Milena*, trans. Philip Boehm (New York: Schocken, 1983; 1990) [Kafka Library].
P	Franz Kafka, *Der Prozess. Roman*, ed. Max Brod (Fischer: Frankfurt, 1964; 1979) [Fischer Taschenbuch 676].
PKA1	Franz Kafka, *Der Proceß*, ed. Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1990) [Franz Kafka, *Schriften - Tagebücher - Briefe*. Kritische Ausgabe].
PKA2	Franz Kafka, *Der Proceß*, Apparatband, ed. Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1990) [Kritische Ausgabe].
S	Franz Kafka, *Das Schloß. Roman,* ed. Max Brod (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1946; 1968) [Fischer Taschenbuch 900].
SKA1	Franz Kafka, *Das Schloß*, ed. Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1982) [Kritische Ausgabe].
SKA2	Franz Kafka, *Das Schloß*, Apparatband, ed. Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1982) [Kritische Ausgabe].
T	Franz Kafka, *Tagebücher 1910–1924*, ed. Max Brod (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1951; 1973) [Fischer Taschenbuch 1346].

TKA1	Franz Kafka, *Tagebücher*, ed. Hans-Gerd Koch, Michael Müller and Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1990) [Kritische Ausgabe].
TKA2	Franz Kafka, *Tagebücher*, Apparatband, ed. Hans-Gerd Koch, Michael Müller and Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1990) [Kritische Ausgabe].
TKA3	Franz Kafka, *Tagebücher*, Kommentarband, ed. Hans-Gerd Koch, Michael Müller and Malcolm Pasley (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1990) [Kritische Ausgabe].
TR	Franz Kafka, *The Trial*, trans. Willa and Edwin Muir (New York: Schocken, 1946; 1988) [Kafka Library].
V	Franz Kafka, *Amerika. Roman* [originally: *Der Verschollene*], ed. Max Brod (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1953; 1956) [Fischer Taschenbuch 132].
VKA1	Franz Kafka, *Der Verschollene*, ed. Jost Schillemeit (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1983 [Kritische Ausgabe].
VKA2	Franz Kafka, *Der Verschollene*, Apparatband, ed. Jost Schillemeit (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1983) [Kritische Ausgabe].