

Washington University in St. Louis

Washington University Open Scholarship

All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs)

Summer 8-27-2013

A Multiplicity of Masculinities: The Formation of National Identity in Imperial Germany and its Influence on Notions of the Masculine

Faruk Pasic

Washington University in St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Pasic, Faruk, "A Multiplicity of Masculinities: The Formation of National Identity in Imperial Germany and its Influence on Notions of the Masculine" (2013). *All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs)*. 1152.

<https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/etd/1152>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs) by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS

Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures

Dissertation Examination Committee:

Lynne Tatlock, Chair

Matt Erlin

Jennifer Kapczynski

Paul Michael Lützeler

Marvin Marcus

Corinna Treitel

A Multiplicity of Masculinities: The Formation of National Identity in Imperial Germany and its
Influence on Notions of the Masculine

by

Faruk Pašić

A dissertation presented to the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of Washington University in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

August 2013

St. Louis, Missouri

© 2013

Faruk Pašić

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Representations of Normative Masculinity in the Works of Louise von François, Paul Heyse, and E. Werner	
Introduction	42
“Ein Volk in Waffen”: Pre-Unification Depictions of German Masculinity	47
“Das Dichten ist ja nur thatenloses Träumen!”: German Masculinity in Wartime	73
“Weib und Heimat und Familie”: Post-Unification German Masculinity	91
Notes	110
Chapter Two: Alternative Masculinities of the <i>Gründerzeit</i> in the Works of Fontane, Raabe, and Storm	
Introduction	115
No Country for Young Men: Theodor Fontane’s (Un-)Heroic Prussians	118
History as a Genealogical Narrative: Wilhelm Raabe’s Collectors	135
Fleeing a Life of Social Restrictions: Theodor Storm’s Misfits	151
Notes	167
Chapter Three: Regionally Defined Notions of Masculinity in Imperial Germany	
Introduction	171
“To Huus! To Huus, Vatter!”: Expressions of Masculinity Through Regional Character	179
Notes	210
Conclusion	213
Works Cited	218

Acknowledgements

I wish to extend my sincerest thanks to the faculty of the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures at Washington University in St. Louis for their unhesitating help throughout my graduate career. I owe my deepest gratitude to Lynne Tatlock, who provided me with unwavering support and mentorship even before I began my dissertation and whose unfading belief in my abilities as a scholar motivated me to persevere in the critical stages of writing it. Brief yet insightful conversations on the volleyball court with Matt Erlin helped me organize my thoughts and structure my arguments more effectively, and the comments by Jennifer Kapczynski opened up perspectives I had not yet explored. Thank you also to Paul Michael Lützeler, Corinna Treitel, and Marvin Marcus for reading my dissertation and participating in the dissertation examination committee.

This project would not have been possible without the generous dissertation fellowship from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. I have also benefited greatly from the extensive collection of nineteenth-century German literature available at Washington University Libraries and from the expedient ways of ordering texts not available on site. Brian Vetruba deserves special credit for his maintenance of research tools and his general readiness to help. I also appreciated the quiet study rooms in Olin Library and their inspiring view of campus.

Special thanks also to Empress Sanders and Jennifer Jodell for keeping an eye on administrative deadlines and for ensuring that all the necessary documents are in order.

I am also indebted to my parents, who have always stressed the value of a strong education and planted the seeds for my academic career at an early age. Last but not least, I want to thank my wife, Vera Valakh, for her patience and encouragement over the last four years. This success is hers as much as it is mine.

Introduction: The Intersection of National and Masculine Identity in Nineteenth-Century Germany

This project studies the consolidation of German national identity upon the foundation of the Second German Empire in the last third of the nineteenth century and the manner in which this consolidation coincided with, or even brought about, particular notions about German masculinity. Benedict Anderson has compared one's perception of the "nation" to the way in which one perceives the concepts of "kinship" or "religion," insofar as both represent communities that "are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined."¹ If the nation is indeed an imagined community, then that community is styled by the values and ideals of its members and, in turn, imbues its members with characteristics and forms of behavior that symbolize their ideals. This idealization certainly extends to the performance of gender as well; for, gender represents a significant element of an individual's understanding of the self and influences both one's status within a community and one's interaction with it. Such being the case, it also figures largely into the construction of national character.

Hagemann sees the Prussian defeat by Napoleon as a turning point in the history of the Prussian monarchy that marks the beginning of a "Geschichte von Nation, Militär und Geschlecht"²; the history of Prussia is therefore intimately tied to that of Germany in the nineteenth century. The defeat initiated a series of military reforms that included, among other measures, the elimination of "foreigners" from the army, which meant increased reliance upon "national-Prussian" officers and soldiers.³ This move was not only meant to increase the army's identification with the state that it needed to protect, but, as we shall see, it was also predicated upon the notion that the influence of the foreign had introduced a physical and mental weakening of the Prussians. The reforms thus intended to strengthen both the quality of the armed forces

and the masculinity of German men in general. The events of the Napoleonic Wars and their outcome proved to be fertile ground for German fiction of the nineteenth century. Yet, in spite of this literary linking of nationhood and gender, relatively few studies have focused on specific examples of this process in the literature of the late nineteenth century.

Much of the existing scholarship on nationhood and literature in Imperial Germany focuses on the formation of German national identity in the first two decades of the existence of the empire. Kirsten Belgum's *Popularizing the Nation*⁴ is a seminal work in this field. Brent Peterson's *History, Fiction and Germany*,⁵ Alon Confino's *The Nation as a Local Metaphor*,⁶ and Arne Koch's *Between National Fantasies and Regional Realities*⁷ also constitute significant contributions to this scholarship. However, there is a dearth of scholarship examining the images of "German" masculinity emerging in the last third of the nineteenth century, parallel to the emergence of German nationalism. Some existing texts on gender in the German Empire, such as *Gender and Germanness*⁸ by Patricia Herminhouse and Magda Mueller and "The National Family: Allegory and Femininity in a *Festspiel* from 1880"⁹ by Jennifer Askey, predominantly highlight the role of women and femininity in connection with national identity, but their discussion of the role that masculinity played in the empire is either sparse or altogether missing. Others, like Ute Frevert's "*Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann*,"¹⁰ Walter Erhart's *Familienmänner*,¹¹ and David S. Johnson's "The Ironies of Degeneration,"¹² for example, do establish a relationship between masculinity, the nineteenth-century bourgeois value system, and German nationhood to varying degrees, but that relationship does not lie at the center of these studies. My project expands upon existing discussions of the role of masculinity in the German Empire and is distinguished in particular by its examination of both regional and social

differences between the male characters in the literature from the first two decades of the Second German Empire.

Sociohistorical studies of nationalism in the Second German Empire as well as theories of gender and in particular of masculinities inform my approach. I shall undertake close readings both of primary literature depicting characters that embody desired masculine ideals and of primary literature describing men who do not live up to the prescribed behavioral models of late-nineteenth-century Germany. Although this project is not intended primarily as a historical study, I shall begin with a historical overview roughly describing the major factors that contributed to the development of national identity, particularly in the nineteenth century, in order to establish a basis for the discussion of the German nation.

Ways of Defining the German Nation

The unification of Germany in 1871 seems somewhat surprising: only five years earlier, a war had been fought in an attempt to prevent Prussian dominance over the German states, but now a Prussian monarch and his minister president led a coalition of German states, including Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg, into a war against France that resulted in the establishment of a German Empire. Unification presented a unique challenge to the way in which most of the members of the new empire had identified themselves up to that point because Germany as a nation previously existed only in theory, as an eighteenth-century ideal of a people connected by the bond of a common language and culture. The reality was that such a Germany did not exist and it did not spontaneously come into being with the founding of an empire. The idea of the German nation had yet to be created and molded into what it eventually became by 1914. Examining how this national identity formed helps one understand how Germans in the empire

thought of themselves and their roles in society, and it provides insight into how they perceived their country and its position in the world.

The obstacles to defining “Germany” as a concept had existed since the formation of the Holy Roman Empire, and long before 1870 both politicians and intellectuals had struggled to determine what unified the German states. Therefore, my first task in this introduction is not only to examine how Germany functioned as an “imagined community,” to borrow Anderson’s term, well before the creation of a unified German state, but also to determine how an existing notion of the German nation was affected by the onset of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870 and was further crystallized in the decades following the war. Moreover, I will explore how the population of the newly established German Empire tried to reconcile its various regional identities with the national German identity that emerged in the postwar period and to what extent the contemporary discourse on nationalism identified Prussianness as German.

Integration certainly did not occur over night and required the involvement of several social institutions in order to be successful in the long term. As we will see, religion played an important role as a force of integration as well as one of division, and I will examine the manner in which nationalism in Imperial Germany sometimes took on traits traditionally associated with religion. An additional cornerstone in establishing a sense of national belonging was formed by the imperial educational system, which encouraged teachers to use methods such as memorization and extensive drills and thus shared certain similarities with military indoctrination. History in particular played a crucial role in school curricula; the nineteenth-century approach to historiography, therefore, significantly shaped the way in which Germany’s youth perceived the German nation. Finally, the role of the media in disseminating ideas about the nation cannot be underestimated. Mass publications shaped the public’s understanding of

national symbols and facilitated the establishment of bourgeois culture as the dominant and unifying force in German society, exhibiting its own set of morals and virtues.

Ultimately, the form that German national identity took on over the course of the nineteenth century owed much to the wars fought against French armies. The sound defeat of the Prussians at the hands of Napoleon Bonaparte left a lingering trace of self-doubt in the collective consciousness; this defeat is one of the major reasons why the memory of the Napoleonic Wars played such a crucial role in uniting the disparate German states under a single banner in 1870-71. In the final section of this introduction, I claim that the nineteenth-century quest to define what a sense of national belonging would mean for Germans was tied to a re-imagining of German masculinity, which began around 1800 and aimed to reshape the minds and bodies of German men. Following the humiliation of 1806, such a re-imagining seemed even more necessary than before.

Perhaps Heinrich von Treitschke was justified in his claim that “Germany was Bismarck’s Reich,”¹³ if his thesis about the teleological course of history which led to the establishment of the Second Empire is disregarded. After all, the Prussians were responsible for shaping Germany into a state as it existed at the beginning of the twentieth century; they were the ones who provided the German *Volk* with a clear direction and who gave form to a German state. It is not unusual for historians to define the history of a country by its statehood—and German unification under Bismarck was certainly responsible for promoting more vigorously a sense of common customs, origins, history, and language among Germans—but it would be a decidedly limited view of history to look at Germany in this way because it would define national identity solely by the political status of the country.

German national identity, however, certainly does not begin and end with the German Empire. Rather, it is part of an ongoing and centuries-long process that can be traced at least as early as the foundation of the Holy Roman Empire, “the entity a majority of contemporaries would have had in mind if they had used the term *Deutschland* in a political sense.”¹⁴ It is undeniable that the history of the Holy Roman Empire is, at the same time, the history of Germany before such an entity actually existed. Historical figures such as Johannes Gutenberg, Albrecht Dürer, and Martin Luther, all of whom helped shape a national image of Germany, were official subjects of the Holy Roman Empire. The empire, however, did not have a strong central government so that the 360 sovereign entities it encompassed existed in relatively loose political association with each other. Poor roads and an unreliable communications network encouraged this kind of fragmentation, while the social sphere of most inhabitants of the empire was directly affected by their economic dependency—many of them rarely left their city, village cluster, or lordship unless they had to do so.¹⁵ For a long time, a unifying factor in the Holy Roman Empire was Christianity, but with the onset of the Reformation, even that factor of uniformity disappeared. While Luther’s translation of the Bible made the creation of a “German culture ... part of the Protestant revolt against the corruption of the Roman church,”¹⁶ the Peace of Augsburg of 1555, which allowed the ruler of each region to dictate the region’s religion, further isolated the German territories within the Holy Roman Empire from each other.

These religious foundations for a German culture, however, served as a basis for a secular one that began to build upon those foundations in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.¹⁷ This was primarily a literary culture, the expansion of which was aided by “an expanding network of publishers, periodicals, lending libraries, and reading societies.”¹⁸ Germany increasingly became identifiable as a cultural construct, rather than a collection of

political networks limited by territory. The prerequisite for participation in this culture was the knowledge of German, and by the beginning of the eighteenth century a literary culture was beginning to form that could be identified as German in its language and range of topics.¹⁹ However, one should not overestimate how many people had access to it. First, education was a major limiting factor in this national literary culture. Second, economic constraints further limited access to periodicals and books. “To most craftsmen and farmers,” claims James Sheehan, “to villagers and the urban poor, to domestic servants and common soldiers – in short, to the overwhelming majority of the population – national literary culture meant very little.”²⁰ Thus, even at the beginning of the nineteenth century, national culture remained more an ideal than a fact, and the texts that would later form the basis of a German literary canon did not play that role at the time.

Examining the German canon and its effects on the formation of a national culture becomes much more productive in the second half of the nineteenth century, more precisely in 1867, after ‘timeless’ copyright ended and editions of the works of Lessing, Wieland, Goethe, and Schiller became more widely available in cheap editions.²¹ As Brent Peterson argues, one should also remember that “the canon, despite its cultural importance, did not create the nation”²²; nor did it exhibit “a collective sense of imagined history.”²³ While there are certainly canonical texts that attempt to reclaim an imaginary past, such as Schiller’s *Wilhelm Tell* or his *Wallenstein* plays, the same is not true for the majority of his other works. Popular literature of the early nineteenth century is much more revealing in that regard, and it tended to reach a much wider audience than the works of Schiller and Goethe.

The *Biedermeier* period witnessed a boom in the genre of historical fiction, much of which drew inspiration from the reign of Frederick II of Prussia (i.e., Frederick the Great) or

from the recent events of the Napoleonic Wars. Even though they often depicted “German” characters, works of this genre rarely agreed on what it meant to be German. Nevertheless, the thematic focus of historical fiction on issues of national identity indicates that there was widespread concern during this period to identify one’s nationality in some way.²⁴ Peterson observes two lessons that emerge from the historical fiction of the *Biedermeier* period. First, it was certainly no era of consolidation, since there was no uniform mythology that was established across all novels and since even Frederick II had not yet been established as a national hero. Second, many heroes in the genre managed to survive national or ethnic pressures only if they avoided tough decisions and withdrew to spheres outside of nationality or ethnicity such as their social class, like Robert Gautier from Friedrich de la Motte Fouqué’s *Der Refugié* or Theodor von *** from Willibald Alexis’ *Die Geächteten*.²⁵

A critical distinction between the presentation of academic history and that of historical fiction during this period, other than the slippery distinction between fiction and non-fiction, was that historical fiction was driven by narratives about individual characters in a microcosm, while academic history was usually presented as a series of macrocosmic events. The format of historical fiction lent itself perfectly to the formation of a national mythology because it invited readers to identify with a figure that, although fictional, could be representative of a person who actually existed in the past. Readers could project their own values onto this character and thus create a virtual bond between themselves and the world of their ancestors.

It is noteworthy that Frederick II became a popular subject of historical fiction. Even though the representations of the Prussian king were not always heroic and often ambivalent, it is nevertheless significant that he occupied the imagination of so many writers. Peterson highlights a work by Julius Bacher, *Frederick the Great’s Search for a Wife* (1857), not because it deals

with a unique subject matter²⁶ but because of the manner in which the author reconciles the Prussian king's penchant for French culture with his role as representative and protector of German virtues. Bacher depicts young Frederick II being criticized by his father for his lack of German virtues and his adoration of French culture. The author thus establishes from the start a basic opposition between everything that makes the French "evil" and the Germans "good." The first thirty pages are then devoted to presenting the protagonist's transformation into a solidly German character. By means of this literary strategy, Bacher first establishes a basic identification between the reader and Frederick and then describes the protagonist using traits that serve not only to identify him but also both the nation and its enemies.²⁷ In an effort to portray Frederick as a representative of German virtues, the novel describes him through a negative relationship, as "not-French" rather than German. Such a definition indicates that while there was no agreement at this time as to what exactly constituted Germany and the German national character, it was clear what Germany was *not*—and it was most definitely not French.

Not surprisingly, the French acted mostly as villains throughout the nineteenth century in German representations of history. The wounds of German humiliation inflicted not only by the sword of Napoleon's army but also by Metternich's pen at the Congress of Vienna were slow to heal indeed. Once France declared war in 1870, however, the vilification of the French intensified and became even more vicious in the depiction of the dichotomy between the two nations. Bismarck's government immediately pinned the blame for the war on the French, characterizing them as capricious aggressors who instigated the hostilities for no reason. The press reduced the conflict to a quarrel between individual personalities: Napoleon III and Benedetti on the one side and William I on the other.²⁸ Regardless of what actually happened between Benedetti and William I at Bad Ems, the public applied the framework of popular

literature to reality, concentrating on the interpersonal relationships between several key figures, thereby heightening the melodrama of an event that was otherwise much less interesting.

Once the German Empire had been founded, such selective and inventive representations of history became part of a process that Hans-Ulrich Wehler describes as “eine Ummodellierung des historischen Kollektivgedächtnisses.”²⁹ This process included a restructuring of German history to establish a historical progression from Arminius to Charlemagne, Luther, and Frederick the Great, which culminated in Bismarck’s state.³⁰ The historical narrative of imperial Germany was thus expanded to the ancient world and the new nation firmly anchored within a mythology designed solely to give legitimacy to its existence. In addition, the aggressive stereotyping of various “Others” continued even after 1871 and any perceived difference of opinion or behavior was ascribed to national character. Following the war, francophobia was still rampant for years. The 1880s saw a rise in hate speech against the Slavs due to conflicts with the Poles in the east, while the English became the target of nationalist hatred as Germany pursued colonial interests in that same decade.³¹ Wehler, however, also points out that nationalism in the Empire was defined not only by an outward direction, but also by an inward orientation that targeted anybody and anything that was in any way different from the norm,³² thereby creating an intense pressure to conform. The ideal German society was imagined to exist harmoniously, and any conflict that did arise within the nation was blamed on scapegoats such as Social Democrats and Catholics, who supposedly disrupted this harmonious existence.³³ The Social Democrats especially presented a threat to the imperial government, which is why they occupied a symbolic sphere similar to that of the French in public consciousness.

Alon Confino writes in the introduction to his book *The Nation as a Local Metaphor* that his aim is to devise a “remedy to the artificial dichotomy between nationalism from above and

from below”³⁴ that has plagued the exploration of German national identity for some time.

While this is indeed a worthwhile endeavor and while I do not dispute Confino’s argument I am reluctant to discard the dichotomy; it does help visualize the directions that nationalism took in the German Empire. Bismarck’s state was “self-determined,” as James Sheehan puts it, “not by popular sovereignty or the Volk, but by its leading statesman.”³⁵ Such an assessment indicates that the state played a major role in guiding the public’s perception of the nation, but it does not mean that the entire public agreed with the ideas put forth by the state or that the public did not form its own identity. Perhaps one should not think of the formation of national identity as a dichotomous relationship between nationalism “from above” and nationalism “from below,” but rather a complementary relationship in which each borrows from the other.

Nationalism vs. Regional Particularism

As I indicated above, for a long time Germany had existed only as a grouping of autonomous states, each with its own traditions, own loyalties and concerns. These aspects of regional identity did not simply disappear once the German Empire was founded, but rather “German national identity was interwoven with, and sometimes contradicted by, regional loyalties, by gender roles and occupational categories, as well as by caste, class, political, and religious affiliations.”³⁶ Especially the German aristocracy did not necessarily see itself bound to any single nation or as part of a larger group, but it was traditionally a “transnational continuum of gradations in title and pedigree, or the dizzying array of localities.”³⁷ Throughout the nineteenth century, however, the Protestant liberal bourgeoisie attempted to define the characteristics of German nationalism, which eventually came to include, among other aspects, the unification of Germany in one national state; retaining the monarchy; the overcoming of

regional fragmentation; the creation of a new, national identity that superseded outdated loyalties to dynasties, cities, or regions; and the formation of a national mythology of a “chosen people” based on a teleological view of history.³⁸ This list makes clear that the liberal bourgeois proponents of nationalism not only upheld the ideals of a *Volksnation*, a nation based on common origins,³⁹ and a *Kulturnation*, an intellectual notion of nation proposed by Herder and others that was based on a common cultural heritage,⁴⁰ but that they had also already identified regional differences as a major obstacle to German unity. Overcoming these differences would prove to be an extremely challenging task.

In the 1850s, when a German state was still but a distant dream, *Die Gartenlaube*, a mouthpiece of bourgeois liberalism, reported on the experiences of German settlers abroad in an attempt to “highlight the ways in which these communities represented a successful form of German colonialism in the absence of a centralized, national colonial policy. The magazine also sought to present a form of German national identity that was informed by the German colonial experience.”⁴¹ The portrayal of such emigrant experiences showed to the German readership that Germans from different backgrounds were able to reconcile their differences and coexist in a microcosm of a German nation-state. By 1856, overseas successes by German settlers “had been consolidated to form a picture of German settlers forgetting their instinctive *Kleinstaaterei* to create strong communities exercising their new political freedom.”⁴²

Other voices at home, however, were not as optimistic as the *Gartenlaube* about the possibility of a German nation, especially following Prussia’s war against Austria. In 1869, Ludwig August von Rochau, chief editor of the weekly paper of the *Nationalverein*, complained that German unity was not thoroughly embedded in the hearts of the nation and that while some sometimes yearned for such unity, this was merely poetic self-deception that had no basis in

reality. Rochau believed that most of the fragmented groups comprising the German *Volk* clung too tightly to their beliefs of cultural superiority over the other groups and that they would agree to unification only if they could retain a high degree of sovereignty. He remarked, furthermore, that it would be difficult to imagine, “dass [die Nation] jemals auf dem Wege der freien Vereinbarung zum Ziel gelangen werde. Wenn auch nicht gerade unmittelbare Anwendung von Waffengewalt, so doch jedenfalls ein unwiderstehlicher Zwang der Umstände ist aller Voraussicht nach das einzige Mittel, um den Partikularismus zu brechen.”⁴³ Rochau did not believe that the German territories would agree to a unified state if left to decide on the matter peacefully. The armed conflict he most likely had in mind was a civil war, such as the American Civil War that had united a divided nation just a few years earlier, but his prediction instead came true when the Prussian king declared war on France in the name of all Germans.

A surprising development following France’s declaration of war in 1870 was that Prussia suddenly styled itself the representative of all German states, as they all gathered under the banner of William I to battle the perceived aggressor. This development raises the obvious question: what brought about this seemingly sudden change in the attitude that Rochau had so lamented? Frank Becker raises the point that a war with France had already been anticipated for several decades, and once it finally happened, it met with a “Deutungskultur” that the public had already created around the “Erzfeind,” i.e., the “Erbfeind.”⁴⁴ At the very outset of the war many did not perceive the ramifications of the fact that the war was led by the Prussian king and his minister president. The situation changed once the public learned about the events surrounding the Bad Ems affair, at least the way they were officially reported. The entire discourse surrounding the event centered on the supposed insult to the Prussian king’s honor, which served as a premise for German retaliation against France. At that point, what had actually occurred

between Wilhelm I and Benedetti was moot because the governments, parties, and newspapers had stylized it to mean something more. After that, the French ambassador's insult to the honor of the Prussian monarch had become synonymous with an insult to the entire German nation by the entire French nation, and it became the force that drove the mobilization of the public behind Prussia as the leader of Germany in the Franco-Prussian War.⁴⁵

By opening up themselves politically to the nationalist movement and the national idea, Bismarck and William I immediately gained the support of the liberal bourgeoisie, which replied to this political move by nationalizing the monarch: "Indem die Ehre des Königs mit der Ehre der Nation identifiziert wird, ist das Bündnis von Krone und Nation schon symbolisch vorweggenommen."⁴⁶ The press only amplified this feeling by employing a synthesis of "politisch-kultureller Muster aus der aristokratischen und der bürgerlichen Tradition."⁴⁷ It exploited an almost feudal pathos that called for the king's "subjects" to give their lives for him as part of a kind of blood-oath, but at the same time it used a bourgeois-nationalist pathos that appealed to the honor of all Germans in solidarity with the Prussian king: the insult to his honor represented an insult to the honor of the nation.⁴⁸

In the postwar period, this perception of the war as an effort led by the Prussian king who unified the German states opened the door for a "Prussification" of the German Empire by identifying the unification as a Prussian achievement. The new nationalist ideology in the empire stressed the importance of the Kaiser, the military, and the reign of Bismarck, the "große Individuum,"⁴⁹ giving them the sole credit for bringing about German unification. Bismarck's argument was that the nationalist movement before 1870 failed to achieve unification on its own and that it needed a strong centralized force in order to effect this change.⁵⁰ The imperial government thus sought to direct nationalist loyalty to itself by essentially taking over the

nationalist movement and discrediting its bourgeois liberal roots. The Prussians had already prepared the ground for this cooption during the war in their claim that William I represented Germany. Therefore, when the political structure of Germany changed in 1871, nationalist ideology changed with it. It simply had to change because the entire *telos* of German nationalism had heretofore rested on the eventual unification of the separate states. Since the ultimate goal had been achieved, the nation needed a new goal toward which to strive.⁵¹

Around 1878/79, German nationalism experienced a political shift from a left to right. This “Reichsnationalismus”⁵² distanced itself ever more noticeably from the liberal idea of a *Kulturnation* and expressed itself increasingly in the form of chauvinism, which became especially pronounced toward the turn of the century: “governments required schoolbooks to adopt a ‘German’ perspective, built statues and monuments to German heroes, and asserted national interests with a new intensity.”⁵³ Although such a cultural climate seems overwhelming and somewhat alienating to outsiders, David Blackbourn also asserts that nationalism became more expressed at all levels of German society after 1890 and that it was not merely a government phenomenon, for even those who were among the most ardent critics of the imperial government, such as Social Democrats, considered themselves “good Germans.”⁵⁴

At the regional level, associations and clubs that endorsed the concept of self-improvement had flourished since the mid-1800s. Their mission was primarily to promote the progress of civilization among the proletariat and the lower middle class.⁵⁵ These *Vereine* came about mainly through local initiatives, which means that the state was usually not involved in their creation. Nevertheless, it did provide the communications networks necessary for the infrastructure of some associations and it also funded and maintained museums and universities, which contributed to this overall civilizing mission, thus making the state a “natural ally” of the

educated bourgeoisie.⁵⁶ After the founding of the Empire in 1871, the meaning of a membership in a club or association expanded because “now social and cultural advance became a testimony to German progress”⁵⁷ and added another layer to the identification with the nation.

The intersection of the local with the national was not unique to clubs and associations. According to Alon Confino, the idea of *Heimat* was also one of Germany’s responses to modernity. It was “a memory invented just when German society was rapidly changing, as a bridge between a past and a present that looked uniquely dissimilar.”⁵⁸ Even though the preoccupation with *Heimat* history was closely related to the identification with one’s region, it emerged at a time when the pressures of national and international standardization in language, economics, and lifestyle threatened to erase local traditions.⁵⁹ According to Confino, highlighting *Heimat* did not counteract national loyalties but rather evoked feelings for the locality that were then projected onto the nation. *Heimatlers* merely “looked in the past for reassurances of local uniqueness”⁶⁰ while coming to terms with the realities of national homogenization and in this manner reconciled their memory of the local with the present of the national.

It would be difficult to claim that the German Empire had become completely homogenized by 1914. There were certainly forces in imperial society that tried to facilitate and accelerate the process of building a distinctly German culture and identification with the nation, but in the end the most valuable strategy was simply time. “By 1914 there was a generation of 30- and 40-year olds who had known nothing but the Empire, and for them it was synonymous with ‘Germany,’”⁶¹ writes Matthew Jefferies. Of course, the government played its role in passing laws and standardizing the way in which the Empire was represented, but it required an

entirely new stratum of the population that would grow up with the Empire in order to shape the legacy of its forefathers into a distinctly imperial culture.

History and its Role in Socialization

In his book *Imperial Germany, 1871-1918*, Volker Berghahn proposes that the manner in which a group of people experiences their nation changes from generation to generation because “it is historical experiences and socialization into a certain era that binds members of several cohorts together as a generation.”⁶² Ideological differences arise from differences in socialization between the generations, so that the *Gründergeneration*, for example, might be subject to a different worldview from that of the generation that grew up in the 1880s.

Socialization is the process by which a person acquires social norms, customs, and ideologies. It should therefore not come as a surprise that schools and the military were the two agents of socialization that contributed significantly to acquisition of nationalist ideology and national identity in the German Empire. Bismarck recognized the influence of teachers relatively early, when he thanked them shortly after the war “for their ‘outstanding contributions’ to recent events and called attention to their responsibility for cultivating national feelings,” while his minister of culture, Adalbert Falk, proclaimed that “the role of the schools was ‘to strengthen and enliven the German national consciousness.’”⁶³

Imperial education focused on discipline and used repetitive drills to convey knowledge to students, often because discipline was the key to keeping order in overcrowded classrooms and drills were a simple way to ensure every student’s participation.⁶⁴ Drills were especially common in history classes, which forced students to memorize endlessly the dates of sieges and battles.⁶⁵ Even before the Franco-Prussian War, German history textbooks devoted on average

25 to 50 percent of their space to the topic of war, a figure that did not decrease in the Empire.⁶⁶ In 1872, a new nationwide school curriculum introduced history for the first time as a separate subject, and based on instructions by William I himself, it centered on the Prussian Wars and the outstanding Prussian personalities in them.⁶⁷ Despite the Kaiser's interventions in the school curriculum, most textbook authors were aware that they were writing for a broad constituency and made an effort "to integrate the diverse nation by inviting participation in, and celebration of, a standardized past,"⁶⁸ but more importantly a *German* past.

With the ascension of William II to the German throne the imperial education system increasingly took on the form of indoctrination. The new Kaiser issued a cabinet order in 1889 that called for more emphasis on the German language as compared to other languages in the curriculum and for a restructuring of history and religious studies, in order to combat what he perceived as a threat posed by Social Democratic ideas and to strengthen the traditions of the Hohenzollern monarchy.⁶⁹ Commenting on this cabinet order, Alfred Kelly remarks that the Kaiser's main concern was that the schools "would turn out loyal young Germans" and that the best way so save the children's souls from the evils of Social Democracy was to subject them to "patriotic history" instruction.⁷⁰ Even those who did not receive a formal education often wound up as soldiers in the army due to universal military service, which performed a function similar to that which William II envisioned for the school system. Because the Prussian War Ministry became reluctant to recruit young men from cities due to suspicion of their sympathizing with Social Democrats, it resorted more frequently to rural areas in the search for new soldiers. For this reason the army soon "came to be seen as the 'school of the nation,' where poorly educated young men from the provinces were filled up with conservative notions about the Hohenzollern monarchy and national unity."⁷¹ One could not find freedom of thought at German universities

either, where the political composition of the faculty began to homogenize in the 1880s. A political and social conservatism asserted itself so that liberal outsiders, no matter how brilliant they might have been, never received the opportunity to prove themselves.⁷²

Despite the heavy emphasis on war in the presentation of history in school textbooks, their attitude towards war was not always clear-cut. According to Kelly, authors were hesitant to glorify the horrors of the battlefield and war itself and instead chose to concentrate especially on the meaning of the Franco-Prussian War for Germany by defining the nation as “the heir to the pious earnestness and harmony of 1870, which was, in turn, a revival of the spirit of 1813.”⁷³ While the history being taught underwent standardization during this period, the depictions of individual battles did not conform to one standard because authors seemed unsure of how to present their brutal realities to school children. For this reason, many of them simply delivered the descriptions and statistics of the events in bland prose.⁷⁴ The ambivalence of history books in this matter suggests that a universally supported militaristic education of the German youth did not take place. The primary pedagogical purpose of history textbooks was to introduce the students to German virtues, exemplified by the soldiers of the Franco-Prussian War. However, war did not create these virtues. They were described as the product of the soldiers’ “piously Christian willpower,”⁷⁵ which the war merely brought to the fore.

In addition to the ambivalence of history books in the representation of war, the government’s agenda to produce young German subjects met with resistance from other sources. The increasingly more chauvinistic atmosphere after 1890 became a major concern of teachers, many of whom felt uncomfortable teaching German history after 1871 because they felt that it “opened the doors for political propaganda.”⁷⁶ Although there was no question as to their patriotism and loyalty to the regime, teachers were often young liberal idealists who did not

welcome the proposed changes of 1889.⁷⁷ Even if teachers complied with teaching the new curriculum, its effectiveness was nevertheless dependent on the cooperation of the students, which one could not take for granted. While schools could act as powerful agents of socialization, Berghahn indicates that they also represented institutions against which the young rebelled and that “in many cases it was an explicit or tacit critique of their experiences with these institutions that incited their resolve to do things differently once they had reached adulthood.”⁷⁸ The military sometimes also experienced failure in socializing new recruits. By the 1890s, the higher-ranked officers were assigned the task of introducing a somewhat one-sided view of German history and contemporary politics to the youths who had recently joined up. This official depiction of Germany clashed with the realities that some of the recruits had experienced in the slums of the big cities or with the worldview they were presented if they had come into contact with the Social Democrats. This clash sometimes led to conflict between the often upper-class officers and the recruits from the lower classes.⁷⁹

Regardless of the resistance with which the imperial government met in enforcing its plan to gain the loyalty of the population, the mechanisms of socialization achieved their purpose in the end by promoting basic identification with the regime among a majority of the population. While a growing number of voters nevertheless wished to change the German political system, only a minority wanted to dispose of the Hohenzollern monarchy by revolutionary means. According to Berghahn, this identification is the reason “why so many millions joined up, enthusiastically or pensively, when a war broke out in 1914 that had been presented to them as a war in defense of the Fatherland.”⁸⁰

The question remains as to why history, as a subject to be studied, was bestowed with the prerogative of shaping the minds of the nation. The reason behind it is indeed a larger obsession

with history among nineteenth-century Germans, which in turn originated in an established tradition of Hegelian historicism and its idea that understanding a society required the study of its history. Although heightened interest in the subject of history and increased identification with the past was not peculiar to Germany, the extent to which the past came to occupy every facet of German culture and society in the second half of the nineteenth century was relatively unusual. No anniversary was too small to be celebrated, no period too insignificant to be researched and displayed in historical museums. “The German *Bildungsbürgertum*,” claims Matthew Jefferies, “saw itself as the legitimate heir of centuries of history, and attempted to express this optimistic faith in ‘progress’ by demonstrating a proprietorial control over the past,” which then became reflected and exaggerated “by the particular dominance in German intellectual life of what became known as *Historismus* or ‘historicism.’”⁸¹

Brent Peterson asserts that one can trace the roots of this development in German society to the aftereffects of 1815, which registered in the collective consciousness of Germans as an extremely sharp break with the past. For centuries, the order of things had remained relatively unchanged, and therefore the Napoleonic Wars and the outcome of the Congress of Vienna represented a tremendous upheaval for all German states, overthrowing traditional alliances and fusing together territories that had little historical relation to each other. This caesura, Peterson argues, gave rise to a new awareness of history among Germans and to the realization that common experiences can change over time, which in turn resulted in an effort to hold on to those experiences marked by the rise of both academic history and historical fiction.⁸² Kathrin Maurer makes a similar claim about the period following 1848. The failed bourgeois revolution and the rise to power of Otto von Bismarck in the Prussian state made this an era of immense social and political change, and a group of academic historians, often classified as the “Prussian School,”

emerged, eager to document the history of the German nation.⁸³ Although this was a diverse group, all of its members subscribed to the notion that “the historian should strive for political impartiality, demanded the building of a unified German nation-state, and backed the imperialist power politics of the Prussian regime.”⁸⁴

Maurer observes that “the scholarly and literary discourses were closely intertwined during this time,”⁸⁵ and the academic historian Gustav Droysen, who was part of the Prussian School, represents this trend especially well. Droysen claimed that a “neutral” position is impossible for a historian because he is always a product of other contexts that influence his stance toward the past.⁸⁶ Thus a central term for Droysen’s historicism became the concept of a “poetics of transfiguration,” which in turn figured into the theory of German realism in the 1850s and was later developed by writers such as Theodor Fontane.⁸⁷ According to Fontane, the process of transfiguration in realist literature occurs when an artist selects, leaves out, or adds elements to the unrefined reality he observes in order to enhance the aesthetic experience of it.⁸⁸ Droysen believed that historicism should share this objective and that a historian should not merely present a series of facts, but should project in his account of history the moral qualities of an idealized state, nation, and people. According to Droysen, “history has a patriotic mission, that is, to give the people and the state the image of itself; an obligation, which is then twice as great if the national consciousness is more unformed and weaker than it should be.”⁸⁹ It was clear to Droysen that the nation lacked a firm identity of itself, and he recognized that history had the power to shape this identity for it.

One cannot dismiss the historians of the Prussian School as eccentric scholars attempting to redefine German history; their notions of historicism reflect a larger trend in German perception and presentation of the nation’s history. Popular historical texts propagated a view of

German history that fit squarely into nationalist ideology by claiming that all Germans shared common origins, history, and destiny; that they shared a single geography, culture, and language; and that they belonged in one single nation-state.⁹⁰ The “imagined history” that formed the basis of German national consciousness in the final third of the nineteenth century was an artistic and scientific production that trod the line between fiction and fact. There was very little popular and academic history available to readers before 1830, and there were very few memoirs and biographical accounts. For this reason the bourgeois readership in the first quarter of the nineteenth century experienced much of its initial contact with German history through historical fiction.⁹¹ In the second half of the nineteenth century, “life stories” of individuals and families became a popular mode of European realist fiction, most familiar to Germans through the translated novels of Charles Dickens and exemplified in German literature by the works of Gustav Freytag. In 1867, Freytag concluded work on his commercially successful cultural history of Germany, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, and soon after began writing the first volume of *Die Ahnen*, the fictional account of a German family’s convoluted history that vaguely connects several of its descendants across centuries, starting with the Middle Ages. While Freytag never claimed that *Die Ahnen* is historically accurate, the work does show the relative ease with which the author was able to cross the boundary separating historical fact and historical fiction through the method of telling the life stories of his characters. Maurer argues that scholarly historicism after 1850 recognized the popularity of this method and likewise adopted biography as its narrative mode.⁹² History thus served to mythologize the origins and the *telos* of the German *Volk*, for which reason a deliberately selective narrative of what was considered German history came to dominate public consciousness.

When the *Gartenlaube* entered the scene in 1853, it introduced yet another way in which the bourgeoisie could engage with history. In *Popularizing the Nation*, Kirsten Belgum explains how the family journal contributed to a unified sense of the nation by actively participating in the construction of a coherent and continuous national past: “The *Gartenlaube* helped invent an unbroken national tradition by celebrating historical rulers, warriors, and cultural figures as well as contemporaries. It presented its readers with a long line of great German heroes such as Hermann the Cheruskan, Luther, and Friedrich the Great. In doing so, it added to the ongoing process of constructing a myth of national origins and continuity.”⁹³ This manufacture of contemporary national identity from elements of the past is what Eric Hobsbawm has called the “invention of tradition.”⁹⁴ One of the core elements in this invented tradition was the myth of a common German language. Even in the nineteenth century, spoken German diverged as widely as the states that constituted the German Empire, and even though a standard written German existed, unity of German speech remained a wish at most.⁹⁵ When scholars such as Wilhelm Scherer and Otto Behagel claimed, despite all the evidence to the contrary, to have traced the roots of written High German to a form of Middle High German of the Hohenstaufen era, which allegedly formed the basis for all German dialects, they lent credence to the myth of a unified homogenous Germany.

The most significant event for the construction of a national historical narrative was the Franco-Prussian War. It combined elements of recent history with elements of history that already formed the public consciousness and seemed to confirm a teleological progression of history. Frank Becker claims that the imagining of the war as a *Nationalkrieg* was a form of reality construction that began as soon as the war was declared. The reason it was possible for the public to believe that a “German” army fought against the French was that from the start it

stylized the various armies joining forces on the German side as forming a “Nationalarmee.”⁹⁶ The way in which the public understood the war *as it was happening* would not have been possible without an already present matrix of signification that resulted from a preoccupation with the past common among the bourgeoisie of the German territories. Previous conflicts with France marked the French as the *Erbfeind* of the German nation and allowed Germans to place 1870 in a chain of instances of French aggression that opened up a variety of possibilities of interpreting the conflict as part of a long-standing tradition.⁹⁷

Of course, the obvious historical analogy to 1870, and the one that most writers exploited, was the Wars of Liberation. They served as an example of yet another war against France in which the German peoples rose up and fought as one nation. Most depictions of 1813-15 glossed over the fact that much of the fighting was done by Prussia and that Saxony had previously fought on the side of Napoleon. In the view of many nationalists the conflict of 1870-71 was the continuation and the just conclusion of a war that Germany had won but that nevertheless lingered in popular memory as a defeat due to the compromises and concessions made at the Congress of Vienna.⁹⁸ A multitude of histories documenting the Wars of Liberation produced material with which to construct the meaning of the Franco-Prussian War for the collective memory of Germans. Patriotic songs from 1813 were revived and appropriated for the new conflict with relative ease⁹⁹ and even the motto of 1813, “Der König rief und alle kamen,” regained the popularity that it originally carried.¹⁰⁰

Kelly argues, however, that in the years following the war the focus of public discourse shifted away from the role of William I in uniting the nation and toward the image of the “people in arms” who achieved victory by working together.¹⁰¹ The “drama about the destiny of the Germans”¹⁰² in postwar history books revolved more around the virtues of German soldiers than

the virtues of the Prussian king, and “always the focus is on Germans making the nation together, as a people, never on a Prussian-led coalition.”¹⁰³ Becker agrees that after the war the depiction of the nation building that occurred during the war relied on the *topoi* of “Integration, Ausgleich und Zusammenarbeit”¹⁰⁴ to show that the war had been a popular cooperative effort. The German state resulted from a national “Kraftanstrengung”¹⁰⁵ that already determined the eventual character of the state. Those who failed to secure a role for themselves in the war that formed the nation—no matter how small or symbolic that role might be—could not stake their claim in the nation later.¹⁰⁶ The bourgeoisie acquired its position in the new empire by holding up the image of the middle-class soldier, whose virtues won the war and united the nation.

The Influence of Bourgeois Culture on the Nation

The army occupied a special place in the self-image of Germans after the war. The German empire was proclaimed as a result of the victory over France in 1871, a victory that would not have been possible without the massive mobilization of soldiers across the German states. Therefore, in the rhetoric of opposition between France and Germany that prevailed even before the Franco-Prussian War, the German soldier could not occupy the same symbolic space as the French soldier. “Wenn die Armee die Nation vorwegnahm, wenn der Krieg die erste ‘Tathandlung’ Deutschlands war,” explains Becker, “dann müssen die Eigenschaften, die der Armee und ihrer Vorgehensweise beigelegt wurden, notwendigerweise auch auf die nationale Selbstidentifikation Einfluß nehmen.”¹⁰⁷ As a result, public discourse on the German soldier after the war imbued him with distinctly bourgeois traits, while the tropes such as the opposition between decadence and morality, which the bourgeoisie had used for decades to distinguish itself from the aristocracy, were applied to the French.¹⁰⁸ Remarkably, the despised aristocracy at

home became identified as first and foremost German (and thus generally “good”). Even thoroughly aristocratic figures such as William I and Helmuth von Moltke were characterized in bourgeois terms: accounts and anecdotes emphasized William’s diligence¹⁰⁹ and his hospitality,¹¹⁰ while they praised Moltke for his learnedness and scientifically analytical mind.¹¹¹

German soldiers themselves were described as paragons of bourgeois morality. The notion that a bourgeois who joined the war effort could become *solely* a soldier and abandon his roots would have been utterly alienating and did not correspond to the image that the public developed of the German army that fought the war.¹¹² The militaristic traits that the bourgeois had to adopt while in the army did not undermine his values because he did not wish to be primarily a soldier but to return home and continue his middle-class existence.¹¹³ This characterization stood in stark contrast to that of the French professional standing army, which was often depicted as a group of brutal ruffians who instilled fear even in their own population.¹¹⁴ The self-stylization by the Germans as a peace-loving nation, whose citizenry was forced to take up arms after being challenged by the aggressive French, disregards the fact that the majority of the armed forces were not mobilized citizens who had to leave their wives and children to go to war, but reserve troops (“Linienoldaten”) who were standing ready and needed to leave behind only their barracks.¹¹⁵ The myth of the bourgeois soldier demonstrates that the bourgeoisie was able to shape the history of the war *ex post facto* and thus develop a discourse in which it could claim to have contributed in large part to the formation of the empire. The appropriation of the army was, however, only one way in which the bourgeoisie secured its place in the German Empire.

Matthew Jefferies describes the German bourgeoisie (*Bürgertum*) as primarily a class identity that defined itself via juxtaposition with the proletariat and the aristocracy.¹¹⁶ If this

class identity came to stand in for a national identity, i.e., if German national identity came to be primarily defined by traits commonly associated with the bourgeoisie, then this was the result of the tremendous social influence of the bourgeoisie, which drew elements from both the proletariat and the aristocracy towards itself. On the one end of the social spectrum, upward-striving proletarians adopted traits of the *Kleinbürgertum* in an effort to improve their status; on the other end, aristocrats struggling to maintain their social standing began associating with members of the influential *Großbürgertum* in order to legitimize their position. The nationalist project based on a common culture that Herder proposed at the end of the eighteenth century gained momentum during the nineteenth century precisely because of the bourgeois idealization of and enthusiasm for a shared culture, i.e., a ‘high culture’ or culture with a capital ‘C.’¹¹⁷ The bourgeoisie increasingly identified itself with all of the elements that constitute this German culture. Thus the *Volksgeist* that it supposedly determined was necessarily a bourgeois *Volksgeist*.

Mass Media: The Disseminator of National Culture

I have alluded above to the significance of historical fiction in the promotion of collective national consciousness. In the first half of the nineteenth century, literature in the form of books was the primary mass medium because books were available to a relatively wide and rapidly expanding readership,¹¹⁸ who either purchased them or borrowed them from lending libraries. Especially in the second half of the century, however, as regularly published journals, newspapers, and magazines became much more affordable than books and their print quality began to improve, they also started to play a larger role in mass culture and to connect a wide variety of readers to a virtual, or imagined, community: “Week after week, a growing audience

shared access to common images and narratives of German history, world events, and modern life. Participation in this nationwide activity of reading the press made each reader a member of a new national community, a nation of readers.”¹¹⁹ Certainly one of the most influential of such publications was the *Gartenlaube*, which characterized itself as a primarily “German family magazine, a magazine for the German *Volk*.”¹²⁰ In other words, it acted simultaneously as both a mirror and a model for the German bourgeoisie, reflecting its values and ideals while presenting it with an ideal for which to strive.

If the bourgeoisie came to shape and dominate national discourse in the second half of the nineteenth century, then the *Gartenlaube* played no small part in that development: “By offering a distillation of the public and private worlds of the German liberal bourgeoisie, *Die Gartenlaube* came to both reflect and shape the processes of what Geoff Eley has described as the increasing *embourgeoisement* of German society.”¹²¹ Its founder, Ernst Keil, was consistently committed to promoting liberal principles¹²² and often used his journal “as a mouthpiece to profess his dedication to German unification,”¹²³ even though he had faced imprisonment for the liberal politics of the magazine he previously edited. The *Gartenlaube* paid tribute to liberal heroes from the first half of the century who had fought for unification and traced the progress toward unity in the three wars between 1864 and 1871.¹²⁴ The journal’s popularity spiked after unification, and by 1890 the *Gartenlaube* had a print run of 300,000.¹²⁵ Keil also believed in the importance of the family to the nation, which is why he did not want to exclude women and children from the journal’s target audience.¹²⁶ Thus, the *Gartenlaube* situated the bourgeois family both “as a legitimate space within which the processes of ideological conditioning and consensus building could be carried on, and as a familial and social model worthy of nation-wide emulation.”¹²⁷

The *Gartenlaube* presented history selectively and thus participated in the ongoing process of constructing a national mythology and the “invention of tradition.” However, it was not the only mass publication to do so, since during the Franco-Prussian War, for example, newspapers also generated national enthusiasm for the war. The title of the wartime newspaper “Der Deutsche Volkskrieg”¹²⁸ itself appealed to the emotional connections that this image evoked, perhaps most obviously the *Völkerschlacht* of 1813. Newspapers even borrowed staples of the culture of the *Bildungsbürger* for nationalistic purposes during the war. Schiller’s verses “Nichtswürdig ist die Nation, die nicht / Ihr alles freudig setzt an ihre Ehre” from *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* were repeated countless times in depictions of the war, as if the classic author had written it solely for this occasion.¹²⁹ Popular newspapers sensationalized the Bad Ems affair, and the intense outrage at the insult to the honor of the Prussian king occurred in part because of this exaggeration.¹³⁰ By selecting, recycling, and reshaping widely recognized cultural material in its pages, the popular press of the nineteenth century “became both a disseminator of national images and identities to a large national audience and a mechanism for that mass audience to participate in the process of constructing those images and identities.”¹³¹

The Function of National Symbols in Creating a Self-Image

National monuments were central to the spectacularization of the nation.¹³² The period between the French Revolution and the First World War was a golden age for monuments¹³³ because they were seen “as an important tool in the construction of identities.”¹³⁴ The most common kinds of monuments in the German Empire served to commemorate the wars between 1864 and 1871, to honor Kaiser William I, and to pay tribute to Bismarck after his death in 1898.¹³⁵ The 1890s, for example, saw some 400 new monuments dedicated to William I.¹³⁶

Jefferies interprets the first wave of monuments that commemorated the war as a glorification of Germany's new status as a nation rather than its victory over France. The most famous of these was the Niederwald Monument, which introduced the allegorical figure of Germania as the definitive representation of a unified Germany that in this case "did not seek confrontation with France," as Jefferies notes, since "[the statue's] gaze is directed towards her own land" and the sword she holds merely rests by her side.¹³⁷ Wehler offers a counter-interpretation. He sees the war memorials of this period, including the Niederwald Monument and the Hermann Monument, as an appeal to German militarism and a celebration of the victory over France, unlike the later monuments to William I and Bismarck, which addressed the public's sense of national identity.¹³⁸

Regardless of the intended meaning of national monuments, their proliferation during the last quarter of the nineteenth century indicates that Germans wished to express their national belonging in some meaningful way. Conventional depictions of the immediate postwar period usually make the claim that a wave of enthusiastic patriotism swept the nation, but in fact there was an absence of the officially recognized national symbols such as a flag, an anthem, or a national holiday¹³⁹ that typically serve as tools of patriotic expression. Confino suggests that a reason for this lack of national symbols was Bismarck's refusal to sanction them. Bismarck feared that they could imply "a transference of legitimacy from the dynasties to the people,"¹⁴⁰ and thus the Empire of the Bismarck era decided to shape national identity through other symbolic means such as monuments, architecture, museums, and universities.¹⁴¹ Monuments, and especially landscape monuments, thus acquired a meaning beyond mere places of identification with the nation: "George Mosse characterizes the monuments as churches, for what he terms the 'secular religion' of nationalism: 'sacred spaces' where the nation could worship

itself.”¹⁴² It is precisely because they represented such sacred spaces that monuments became sites not only for tourist pilgrimages but also for celebrations of national unity.

Masculinity as an Element of National Identity

As explained above, the Napoleonic Wars had a tremendous impact on Germans’ self-understanding and on the development of German nationality as an expression of unity against a common foe. However, the German experience of military defeat by the French army also generated a discourse on masculinity that emerged around 1805/06 and continued to shape the view of German masculinity throughout the nineteenth century. The military defeat was blamed on the weakness of both the bodies and the minds of not only German soldiers but of German men in general. Thus social commentators of the period argued that a new emphasis needed to be placed on the development of men’s faculties.

In an effort to explore the crisis of masculinity in the wake of the Wars of Liberation, Peter Uwe Hohendahl examines texts from this period that prescribe different ways of constructing a new German masculinity after the Prussian defeat in 1806. Because the reformers who wrote these texts saw the root of the problem in the soldiers’ lack of interest in the causes of the war, they believed that “a new kind of virility was needed, not only within the army, but also at the base of the social structure from which the state draws its soldiers. ... In short, a new type of manly subject was needed that was strongly motivated to act, but also demonstrated responsibility and self-restraint in his decision making.”¹⁴³

Among the various prescriptions for the construction of a new type of masculinity that Hohendahl examines, three stand out: masculinity by means of *Bildung*, which stresses the aspect of personal improvement and growth as the path to a mature and autonomous male

subject; the concept of masculinity as an ideal, epitomized by Friedrich Ehrenberg and Johann Christian Siede, whose writings tended to approach masculinity more as an issue of character and attitude rather than an array of dogmatic principles; and masculinity achieved by the physical development of the male body as a way of developing a sense of discipline, responsibility, and spiritual vigor.¹⁴⁴ Although these three prescriptions differ from each other in their focus, they do have one central element in common in their construction of the masculine subject: self-control. Ehrenberg, for example, identified the will as the actual essence of masculinity: “Vorzüglich soll sich die Stärke des Mannes in seinem Willen kund thun. Der Wille ist des Menschen eigentliches Selbst und sein königlicher Gebiether.”¹⁴⁵ Thus, the will—not reason—represents the true quality that defines a man and it is the source of his ability to exercise control over his drives and emotions in an autonomous fashion.

Siede, on the other hand, offers a much more practical guide to the ideal of masculinity. The crucial term for his understanding of a new masculinity is “solidity,” which is marked by balance and measuredness, i.e., an absence of extremes of any kind and exercise of utmost sincerity. As Hohendahl explains, “*Artigkeit* and *Höflichkeit* are characteristics of the solid man.”¹⁴⁶ The importance of self-control becomes apparent in the description of this model as well, but it is not so much control of the man’s drives that is at stake for Siede as it is his control of social situations and interactions. Politeness and courtesy are not necessary for the male subject himself but for his contact with others. This emphasis on the social indicates that Siede recognized masculinity as a performance in the public sphere that had to be mastered in order to convey authority.

If the Napoleonic Wars had indeed raised persistent doubts regarding the virility of German men, as suggested by Ehrenberg and Siede, the victory over France in 1871 certainly

soothed the sting of this traumatic experience and allowed Germans to perceive themselves differently with regard to their masculine prowess. The preceding introduction has described the development of German national consciousness over the course of the nineteenth century and has explained the influence of unification on the perception of Germany as a nation. The following chapters seek to understand how this development of a national identity—the awareness of belonging to a distinct and persisting entity with definitively recognizable characteristics—contributed to the notion that certain expressions of masculinity formed the “German character,” i.e., the notion that there was a particular *German* masculinity.

As Ute Frevert recognizes in her study “*Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann*,” the intellectual perception that masculinity was in some ways socially constructed that had continued to inform writers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries gave way over the subsequent decades to a view that increasingly came to regard masculine traits as biologically determined. She notes that entries in German lexicons starting as early as 1830 designate men’s fertility and their ability to procreate as the basis for both mental and physical abilities, including their stronger will as compared to women, their more powerful musculature, and their more developed courageousness.¹⁴⁷ Judith Butler and other gender theorists have made clear, however, that gender is never simply natural fact, regardless of how it is defined within the prevailing discourse of a historical period. Rather, this perceived naturalness is “constituted through discursively constrained performative acts that produce the body through and within the categories of sex.”¹⁴⁸ Therefore, whenever the term “masculinity” appears as a gender category in this study, its ties to the biologicistic definitions within the gender discourses of the nineteenth century are acknowledged implicitly, but this link is also understood as a social construct and is treated as such in the analyses of individual works investigated here, many of which, in fact, also

call into question the biologic determination of gender by presenting masculinity as a quality that must be acquired.

This investigation focuses roughly on the interval between 1870 and 1890, which can be described as the formative period of the German Empire. Characterized by a short economic boom and Bismarck's attempt to gain control over social formations within the empire—for example, by means of a *Kulturkampf* that limited the cultural and financial power of the Catholic Church—it is a time of emphasis on domestic policy when the government and the population turned inward in an effort to establish common ground among the newly unified regions. The ascension of William II to the German throne in 1888 and, more importantly, the dismissal of Bismarck from the German chancellorship in 1890 reflected a change in Germany's political climate that also signaled the end of the empire's infancy. When the new emperor shifted his attention to foreign policy and the acquisition of colonies abroad, he implied that Germany no longer needed to “find itself” and was ready to participate more confidently on the world stage. Therefore, my focus on the initial twenty years of the German Empire's history means to capture national hopes, fears, and self-understanding as they were reflected in the literary output of this formative period.

I begin in chapter one with an examination of *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingssöhne* by Louise von François, *Colberg, Er soll dein Herr sein*, and *Das Glück von Rothenburg* by Paul Heyse, and *Ein Held der Feder* and *Am Altar* by E. Werner. While each of these writers addressed a slightly different readership, they were all widely read and their works therefore can be understood as a reflection of popular taste in this period. My analyses of these six works demonstrate how writers in the 1870s and 1880s were able to integrate into their texts the notions of masculinity put forth by, among others, Ehrenberg and Siede, combining the qualities of a

strong will, physical prowess, and spiritual or cultural vigor to shape their male characters. These literary representations of German men implicitly attribute the foundation of the unified state to the strength of German masculinity and thereby create an image of German manhood that answers the fears of early-nineteenth-century texts lamenting a general weakness of the male population and thus the vulnerability of the nation.

In the following chapter, the male figures in Theodor Fontane's *Ellernklipp* and *Mathilde Möhring*, Wilhelm Raabe's *Das Odfeld* and *Wunnigel*, and Theodor Storm's *Draußen im Heidedorf* and *Hans und Heinz Kirch* are shown to be countertypes to the German masculine stereotypes observed in chapter one. While Fontane, Raabe, and Storm remain ambivalent in their support or subversion of hegemonic models of masculinity in these texts, it is quite clear that the stereotype does not constitute for them the sole acceptable model of masculine behavior for German men. Using Walter Erhart's concept of masculine narratives, I show that even those characters that adhere to that model are often depicted as incapable of continuing their genealogical line or as meeting the same fate as the characters that do not adhere to it. The writers in this group thus problematize the notion that there is one "proper" type of German masculinity. Chapter three offers a renewed look at a work by Fontane, *Cécile*, and two by Storm, *Eine Halligfahrt* and *Bötjer Basch*. It reevaluates these works as regional literature that presents the characters' attainment of masculinity as intimately tied to their allegiance with one particular region within the empire. The texts thus subvert the idea of a single prevailing German masculinity and instead project a multiplicity of masculinities in Imperial Germany. At the same time they do not necessarily undermine the hegemonic stereotype, but they highlight the significance of *Heimat* as defined by local landscape and geography for the construction of gender identity.

Structured thematically, this study first presents a noticeably idealized form of German masculinity that one can observe in popular texts around the time of German unification, then offers a look at works depicting a countervailing image of masculinity in Imperial Germany that questions this ideal, and ends with the claim that the perceptions of masculinity in the empire were indeed complex and did not converge in one specific image. The grouping of the authors in chapters one and two is not primarily one of literary status, i.e., the chapters do not constitute a comparison of works that German studies has derisively termed *Trivialliteratur* with those from the German literary canon.¹⁴⁹ Instead, literary texts, whatever their status and quality, are regarded here as a reflection of the currents that shape the social reality of their time. A text that experienced commercial success at the time of its publication, regardless of its present-day status, may convey more directly the themes that resonated with its contemporary readership. Thus, the texts analyzed in each chapter were chosen according to the common themes they explore or the similar views they express. As cultural artifacts, they allow the present-day scholar to parse a literary mosaic of German masculinity in the German Empire.

Notes:

1. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. and ext. ed. (London; New York: Verso, 1991), 6.
2. Karen Hagemann, "Nation, Militär und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens: Eine Einführung," in *"Männlicher Muth und Teutsche Ehre": Nation, Militär und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002), 17.
3. Anderson, 22.
4. Kirsten Belgum, *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998).
5. Brent O. Peterson, *History, Fiction and Germany: Writing the Nineteenth-Century Nation* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2005).
6. Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
7. Arne Koch, *Between National Fantasies and Regional Realities: The Paradox of Identity in Nineteenth-Century German Literature* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006).
8. Patricia Herminhouse and Magda Mueller, *Gender and Germanness: Cultural Productions of Nation* (Providence, RI: Berghahn Books, 1997).
9. Jennifer Askey, "The National Family: Allegory and Femininity in a *Festspiel* from 1880," *Women in German Yearbook* 24 (2008): 49-70.
10. Ute Frevert, *"Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann": Geschlechter-Differenzen in der Moderne* (Munich: Beck, 1995).
11. Walter Erhart, *Familienmänner: Über den literarischen Ursprung moderner Männlichkeit* (Munich: W. Fink, 2001).
12. David S. Johnson, "The Ironies of Degeneration: The Dilemmas of Bourgeois Masculinity in Theodor Fontane's *Frau Jenny Treibel* and *Mathilde Möhring*," *Monatshefte* 102, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 147-61.
13. James J. Sheehan, "What is German History? Reflections on the Role of the *Nation* in German History and Historiography," *Journal of Modern History* 53 (1981): 2.
14. *Ibid.*, 6.
15. *Ibid.*, 7.
16. *Ibid.*, 8.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, 9.
20. *Ibid.*, 14.
21. Matthew Jefferies, *Imperial Culture in Germany, 1871-1918* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 93.
22. Brent O. Peterson, *History, Fiction and Germany: Writing the Nineteenth-Century Nation* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2005), 74.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*, 75.
25. *Ibid.*, 94.
26. In fact, the amorous adventures of Frederick the Great were quite a popular subject during this period. Peterson, 119.
27. *Ibid.*, 120-21.
28. Alfred Kelly, "The Franco-Prussian War and Unification in German History Schoolbooks," in *1870/71-1989/90: German Unifications and the Change of Literary Discourse*, ed. Walter Pape (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1993), 46.
29. Hans Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte: Von der „deutschen Doppelrevolution“ bis zum Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs, 1849-1914* (Munich: Beck, 1995), 951.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*, 953.
32. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Das deutsche Kaiserreich, 1871-1918* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 108.
33. *Ibid.*, 134-35.
34. Confino, 4.
35. Sheehan, 17.

36. Peterson, 11.
37. Ibid., 70-71.
38. Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 941-42.
39. Ibid., 951.
40. Ibid., 952.
41. Matthew Fitzpatrick, "Narrating Empire: *Die Gartenlaube* and Germany's Nineteenth-Century Liberal Expansionism," *German Studies Review* 30.1 (Feb. 2007): 101.
42. Ibid., 102.
43. Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 939-40.
44. Frank Becker, *Bilder von Krieg und Nation* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2001), 292.
45. Ibid., 297-99.
46. Ibid., 299.
47. Ibid., 305.
48. Ibid.
49. Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 949.
50. Ibid., 948.
51. Ibid., 946.
52. Ibid., 947.
53. David Blackbourn, *The Long Nineteenth Century* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 426.
54. Ibid., 425.
55. Ibid., 280.
56. Ibid., 281-82.
57. Ibid., 282.
58. Confino, 98.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., 103.
61. Jefferies, 43.
62. Volker R. Berghahn, *Imperial Germany, 1871-1918: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics* (New York: Berghahn, 2005), 79.
63. Kelly, 37-38.
64. Berghahn, 82.
65. Jennifer Askey, "The National Family: Allegory and Femininity in a *Festspiel* from 1880," *Women in German Yearbook* 24 (2008): 53.
66. Kelly, 44.
67. Ibid., 38.
68. Ibid., 43.
69. Berghahn, 82.
70. Kelly, 39.
71. Berghahn, 84.
72. Wehler, *Das deutsche Kaiserreich*, 129.
73. Kelly, 45.
74. Ibid., 51.
75. Ibid., 59.
76. Ibid., 42-43.
77. Ibid., 43.
78. Berghahn, 81.
79. Ibid., 85.
80. Ibid.
81. Jefferies, 101.
82. Peterson, 73.
83. Kathrin Maurer, "Literary Crossings: The Representation of Nation in Academic Historiography and Historical Prose in Nineteenth-Century Germany," *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 29, no. 4 (Dec 2007): 359.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid., 361.

87. Ibid., 362.
88. Ibid., 363.
89. Ibid.
90. Peterson, 9.
91. Ibid., 72.
92. Maurer, 364.
93. Kirsten Belgum, *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), xxi.
94. Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.
95. Peterson, 10.
96. Becker, 293.
97. Ibid., 306-07.
98. Ibid., 309.
99. Ibid., 310-11.
100. Ibid., 319-20.
101. Kelly, 49-50.
102. Ibid., 58.
103. Ibid.
104. Becker, 295.
105. Ibid., 294.
106. Ibid.
107. Ibid., 342.
108. Ibid., 344.
109. Ibid., 345.
110. Ibid., 346.
111. Ibid., 347.
112. Ibid., 351.
113. Ibid., 353.
114. Ibid., 354.
115. Ibid., 356.
116. Jefferies, 30.
117. Ibid.
118. Blackburn, 128.
119. Belgum, xix.
120. Ibid., xiii.
121. Fitzpatrick, 98.
122. Ibid.
123. Belgum, xiv.
124. Ibid.
125. Peter Gay, "Experiment in Denial: A Reading of the *Gartenlaube* in the Year 1890," in *Traditions of Experiment from the Enlightenment to the Present*, eds. Nancy Kaiser and David E. Wellberry (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 148.
126. Belgum, xv.
127. Fitzpatrick, 98.
128. Becker, 300.
129. Ibid., 303.
130. Ibid., 304.
131. Belgum, xix.
132. Ibid., 84.
133. Jefferies, 61.
134. Ibid., 62.
135. Ibid.
136. Ibid., 64.
137. Ibid., 62.

138. Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, 957-58.
139. *Ibid.*, 957.
140. Confino, 31.
141. *Ibid.*
142. Jefferies, 65.
143. Peter Uwe Hohendahl, "The New Man: Theories of Masculinity around 1800," *Goethe Yearbook* 15 (2008): 187.
144. *Ibid.*, 188.
145. Friedrich Ehrenberg, *Der Charakter und die Bestimmung des Mannes* (Leipzig: Büschler, 1808), 18, quoted in Hohendahl, 191.
146. *Ibid.*, 194.
147. Ute Frevert, "*Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann*": *Geschlechter-Differenzen in der Moderne* (Munich: Beck, 1995), 31.
148. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), x.
149. It would be particularly difficult in the first place to determine the status of someone like Heyse in such terms, since he fell into relative obscurity after the First World War despite having been honored with the Nobel Prize for Literature.

Chapter One: Representations of Normative Masculinity in the Works of Louise von François, Paul Heyse, and E. Werner

After witnessing the failure of the 1848 revolution to bring about a unified democratic German government and the increased struggle between Austria and Prussia to assert and consolidate their power over other German states in the 1850s and 1860s, both writers as well as intellectuals became interested in determining the extent of the German nation. After Prussia's dispute with Austria over Schleswig-Holstein escalated in the 1860s, the "Greater German" solution to the German question seemed ever less likely, and for many observers Prussia emerged as the dominant force among German states and as the vanguard of a unified Germany. The Battle of Königgrätz (1866), the decisive clash in the Austro-Prussian War, once and for all paved the way for a "Lesser German" solution and thus also sparked the imagination of those who had anticipated some form of unification since the early nineteenth century. A close examination of popular literature published in the decade leading up to the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, as well as in the decade following it, provides insight into how these works intervened in the discourses that shaped public understanding of the political and social developments of a tumultuous historical period and of a German community that had not existed as such before this time.

As Kirsten Belgum demonstrates in her influential study of the family magazine *Die Gartenlaube*, popular print media played a key role in promoting the idea of the nation and in providing readers with a library of symbols that formed a basis for national identification. Belgum sees in the *Gartenlaube* "a unifying disseminator of ideas and an index of transregional, that is, national interests"¹ because its circulation extended even beyond those regions that were eventually incorporated in the German Empire and because the magazine therefore brought together a wide range of audiences. The same claim can be made for other forms of print media

that enjoyed wide circulation, including books. The *Gartenlaube* perhaps distinguished itself from some other publications, even as early as 1861, through its focus on discussions pertaining to German unity, thus suggesting that the editorial staff “saw this discussion of the nation as the key to [the magazine’s] increasing popularity.”² Of course, the editor, Ernst Keil, was a national liberal and had made clear his intentions for the *Gartenlaube* with his initial greeting to its readers in the first issue. By addressing them as people “in the German land,”³ i.e., by speaking of Germany as one land rather than a conglomeration of lands, he revealed his dedication to the cause of a unified Germany. Keil recognized that “identification with the nation was a way of transcending conflicting and competing identities,”⁴ especially at a time of shifting alliances that made the future of a German state uncertain. In his appeal to a uniform Germanness, Keil was indeed merely participating in a larger trend among his contemporaries of imagining a national identity based on the notion of a shared past that Eric Hobsbawm has called an “invented tradition.”⁵

Die Gartenlaube was certainly not the sole publication in the second half of the nineteenth century fashioning a national identity for its readers. Roman Lach explains that while the image of Germans as the “edlen Wilden Europas” had a long-standing tradition, the notion that there was a direct ancestral connection between modern German society and the barbarian tribes of antiquity, which supposedly influenced the essence and character of the entire people, was an invention of the nineteenth century.⁶ According to Lach, such an understanding of German history was facilitated by Johann Joachim Winckelmann’s extensive exploration of ancient Greek history and culture, insofar as it allowed nineteenth-century Germans to reimagine classical antiquity in German form and to refer to the ancient Germanic tribes as their ancestors.⁷ The establishment of this imagined common history made it possible, in turn, to imagine a

historical continuity of the German people that treated the existence of this community as a given and that saw a unified Germany as its ultimate goal. This goal would finally become a reality in the final third of the nineteenth century.

Gustav Freytag, one of the most popular German realist authors of the second half of the nineteenth century, is probably most famous for representations of Germany throughout the ages. First, in his cultural history entitled *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit* (1859-1867), Freytag depicted German history by quoting a variety of sources, including fiction, thus blurring the line between historical fact and imagination. Following German unification, he published a novel cycle entitled *Die Ahnen* (1872-1880), in which he portrayed the fate of a dispersed German family starting with the Germanic tribes and concluding with the 1848 revolution. Freytag thus covers roughly 1,500 years of history in six volumes and embeds his narrative within significant cultural events, once again weaving invented stories into the fabric of history.

By presenting the persistence and development of a German family over hundreds of years, Freytag makes his “Ideologie geschichtsübergreifender deutscher Kontinuität”⁸ explicit and traces the roots of his society, and thus also the recent unification, to its ancient ancestors, whom he situates in the forests of Thuringia. As Elystan Griffiths argues, however, Freytag’s objective is not to use history as a model for shaping the future of the nation. Instead, the more vital message of the *Ahnen* cycle is that its various generations of protagonists “liberate themselves progressively from the weight of family history, and increasingly espouse the patriotic cause,” putting aside their own desires for the sake of a greater national good, e.g., by fighting in the Wars of Liberation or taking part in the 1848 revolution.⁹ Summarizing Nipperdey’s evaluation of *Die Ahnen*, Lynne Tatlock therefore regards the cycle not as Freytag’s comment on “the rise of the German national state per se but on the development of the German people,”¹⁰ because it

is the German people that matures over the course of the six volumes in such a way as to make the emergence of a state possible. Indeed, emergence is the appropriate term to use within the context of Freytag's novel because, according to Griffiths, it describes the means by which Germany can become a state "as an organic process of change under the great forces of history, rather than as an imposition by a single state, class or individual."¹¹ This depiction of German nationhood as a form of collective self-realization also coincides with the rise of the middle classes in the nineteenth century, whom Freytag had already made the focus of his *Bilder* and now again portrayed as "all that was vital and productive in German society."¹² Freytag's historical fiction represents a way of legitimizing the formation of a state, the existence of which had limited historical grounding. Furthermore, by tying the rise of Germany to that of the bourgeoisie, Freytag was able to portray a direct link between the nation-state and the *Volk* and thus to suggest that a unified German state was the inevitable outcome of a teleological development.

Gustav Freytag's literary output "in service" of the nation followed, of course, the general direction of German fiction that between 1850 and 1871 included roughly 500 novels dealing in some way with German history and issues of national unification.¹³ After the failed democratic revolution of 1848, historical fiction gave national liberal authors a means of promoting the cause of a unified Germany by depicting events that had already happened and thereby reducing the risk of political consequences for themselves. Frequently in this period writers whose ideals did not particularly align with the social policies of the Prussian state were ready in their fiction to rally the other German states under the Prussian banner because they saw Prussia as the sole political force with enough power and influence to bring about unification. A common strategy in portraying Prussian leadership as capable of uniting Germans was to draw

on the Wars of Liberation (1813-15), in which Prussia played a pivotal role in defeating Napoleon's forces by calling on the various German states to stand together in the fight. Even though the portrayal of the events in fiction was not always historically accurate, it was highly effective in evoking pathos. Although a unification of the German states was in theory a pacifistic cause, it was championed by literature that employed military imagery and thus produced heroes whose mettle was proved by means of armed conflict. As I will show, however, the militaristic masculine ideal for which these heroes came to stand was defined by the notion of a citizen soldier, whose character reflected the values of the bourgeoisie rather than the professional, and traditionally aristocratic, military.

The works of Gustav Freytag are but one example of German authors attempting to define Germanness by viewing current events through the lens of history. In this chapter, I will examine texts by writers whose popularity peaked in the second half of the nineteenth century, with the aim of establishing common ground between their representations of German national identity. Louise von François, Paul Heyse, and E. Werner all stand for different modes of writing. While they address different types of audiences, in their depiction of everyday Germans and heroes—and sometimes, these two categories intersect—they endow their characters with noticeably similar traits and provide their predominantly male protagonists with similar types of challenges. In all of the texts under scrutiny here the protagonists' overcoming of these challenges results in the strengthened bonds of a community usually defined as German and in the reinforcement of heteronormative gender roles, usually focused on the reinvigoration of previously compromised masculinity. The rise of a German state thus stands in symbolic relation to the image of an assertive and virtuous masculine figure who is often also identified, at least implicitly, as bourgeois.

“Ein Volk in Waffen”: Pre-Unification Depictions of German Masculinity

The novel *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingsöhne* by Louise von François and the drama *Colberg* by Paul Heyse participate in the discourse of militaristic masculinity by mythologizing the events of the Wars of Liberation. These works offer examples of a revitalized Germany united by an armed conflict and they both support the Prussian perspective. In the case of François, who came from a Saxon family and spent most of her life in Saxony, scholars have tried to explain her penchant for the glorification of military figures by examining her biography. Linda Kraus Worley notes that François had idolized her father, a Saxon officer who fought against Napoleon, and regarded him as the “most superlative of fathers,” even though he died while she was still a baby.¹⁴ In addition, Barbara Burns also points to François’s uncle Karl, who became her guardian following the death of her parents and whose army code “represented a substantial formative element of François’s world view,” as another hero-figure in her life.¹⁵ The vicinity of her native Weißenfels could look back on a tumultuous history,¹⁶ but especially the devastating consequences of the Wars of Liberation for her homeland provided François with the best argument for putting an end to the “Vielstaaterei” by means of unification.¹⁷

Her idolization of soldier heroes, on the one hand, and the “resonances” she recognized “between the ‘wars of liberation’ and [her] own family history,”¹⁸ on the other, are therefore usually regarded as the roots of her support of a Prussian-led unified Germany. Schuch stresses nevertheless that François should not be considered a Prussian patriot and that she spoke out against “kriegerische, politische Lösungen.”¹⁹ Burns, however, observes that her works seem to concede “the necessity of conflict to achieve certain political aims.”²⁰ This paradox is perhaps resolved by Thomas Fox, who sees in François’s works the construction of the myth of a heroic

age and of regeneration, observing that these are steps constituting the process of forming a nation in the shape of an imagined community.²¹ Although her biography may have influenced the subject matter and characters of her works, François's texts also should be regarded within the literary context of their time and as products of contemporary historical and cultural developments.

Like François, Paul Heyse, for example, also "agreed that Prussian leadership was a prerequisite for unification,"²² which is why the seemingly Prussian-patriotic stance he displays in his plays of the 1860s, *Hans Lange* and *Colberg*, must be read with an awareness of his national liberal intention. Heyse wanted to reach a wider audience than he had previously been able to do with his so-called "Bavarian" plays, and with these two works focusing on Prussian history he was finally able to capture "the national mood and achieve[] major success as a patriotic dramatist throughout the whole of Germany."²³ The fact that *Hans Lange* and *Colberg* were regularly performed and were more successful than any of Heyse's other dramas²⁴ suggests that audiences identified Prussia as more representative of the national idea than Bavaria. Heyse's choice of the Wars of Liberation as his subject for *Colberg* seems farsighted in retrospect, but at the time of its debut it met with resistance even from Prussian officials at the royal theater in Berlin, who considered its anti-French tone too antagonistic in 1865.²⁵

It is ironic that although both François's and Heyse's works were intended to inspire German unification, they reached the zenith of their popularity only after 1871. *Zwillingssöhne* was not even published until 1872, even though François had been working on it for over a decade.²⁶ Heyse had enjoyed success with *Colberg* before 1870, but the onset of the Franco-Prussian War endowed the drama with new significance and the war's outcome elevated it into the "corpus of cultural artefacts, which included works by Goethe, Schiller, and Wagner."²⁷ The

drama became influential enough to receive the honor of being claimed by William II as one of his favorite stage pieces.²⁸ Heyse himself “in no way wanted to foster sentiment against France or its culture” and was appalled that *Colberg* was coopted by chauvinists.²⁹ Disappointed by the actual results of the Prussian-led unification of Germany, he “came to view Prussia as part of the problem” rather than Germany’s salvation,³⁰ and stopped writing patriotic literature altogether.³¹

In the light of German unification, François’s novel also received a different reception from what it would have before 1870. She had been publishing short fiction pieces since the mid-1850s but was only moderately known until the publication of her novels, starting in the 1870s. These works brought her acclaim among literary elites, and even as late as 1955 *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingssöhne* was ranked by Emil Staiger among works of authors such as Raabe and Storm.³² Some critics around the turn of the century considered her work on par with that of major German women writers, such as Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach and Annette von Droste-Hülshoff,³³ and she was highly esteemed among her contemporaries in the last quarter of the nineteenth century as well.³⁴

The critical success François enjoyed well into the twentieth century and her rise to fame were no doubt catalyzed by the accolade she received from Gustav Freytag for her first novel, *Die letzte Reckenburgerin*. Freytag’s oft-quoted acknowledgement of François as a “Dichterin von Gottes Gnaden”³⁵ placed her in the same tier as Freytag himself, especially because he recognized in her writing qualities, “die sonst wohl der Feder einer Frau nicht die behaglichsten Probleme darbieten,”³⁶ and which are therefore to be understood as masculine. *Die letzte Reckenburgerin*, which was serialized in the *Deutsche Romanzeitung* in 1870, had remained relatively obscure until Freytag’s 1872 review³⁷ and now constitutes François’s legacy. *Zwillingssöhne* was published in 1872, no doubt in an attempt to capitalize on François’s newly

gained fame, and while it was not as commercially successful as her first novel, it did reach two editions by 1891.³⁸

It is telling that Freytag praised François's writing, since there are elements in *Zwillingsöhne* that are certainly reminiscent of elements of his *Ahnen* cycle, and particularly of volume 6, *Aus einer kleinen Stadt*. The novel begins around 1780 and is set in Heidewinkel in Saxony. It is told from the point of view of Gottfried Bleibtreu, who grew up as the playmate of Erdmuthe von Fels and is now the pastor in her municipality. Erdmuthe marries Baron de Roc and gives birth to twins who are near polar opposites in their essence and character. The influence of their father's French heritage is pronounced in Raul, who is presented as a vivacious hothead. He would have joined the French army if Baron de Roc had not forced him to join the Elector of Saxony's guard. When Saxony joins the Confederation of the Rhine, Raul's wish is granted after all. Herrmann, on the other hand, is reserved and studious. He volunteers to fight in the War of the Fourth Coalition under his father's command, but he is badly injured at the Battle of Saalfeld while Baron de Roc is killed. After his convalescence, Herrmann completes his course of studies in law and history, while Raul becomes increasingly estranged from his family when he fully embraces his French heritage during his service in Napoleon's army.

By chance, Herrmann meets the Polish wife of a French officer at a local inn, and because she is very ill and soon dies, Herrmann and Erdmuthe decide to make her teenage daughter, Liska, their ward. Liska is careless and superficial, but her personality charms Herrmann, and after he gets to know her better, he decides to ask for her hand in marriage. Shortly thereafter, he leaves for battle in East Prussia. Meanwhile, Raul has gone missing after Napoleon's failed Russian campaign and all reports indicate that he is dead. During Herrmann's absence, however, Raul returns to the surprise and relief of his friends and family, and especially

Liska is glad to meet her new “brother,” whose personality matches her own more so than does Herrmann’s. Upon his return from East Prussia, Herrmann recognizes that the relationship between Raul and Liska has become much closer than that of brother and sister, and he demands that Liska marry Raul instead of him. Soon after the short wedding ceremony, the brothers must fight on opposite sides at the 1813 Battle of Dennewitz. Fatally wounded, Raul is brought to his mother’s house, where he takes his last gasping breath, and within a few days Liska leaves Erdmuthe and Herrmann to return to her native Provence and live out her life as a nun.

As soon as François introduces the tension between the brothers for the first time, it is evident that their relationship performs an allegorical function. Ronald Speirs explains that the use of the term *Bruder* transformed around 1870-71 and shifted “away from its former associations with democratic, republican, even universal brotherhood to the nationalist, patriotic word-field.”³⁹ Given that François had been working on *Zwillingssöhne* for over a decade prior to its publication, the associations that she had with the term at the time were likely to be slightly different. Belgum notes that the term “Bruderkrieg” figured largely into the presentation of the Austro-Prussian War in the *Gartenlaube*, which was trying to present it as a “war between brothers.”⁴⁰ In an article examining poetry in the *Gartenlaube* of the pre-unification period, Regina Hartmann also finds that the terminology of the Austro-Prussian War was still in use and that poets were designating it as a “Bruderschlacht” as late as 1868.⁴¹ It is also possible that François’s own family history played into her choice of presenting two brothers on different sides of a conflict, since her uncle Karl had fought in the Napoleonic Wars on the Russian side, knowing that his brother was in the Saxon army.⁴²

Therefore, if François wrote *Zwillingssöhne* as a warning against internal conflict among German states, her intention was probably understood quite differently at the time of its

publication in 1872. Hartmann observes that the national pathos of the poetry written about the Austro-Prussian War transformed into nationalistic imagery in the context of the Franco-Prussian War.⁴³ It is quite possible that the novel's post-unification readership recognized as the most prominent aspect of the dichotomy between the German-coded Herrmann and the French-coded Raul the superiority of Germany over France, rather than the common origins of the two brothers.

François extends the metaphor of the national family by incorporating into it Herrmann's and Raul's parents, especially their mother Erdmuthe. She introduces the novel with a tour of the region around Heidewinkel, narrated by the pastor Gottfried Bleibtreu, in which the reader is initially treated to a rather bleak view of the brothers' homeland. Bleibtreu first describes the perception that travelers might have of the region, using images such as "Einöde," "grau in grau," and "halbverfaulte[] Strohdächer[]" (6) to evoke its harshness and inaccessibility. He follows this superficial first impression of the surroundings, however, with a more favorable and somewhat romanticized view that the natives have of their land, recalling the "Wonneschauer" (7) that he experienced upon his return after the first prolonged absence from home, when the buzzing of insects was music to his ears and the fragrance of pines that envelops the area was to him as sweet as the aroma of oranges (8).

François's choice to introduce the setting of her novel in these terms reveals the importance of the role that the native soil plays in fostering feelings for the *Heimat*. Freytag also used this strategy of celebrating "the Germanic landscape and regional heritage of a small, specific part of Germany" in *Die Ahnen*, where Thuringia is a metonymic representation of the nation.⁴⁴ The significance of the native soil is also reflected in the name Erdmuthe, in which the first half obviously derives from the word *Erde*, meaning earth or soil, and evokes images of both shelter and nourishment. The second half, "-muthe," calls to mind two possible

associations. The first association is that of *Mut*, the old Germanic word most commonly meaning “courage,”⁴⁵ which in this context implies the character trait that will allow Germans to endure Napoleon’s occupation. The second association is that of *Mutter*, and in conjunction with the first syllable it highlights François’s allegorical depiction of *Heimat* as a mother who gives birth to the native sons Herrmann and Raul.

In the portrayal of Erdmuthe’s marriage to Baron Raul de Roc, François further builds on the idea of nation as family. When Erdmuthe’s father declares his approval of the marriage, he emphasizes the positive qualities that each party brings to the union and looks forward to the day, “wo allesamt, einzelne und Völker, sich als eine große Familie zum Segen vereinen” (70), thus suggesting that they are all meant to be one *Volk*. De Roc’s French heritage is initially regarded as an enrichment of the Saxon strain, but François takes pains to make clear his full assimilation into the Saxon clan. While she describes de Roc’s passion and chivalrous gallantry as leftover traits from his southern heritage, François praises his “Treue und unerschütterliches Vertrauen” (72) as marital virtues he must have soaked up in the north. To make his transformation into a Saxon complete, the Baron even changes his name to Roc von Fels (73), and with the redundancy of this French-German affirmation of strength and solidity François drives home the point of the amalgam of the two cultures.

The peace that was meant to be forged by the union of Erdmuthe and Roc is eventually betrayed by their son Raul. Although he expresses doubt as to the existence of a power that could “sich zwischen Herzen drängen, welche die Mutterliebe eint” (154), his fascination with his French heritage drives him away from the family. Bleibtreu remarks critically, “er erkor sich ein Heimatsland wie ein schönes Weib” (150), and means to say that one has no choice in the matter. *Heimat* is like a family that one loves unconditionally: “wir liebten das unsere

[Heimatsland] ohne Wahl, wie einer den Vater liebt, welchen Gott ihm gegeben hat" (150).

Raul's betrayal of the allegorical national family becomes evident when his attempt to attack his brother fails and he instead injures Erdmuthé's arm (387). In symbolic fashion, François shows in this scene that a war between brothers merely inflicts damage upon the *Heimat*.

While the brothers certainly have an allegorical function in representing both the national family and the Saxon split between loyalties to France and Germany, Bland argues that François's depiction of the characters goes beyond this "'functional' nature" because the brothers act in ways that mark them as individuals.⁴⁶ While I agree with Bland's assessment, I would like to expand on her rather brief discussion of the differences in notions of masculinity that the behavior of the two characters brings to the fore. Although François strives to deliver a balanced depiction of Raul and refrains from designating him as the "evil" brother, it is ultimately his assertion of a French-coded masculinity that leads to his death and thus indicates his inferiority in comparison to Herrmann's German-coded masculine traits.

By introducing the twins as almost polar opposites of each other, François also sets up an opposition between French and German characteristics as expressed in a one-to-one contrast between Raul and Herrmann: Raul is quick in his development, while Herrmann develops slowly but more confidently (76-77). Raul is loud and lively; Herrmann is quiet and observant (77). Raul has a tendency toward vanity, while Herrmann bristles at the sight of a hairbrush (78) and Raul has an impetus to learn many things superficially, while Herrmann remains on one subject until he has thoroughly understood it (78). According to Karen Hagemann, such stark contrast in comparisons of the German and French national character was common during the Napoleonic Wars.⁴⁷ François's portrayal of a German character, however, that is quiet, unassuming, and slow to develop is also typical of the nineteenth-century in general. Speirs points out that this

“negative national self-image ... had been propagated by numerous writers from the *Vormärz* period ... at the latest,” who saw Germans as slow, overly patient over-thinkers and *Schlafmützen* unable to stop others from taking advantage of them.⁴⁸

François endows Herrmann with this quality of the *deutsche Michel*, making him subject to a certain indifferent “Lässigkeit” (95) that prevents him from developing as quickly as his brother, thus mirroring Germany’s perceived social and political backwardness as compared to France at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In fact, Raul openly voices his contempt of the “germanische[] Phlegma[] gegenüber dem zündenden Genius der Zeit” (153-54). At the same time, however, François paints this Germanic trait as a positive one. As Herrmann’s health deteriorates parallel to Prussia’s defeat in the War of the Fourth Coalition and he becomes weaker by the day, the family friend and physician Albrecht Bär claims that this seeming weakness is in truth his strength: “Wenn der große Jagdherr droben zum letzten Halali zusammenblasen lassen wird, bleibt drunten einer zurück, der den Spektakel verschnarcht, und dieser zweite Adam ist ein deutscher Mensch” (108-09). In other words, the Germans’ *Schlafmützigkeit* will allow them to survive even the End of Days and the new man who will then rebuild society will be German.

This calm, composed, and rational streak that shapes German masculinity naturally carries over into the novel’s representation of matters of love as well. While Herrmann is preparing for renewed hostilities in East Prussia, Bleibtreu delivers to him news from home and mentions Raul’s and Liska’s budding friendship. To Bleibtreu’s surprise, Herrmann accepts the news without suspicion or jealousy and is instead glad to hear that his brother’s convalescence is expedited by his fiancée’s joyful spirit (324). Rather than suggesting a lack of love for Liska, Herrmann’s relatively cool acceptance of his brother’s obvious advances toward his bride

conveys that he is simply confident enough not to consider Raul a threat. Herrmann's reaction, however, leads Raul to question whether Germans are capable of love at all, to which Bleibtreu replies that to Germans love is defined by life-long devotion and loyalty, rather than wild passion (334). He later contrasts this kind of loyalty with the behavior he observes in Raul, namely with a fleeting and superficial love that is soon forgotten and then picked up again—more akin to “Liebhaberei” (356) than to true devotion. The inwardness and reflection attributed to German masculinity are thus held up as ideals that Raul's southern French character cannot even approach, and therefore his claim to his brother's bride reflects negatively not only on the figure of Raul individually, but also collectively on the French characteristics he represents.

Rather than Raul, it is indeed the French who are actually vilified in François's novel. For example, the only mention of Paris laments its descent into “eine Stätte unverständlicher Verwilderung” (100) following the French Revolution. François's animosity toward France is already apparent in the short story *Fräulein Muthchen und ihr Hausmeier* (1859), which can be regarded as a prototype of *Zwillingssöhne*. She viewed Napoleon as a decidedly negative influence on France and her representation of him in *Fräulein Muthchen* reveals him as an alien element even within France.⁴⁹ Although François is clearly depicting Napoleon in her short story, she never refers to him by name, instead either using pronouns or identifying him as an “Italiener” (278), rather than a Frenchman, and thus making him seem even less honorable and trustworthy.⁵⁰ She describes him as a man who has killed off the love of the fatherland in himself and now seeks to do the same to all people (324), and throughout her *oeuvre* she portrays him as a threat to the principles of “brotherly love and the duty of the individual to work towards a common purpose.”⁵¹ Fox, meanwhile, recognizes in François's representation of Napoleon

“threats from west, south, and orient, threats that the masculine Germany constructed in this text must exclude.”⁵²

Although Napoleon is conspicuously absent from *Zwillingsöhne*, the function he fulfills in *Fräulein Muthchen* as a ubiquitous threat to Germanness is here taken up by Liska. Born in Italy as the daughter of a Polish aristocrat and a French officer, Liska is “the ultimate Other,”⁵³ and like Napoleon she presents a threat from multiple directions to Herrmann’s German masculinity. When she is taken in by the von Fels family, they seem to make it their task to “tame” her by making her part of Erdmuthe’s household and teaching her German virtues. During her first winter in Saxony, Liska is still a foreign element in her new surroundings, but while her dissent and resentment of her new home slowly subside, Bleibtreu fears that the conquest of her southern spirit would leave her frozen “wie ein armes Singvögelchen, das sich auf dem Zuge nach dem Süden verspätet hat” (243). She eventually warms up to the prospect of being Herrmann’s bride, however, and begins to find “in Haus und Herd die Lösung des deutschen Rätsels” (281). The wording of Liska’s transformation suggests that her integration into the household introduces her into German domesticity and thus begins to peel away her Otherness.

The sudden reappearance of Raul and his wooing of Liska, however, challenge the family’s and Herrmann’s claim to her, leading Albrecht Bär to the jingoistic remark, “wenn einem Franzmann seines Nachbars Weib gefällt, entführt er es ihm, und will der Nachbar es wieder haben, schreit er: Raub!” (312) He thereby casts Raul’s romantic interest in Liska as dishonorable and at the same time offers a metaphor for Napoleon’s conquest of Europe. Herrmann ultimately recognizes that Raul has completely won over Liska and that she has permanently reverted to her Mediterranean character, and he therefore concedes his defeat and

renounces his love for her (388-89). Herrmann's demand that his brother marry her instead is met with fierce resistance from Raul, however, who issues a defiant "Ich will nicht!" (389) but finally does submit begrudgingly to the wedding ceremony. Raul's refusal to marry Liska seems to confirm Bär's assessment of Raul's "French" character, insofar as he is only interested in Liska while she is betrothed to his brother and is merely motivated by envy rather than actual desire. Following Raul's inevitable death in battle, Liska receives no second chance at rejoining the family; she is forever lost and must be expelled from the homeland. Similarly, Raul is denied the privilege of being laid to rest in the *Ahmensaal* with his male ancestors because he had never felt at home in their "Geschlecht" in the first place (409).

The use of the word "Geschlecht" in this context deserves closer examination. Ute Frevert has determined in her analysis of the definition of *Geschlecht* in German lexicons since the eighteenth century that eighteenth-century scholars such as Zedler and Jablonski defined *Geschlecht* primarily as a term designating descent or ancestry, rather than difference of sexual and gender traits, for which it came to stand in the nineteenth century.⁵⁴ Although François adjusts the language of her work to be appropriate for its early-nineteenth-century setting, it is nevertheless worth noting that the term could have had an undertone of its modern form at the time of the novel's publication. The narrator's remark that Raul had always felt more "heimlich" with his mother but that she could not grant him "die kriegerischen Ehren, die er für seinen Grabgang ersehnt haben würde" (409) figures him as not only unworthy of the status of a warrior but consequently also as unworthy of being considered a man. With the exclusion of Raul from both ancestry and manhood and the expulsion of Liska, the integrity of the *Heimat* has been preserved and German masculinity has been successfully protected from a threat.

This masculinity, moreover, bears the marks of the bourgeoisie. François, who sought in her work “to demonstrate the benefits of a life given up to steady and productive work,”⁵⁵ did not shy away from attacking the aristocracy in her works. Tiiu Laane observes that François usually portrays aristocratic figures as “anachronisms in a time that demanded productive activity”⁵⁶ and symbols of “snobbery, glitter and useless existence.”⁵⁷ While the von Fels family certainly belongs to the landowning nobility, “their households and bearing have all the hallmarks of positive bourgeois simplicity which distinguishes them from the more frivolous aristocrats, of whom François disapproves.”⁵⁸ In her adoption of these aristocrats into the fold of the bourgeoisie, François merely follows the conventions of her contemporaries in mythologizing the Wars of Liberation as having been fought by a “people in arms,” a claim that sought to reimagine the liberation of Germany from Napoleon as a feat accomplished by conscripted bourgeois soldiers rather than by the armies of princes.⁵⁹

By recasting Herrmann and Raul in this way, François in effect transforms them into the equivalents of sons in an upper middle-class family, but only Herrmann embodies middle-class virtues, whereas Raul merely acts as his foil. For one, Herrmann is engaged in “juristischen und . . . historischen Studien in Leipzig” (118). In nineteenth-century Germany a law degree was a requirement for civil servants, traditionally a bourgeois profession,⁶⁰ and in general “most German lawyers occupied a position in the upper reaches of the German bourgeoisie.”⁶¹ Although he does not take up the practice of law, Herrmann does accept the responsibilities of an administrator in the recovery from war damage of his home region and in the preparation of it and its inhabitants for further battles (146). While Raul wastes his inheritance in the “flotte[n] Lagerleben” (146), Bleibtreu describes Herrmann as “haushälterisch” (146-47) and therefore as a man who knows how to take care of his household’s resources prudently. Business ethics was

highly regarded among the middle class, as reflected by Gustav Freytag's demand that even German emperors be "serious-minded businessmen" to prevent their country from "losing its vitality."⁶² The bourgeois virtues of productivity and business acumen are thus elevated to essential qualities of German masculinity, even in wartime. Raul goes to war for his own glory and because he feels he was "zum Soldaten geboren" (115). By contrast, Herrmann never loses the trappings of his bourgeois-coded existence. He recognizes both his patriotic duty and the responsibility he has toward his family and estate, and thus his role as a soldier is always secondary to his role as a citizen.

Although such an interpretation of Herrmann would imply that the intention of François's novel was to promote peaceful solutions to conflicts unless no other options are available, Bland finds evidence that, "given its eventual publication date of 1872, *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingssöhne* was read as a triumphalist account of German virtue and courage overcoming French superficiality and treachery."⁶³ History had a similar fate in store for Heyse's patriotic drama *Colberg*. Like François's novel, *Colberg* uses the Wars of Liberation as a backdrop for the praise of German virtues, and like *Zwillingssöhne*, it too contains elements that made it a vehicle for the propagation of chauvinism in Imperial Germany.

Although Heyse was primarily known for his novellas and later his novels, he had also tried his hand at drama and achieved notable success. As I have explained above, *Colberg* in particular became part of his enduring legacy as a dramatist, owed mostly to the play's status in what was then considered the German literary canon. As a great admirer of Grillparzer, Heyse had no interest in writing plays that were impossible to perform.⁶⁴ He believed that historical drama should carry a political point, a point that "must address the collective consciousness of the poet's own age, on some matter of vital national importance," which is why his historical

plays of the 1850s and '60s "gave expression to the patriotic aspirations of the educated German bourgeoisie."⁶⁵ As a figure representing various identities and trends in nineteenth-century Germany,⁶⁶ Heyse certainly seemed perfectly suited for the role of generating socially integrative national imagery, and his immense popularity attests to his ability to reach a wide and varied audience.

Heyse's choice of the Napoleonic Wars as a backdrop in *Colberg* worked to the play's advantage, as far as its popular approval is concerned, but it worked to its "disadvantage," insofar as it was later appropriated for purposes of which the playwright did not approve. The play's patriotic enthusiasm evoked in the postwar period a direct association with the Franco-Prussian War because the imagery that gained popularity in 1870-71 heroized the German resistance to Napoleon. Jürgen Joachimsthaler explains that the success of *Colberg* was also possible because it promised "durch den Rückgriff auf eine historische Ausnahmesituation die doch völlig anders geartete Gegenwart mit eingeübten Erklärungsmustern und Wertvorstellungen symbolisch in Einklang bringen zu können."⁶⁷ The final product is a fictionalized account of an armed conflict that, like *Zwillingssöhne*, has the goal of promoting the national liberal ideal of a unified Germany, but is easily interpreted as Heyse's support of Prussian hegemony and glorification of German superiority, as evidenced by Theodor Fontane's review of an 1870 production, which praises the appropriate and timely nature of its "Loyalität, Appell an das Volk und Haß gegen das neufränkische Cäsarentum."⁶⁸

Colberg presents a dramatized account of the Siege of Kolberg (March to July 1807), which became one of the few Prussian fortresses that remained in Prussian hands after the Treaties of Tilsit were signed. In the play's opening scenes, it becomes apparent that Kolberg is ill-prepared for the looming siege and tensions between the citizens and the military of the town

are surfacing. Heinrich Blank is a citizen who maintains that the town should capitulate and recognize the obvious superiority of the French. His sister Rose and her godfather, Joachim Nettelbeck, the representative of the local populace, typify the opposite point of view and refuse to give up their freedom without a fight. While Ferdinand von Schill is away fighting another battle, it looks as if the commander of Kolberg, Lucadou, is preparing to give up without resistance. On behalf of her godfather, Rose travels to the temporary royal residence in the East Prussian fortress of Memel (Klaipėda) in order to ask King Frederick William III to replace Lucadou with a more capable commander. Impressed by the loyalty and courage of his subjects, the king promises to do what he can.

Soon, Major August Neidhart von Gneisenau arrives to take charge in Kolberg and gradually succeeds in uniting the military and the citizens in an effort to mount a formidable defense of the town. As time goes on, the defenders of Kolberg become increasingly discouraged after receiving news that most other Prussian strongholds, including Danzig, have fallen, and with the town running low on food and resources, the siege enters its critical stage. Gneisenau plans to lead the military against the French in a last stand and leaves the citizens with a choice of fighting alongside them or seeking refuge. They are moved by the school teacher's stirring speech and decide to stand behind Gneisenau. Even Heinrich, who had previously tried to shoot the commander, sees the error of his ways and embarks on a daring solo mission to redeem himself. He discovers and rescues a messenger who had been detained by the French from bringing news of a truce to the town. Once the news reaches Kolberg, the French abandon the siege and Kolberg becomes a symbol of German resistance, resilience, and unity.

As I mentioned above, even the Prussian authorities seemed taken aback by what they saw as obvious anti-French sentiment in Heyse's play, but in fact, as in *Zwillingsöhne*,

Napoleon—or any other Frenchman for that matter—never makes an appearance on stage. If the viewer does hear about the French, it is through second-hand information related in the form of dialog. Nettelbeck’s description of the pomp and circumstance accompanying the French peace envoy’s entry into town before the start of the siege (348-49) conveys the arrogance of the French by implying that they assume that they have already seized Kolberg. Furthermore, Nettelbeck characterizes the revelation of the French army’s cover-up of the truce agreement in order to force a surrender of the stronghold as “tückisch” (451) and thus reinforces the impression of the French as spiteful and dishonorable.

Much as in *Zwillingssöhne*, however, the major conflict actually occurs among the Germans’ own ranks, between those who support Napoleon (Heinrich) and those who support their homeland’s right to self-determination (Gneisenau, Nettelbeck, and Rose). “Für die Deutschen ist der Umsturz der alten Ordnung reale Erfahrung erst unter Napoleon und in der Form des Militär-Imperiums geworden,” as Nipperdey has shown.⁶⁹ Heinrich thus represents the element of the German bourgeoisie that regarded Napoleon as a disseminator of the ideals of the French Revolution. He is fascinated by the notion of uniting the world into one single “Weltbürgerthum” (341) and admires what he sees as Napoleon’s ultimate goal, namely “die Menschen [zu] verbrüdern” (378). Like Raul de Roc, Heinrich idolizes the French emperor as a new Charlemagne (342) and honors his achievement of climbing the ranks of the military to be the master of his own glory: “Den Thron, auf dem er heute sitzt, / hat er aus eigenem Holz geschnitzt” (378). For Heinrich, Napoleon is the embodiment of an upward social mobility that would not have been possible under the old social order.

He faces persistent opposition from the other inhabitants of Kolberg, most notably from Rose and Nettelbeck, who lament that Heinrich has been blinded to the “Schmach” (341) of his

homeland at the hands of Napoleon and who argue that he has not considered the loss of heritage and tradition that a unification of the world under one banner would bring: “Wir sind Weltbürger; ob wir nebenher / Colberger, Preußen, deutsche Männer sind, / Ein Narr, wen das bekümmert!” (351) In contrast to Heinrich’s intellectual and rational defense of his position, Rose repeatedly invokes the sanctity of the fatherland in a religious fervor, referring to it as *das Heiligste*⁷⁰ and renouncing any form of romance while the people are suffering (340). In fact, Heyse establishes an explicit connection between Rose and Joan of Arc, insofar as Rose directly references Schiller’s *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, wishing that she could also sacrifice her life for her fatherland and her king (355). Furthermore, the name Rose Blank is merely a thinly veiled reference to “the White Rose,” a moniker sometimes applied to Joan of Arc.⁷¹ Heyse’s allusion seems an obvious choice, given the significance of the Siege of Orléans as the turning point in the Hundred Years’ War, but his evocation of Joan of Arc also effectively imbues the Germans’ struggle against Napoleon with the holy purpose of expelling the intruders from the homeland. The joining together of the German community thus requires the exclusion of foreigners.

Heyse, therefore, is able to depict the small town of Kolberg as representative of the German national community as a whole, and he does so more overtly than François in *Zwillingsöhne*. As Joachimsthaler notes, the all-German cast is notable in what is supposed to be a small town on the Baltic coast of Pomerania in 1807, without a “polnischer—oder (erkennbar) jüdischer—Mitbürger” among them.⁷² Heyse simplifies his portrayal of the town community by obfuscating the variety that would have been part of everyday life in Kolberg, thereby portraying a small unified community that excludes, however, certain elements that are not considered part of the nation. Like François, Heyse uses the metaphor of the national family in order to convey the strong common bond among all Germans. An obvious example of this

imagery is the relationship between the siblings Rose and Heinrich, but in fact, Heyse's original stage version had cast these characters as lovers. He altered it for the print edition after Fontane criticized the romance as distracting "from the dramatic effectiveness of the political action."⁷³ Heinrich's transformation from Rose's lover to her brother drastically changes the dynamic of the play because the stakes of his loss for the German cause thus become significantly higher. He is able to be viewed as the lost brother or the prodigal son, who through his disavowal of the French can be brought back again "in die preußisch-provinzielle Bürgerschaft jenseits allen 'Weltbürgerthum[s].'"⁷⁴ The implication becomes that the nation is indeed capable of overcoming challenges to its unity, just as Heinrich's family can overcome the challenge to its cohesion.

As in *Zwillingssöhne*, the notion of soldiers as brothers also comes into play, namely in Heyse's portrayal of the relationship between Gneisenau and Nettelbeck, in the sense that Nettelbeck imagines himself both as Gneisenau's brother (434) and as his father (401). Whereas the brothers are in conflict with each other in François's novel, the closeness of the two leader figures in *Colberg* is emblematic of the old guard's acceptance of the new guard and the breaking down of barriers between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. Nowhere is this breakdown more apparent than in Heyse's portrayal of Frederick William III and Queen Louise, who make an appearance in Rose's account of her voyage to Memel. Her description of the monarch as "freundlich wie ein Vater" (384) plays into the convention of rulers in post-feudal Europe fashioning themselves as fathers to their subjects, who were in turn represented as their children or pupils.⁷⁵ The relationship between the king and his subjects is configured as familial, allowing them to be regarded more easily as part of the same tight-knit community.

Queen Louise, on the other hand, takes on not only the role of the mother of the nation but also that of an allegory for the suffering of Prussia and, by extension, Germany. In his portrayal of the queen, Heyse thus fully subscribes to the conventions of the “cult” surrounding Louise in the nineteenth century that stylized her as the “Landesmutter” who bore the pain of her nation.⁷⁶ As Frederick William leads Rose into Louise’s chamber, Rose seems to notice a faint “Spur von einer Leidenskrone” (386) on the queen’s brow, evoking once again by means of religious imagery the anguish to which the nation has been subjected. This noble woman has been degraded to “eine arme Frau” (386), but nevertheless she maintains her dignity and generosity, as demonstrated by the ring that she gives to Rose. The portraits of Queen Louise and Erdmuth von Fels share an obvious similarity in their narrative function as figures of identification for the nation. The acceptance with which Frederick William and Louise welcome Rose, a simple middle-class girl from Kolberg, at their court communicates the monarchs’ familiarity with all their subjects. Their treatment of Rose does not merely hold up Kolberg as the king’s supremely loyal town, but rather frames it as representative of a national family composed of “brave Bürger ... und gute Preußen” (385).

Heyse’s depiction of Frederick William III and Queen Louise as down-to-earth characters with simple tastes and without illusions of grandeur is reminiscent of François’s depiction of the von Fels family’s adoption of the bourgeois habitus, despite their aristocratic title and Herrmann’s role as a military officer. Heyse became disillusioned with the aggressive social policies of the Prussian regime in the postwar period, and in his novel *Kinder der Welt* (1873) he “fashions a Prussian tradition which is based not on [Frederick William’s] military victory against Napoleon, but on his public conduct of his private life.”⁷⁷ The regal couple’s imagined simplicity and conscientiousness meet with Heyse’s approval already in *Colberg*, while the

values of the militaristic Prussian state are actually presented as being at odds with “liberal ideas” and “the achievement of national goals.”⁷⁸ The rising tensions between the soldiers in Kolberg and the town’s citizens require Gneisenau’s intervention to reconcile the differences between the Prussian military code and Heinrich’s democratic and humanistic ideals.

The sense that Prussian militarism is incompatible with bourgeois values and the ideals of the modern age pervades Heyse’s drama from the start. In Scene 2 of Act I, Heinrich reminds Lieutenant Brünnow that the type of honor soldiers admire so greatly is “freilich ein besondres Ding, / Mit dem der Bürger nichts zu schaffen hat” (343). He feels that this honor code has been forced upon the citizens, who do not identify with it and want to put an end to military rule: “mit Knirschen trägt / Die Stadt das Joch der aufgezwungenen Ehre / Und will ein Ende machen” (410). Heinrich does not recognize, however, that even among the citizens there is a sense of duty to fight against the impending doom or at least to delay the inevitable. Nettelbeck, a former sea captain, reprimands Heinrich for his defeatist attitude because he has no respect for men who, despite a glimpse of hope, give up when faced with a challenge: “*Das heiß’ ich Männer, die die Arme rühren, / So lang’ ein Lappen Tuch zusammenhält; / Denn Wind und Wetter stehn in Gottes Hand, / Und eh’ man’s denkt, kommt wieder stille See / Und guter Wind*” (352; original emphasis). Therefore, while Heinrich’s criticism of the army’s imposition of its code upon the bourgeois lifestyle may well be valid, citizens like Nettelbeck believe that there is a general code of honor and duty that regulates masculine behavior and that in the defense of one’s homeland these two codes overlap.

At the same time, however, the military itself seems to have lost sight of its ideals. As Lucadou negotiates the terms of Kolberg’s surrender with the French envoy, Nettelbeck must interrupt the proceedings to remind him that the citizens are not prepared to capitulate and will

man the walls, if need be, should the officers give up (350). The citizens repeatedly suggest that a *Verweichlichung* has taken place in the Prussian military since the time of Frederick II and that “der alte Fritz im Grabe sich / Umdrehte, wenn er was von Jena hörte” (361). The incompetence of generals like Scharnhorst, York, and Blücher in defending Prussia against Napoleon is characterized as a consequence of their bookishness: “Die verstehn den Krieg in die Breit’ und die Länge, / Aber wie man ihn lernt aus Büchern” (376). The crisis of masculinity experienced by Germany at this time is reflected in the play by a general passivity, framed as stemming from learnedness, which the above analysis of *Zwillingsöhne* has already established in the form of young Herrmann as a sign of indecisiveness and weakness. The school’s headmaster is ridiculed for his education because the question of the day is supposedly, “Bist du ein Mann?” and not, “Weißt du, wie ein Mann / Auf griechisch heißt?” (399). Similarly, Heinrich incurs the wrath of his fellow citizens by suggesting that surrendering would be merely the sensible thing to do. They respond that this kind of *räsonniren* has led to the major defeats in the War of the Fourth Coalition (378-79). Amidst these discussions of the failures of German men, Rose rises to the occasion and ventures out to seek help from the king, leading Nettelbeck to remark, “O Zeit, wo Männer alte Weiber werden / Und Weiber ihren Mann stehn!” (365). He thus states explicitly the underlying theme of the first two acts, namely that Germany’s trouble is actually a case of gender trouble.

For this reason, Gneisenau appears in Kolberg not only as a commander skilled in negotiating between his military duties and his duties toward the citizens, but also as a savior who will inspire his men. The religious overtones in Rose’s description of Gneisenau as the savior of Kolberg reach hyperbolic dimensions when she proclaims, “Wir litten – / Ein Jeder nur für sich, – Er für uns Alle” (408). This religious imagery is reinforced in the stage directions for

Scene 9 of Act IV, in which Gneisenau holds council with his officers and the town's representatives in order to discuss Kolberg's last stand. As the major stands at a table at the center of the stage, he is framed by a semi-circle consisting of his officers on the left side and the representatives on the right (424), a set-up that endows the scene with a solemnity akin to da Vinci's rendering of the Last Supper.

Gneisenau is thus presented as an extraordinary figure, on the one hand, but on the other hand, he is merely a man who has been tasked with the command of Kolberg specifically because he exudes masculine vigor and vitality. The first features of his appearance revealed in the dialog of the play are his "strammes Wesen" and his eyes that "blitzen einen durch und durch" (369). It thus becomes immediately clear that Gneisenau is strong-willed and physically powerful. Furthermore, he is described as "ein Mann recht nach dem Herzen Gottes" who is not only knowledgeable about military strategy, but also genuinely cares for both soldiers and citizens and is charming as well (396-97). In short, Gneisenau—like Herrmann von Fels—combines in his character the qualities of both a soldier and a bourgeois. In fact, Heyse actually highlights his bourgeois qualities. In his first speech to the citizens of Kolberg, Gneisenau emphasizes that he stands before them "nicht nur als Commandant," but also "als Bürger" and asks for their help and support as "Freund der Bürger" (390). In a verbal exchange between Gneisenau and his guard, Heyse seems to go out of his way to acknowledge the major's loving wife and children (416-17), who heretofore had not been mentioned, in order to bring out his role as husband and father who understands the meaning of family. Heyse drives home Gneisenau's role as family man when he rebukes Nettelbeck's suggestion of requiring the citizens to participate in the last stand, telling him, "Ihr habt weder Weib noch Kind / Und seid zu rasch, das Leben wegzuwerfen" (427). By being attuned to the needs and concerns of the citizens of

Kolberg, Gneisenau leads by example in proving that even a military code must be informed by bourgeois values.

As both the soldiers and the citizens decide to rally behind him in defense of Kolberg, it soon becomes apparent that Gneisenau's leadership has revitalized the men of the town. Even Rector Zipfel, the headmaster who was ridiculed before, is rehabilitated for the fatherland and, in fact, provides the impetus for the citizens to join Gneisenau in defending Kolberg until the end. He rouses the citizens' patriotic spirit by recounting the well-known story of the Spartans' battle against the Persians at Thermopylae, but not because of the obvious parallels one could draw between Kolberg's losing odds against an overwhelming French force and the resolve of the Spartans to stand their ground against the massive Persian army. Instead, Zipfel points out that there was no distinction between citizens and soldiers in ancient Greece: "Da gab es nur ein *Volk* ... Die waren gute Bürger, so wie wir, / Die hatten Weib und Kind und Haus und Gut / Und auch genug der Schiffe, sich zu retten. / Sie aber *blieben*" (430; original emphasis). He thus makes clear that it is not the governments or the military that will unite Germany, but that it is the citizens—the bourgeoisie—whose common ground as one people forms the basis for a national community and who serve as a foil to the professional army that fights for money rather than ideals.

The citizens' willingness to sacrifice everything in defense of their town leaves Gneisenau convinced that the country is not lost as long as its *Volk* can still prove its "Mannessinn"⁷⁹ (431), and by banding together as one they can collectively redeem Germany's sense of masculinity. Heinrich, however, is initially excluded from this community of German men because of his refusal to abandon his support of France and because of his attempt to kill Gneisenau. Although Heinrich is actually set to be executed, the young man has a change of

heart about the patriotic cause after hearing Rector Zipfel's speech and begs the commander to let him defend Kolberg alongside the other citizens. Gneisenau instead decides to punish him with a fate worse than death and orders Heinrich to be banished to a ship and watch the men give their lives for the fatherland, while he lives on as "der einz'ge Mann aus Colberg, der den Fall / Der Festung überlebt" (432). He thus emasculates Heinrich by assigning to him the same role in the fight as that of women and children.

After he manages to escape his imprisonment, Heinrich must seek the redemption of his masculinity on his own. Whereas before, he refused to acknowledge the militaristic code of honor at all, he now reveals in a conversation with Rose that he must wash clean his sullied honor (442). He describes his new sense of patriotism as a rebirth and is prepared to dedicate this new life to the fatherland (442). The only way for Heinrich to make up for all of his former antagonism is to attempt a daring act that will erase any doubts as to his newly found loyalty, and the rescue of the messenger from French captivity is precisely the act of heroism he needs to redeem himself. In the end, Heinrich's exaggerated exclamations of "Hoch Colberg!" and "Hoch Deutschland!" (451) appear to the contemporary reader as clear overcompensations for his former pro-French and an attempt to ensure his reintegration into the town community. By ultimately reclaiming Heinrich into the fold of the nation and even making him responsible for ending the siege, however, Heyse casts the bourgeoisie as the true force behind the successful defense of Kolberg and, by extension, as the actual last bastion of Germanness.

It is worth noting that neither *Colberg* nor *Zwillingssöhne* concludes with the image of a unified Germany, but rather with a resounding message of hope that unification remains on the horizon. In *Zwillingssöhne*, this hope of a transformed nation is embodied by the transformation of a meek and sickly Herrmann into a blond warrior with a stern gaze, who is strong enough to

renounce love for the sake of the well-being of his family. Although the family has incurred the painful loss of a son, Bleibtreu's blessing of both Raul and Herrmann leaves the reader in a conciliatory mood, while his final words, "und dann weiter voran auf der befreienden Bahn" (413), convey the sense that the ultimate goal is not yet reached and that even German unification would be merely the beginning of a journey toward freedom. *Colberg* depicts a similar process, with the major difference that Heinrich's support of the French makes him more similar to Raul than to Herrmann. Like Herrmann's transformation, however, Heinrich's rebirth into a patriot proves the potency of German masculinity and ensures the continued existence of the fatherland. Furthermore, through the words of Gneisenau, Heyse paints the perseverance of Kolberg as the planting of a "Saatkorn der Freiheit" the thriving of which can only be assured by "ein treuverbrüder't Volk, ein Volk in Waffen" (452). Therefore, the affirmation of masculinity and the rediscovery of Germans as one people are merely the first steps in Germany's assertion of its freedom. This freedom must continue to be protected by a people in arms, citizen soldiers like Herrmann von Fels and Heinrich Blank, and thus the open-endedness of the play connects the German past to Heyse's present, in which the Wars of Unification (1864-67) once again tested the cohesion of the German states.

Such appeals for Germany's liberty found echoes in the rhetoric of 1870-71, when the German war against France was presented as a struggle to escape the clutches of the perceived *Erbfeind*. The Franco-Prussian War thus acquired additional significance, "as if it were a continuation of the wars of liberation from Napoleonic control of 1813-15."⁸⁰ The reason for the continued success of *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingssöhne* and *Colberg* after 1870 is their use of a previous conflict that had become a well-known metaphor for the Franco-Prussian War. In addition, the types of characters that they employ corresponded to the idealized portrayals of

wartime heroism in magazines such as *Die Gartenlaube* and what Hartmann has called their “propagandisch verfälschende Überhöhung des Sterbens”⁸¹ for the honor of the country.

Although such phrasing perhaps exaggerates the extent to which *Gartenlaube*-contributors glorified the violence of war, the reinforcement of Germanness and German masculinity by means of war did indeed become a common trope in German literature during and after the war, as I will show in my analysis of E. Werner’s *Ein Held der Feder* and Paul Heyse’s *Er soll dein Herr sein*.

“Das Dichten ist ja nur thatenloses Träumen!”: German Masculinity in Wartime

The previous section provides examples of popular fiction and drama in the decade leading up to the Franco-Prussian War that were preoccupied with the state of the German nation and reflected national liberal hopes of unification in the near future. Belgum shows that as early as 1861, *Die Gartenlaube* “devoted some space to the problem or fate of the German nation” in every one of its issues and “attempted most frequently to rally its readers for the nation through tales of the foreign occupation of Germany by the French from 1806 through the Wars of Liberation in 1813.”⁸² At a time when Germans were increasingly faced with conflicting and competing identities, magazines like *Die Gartenlaube* saw identification with the nation as a way of moving beyond these differences and “responded ... by providing what was considered good, moral reading material for ‘the German people.’”⁸³ Once the war against France was actually declared, the *Gartenlaube* accompanied the events with noticeably more coverage than was devoted to other recent military conflicts, publishing hundreds of articles about and numerous illustrations of the war, to a degree that prompts Hartmann to compare it to a virtual “Organ der

Kriegsberichtserstattung” during that period, which no doubt also contributed to the magazine’s soaring popularity throughout the 1870s.⁸⁴

The Franco-Prussian War played a major role in the self-understanding of Germans, and because it was an event that made the Second German Empire possible in the first place, the victory over France became a defining historical moment for the German nation. While only a minority of Germans actually participated in the war as soldiers, the majority was nevertheless able to experience it “through the medium of print, cartoons as well as words” and “vicarious participation . . . in the form of crowds welcoming home triumphant troops, church services of thanksgiving, and solemnly staged state ceremonial.”⁸⁵ It is therefore hardly surprising that artistic depictions of the war became popular in the postwar period, be it in the paintings of Anton von Werner, the patriotic poetry of Emil Rittershaus and Albert Traeger, or in the prose fiction of writers as different as E. Werner and Paul Heyse, whose works I shall examine in the following pages.

Werner’s novel *Ein Held der Feder* and Heyse’s novella *Er soll dein Herr sein* pick up some of the themes already observed in *Zwillingsöhne* and *Colberg*. The image of the bourgeois as soldier reappears in these texts as a strategy of showing, on the one hand, that German unification was a grassroots movement brought about by the everyman hero and, on the other hand, that the German men who go to war are merely citizens performing their duty, rather than professional soldiers.⁸⁶ The authors also present the war as an opportunity for German men and women to reevaluate their priorities by placing them in situations that require them to choose their duty to the fatherland over their own personal concerns, thereby allowing them to discover their feelings of national belonging. Lastly, the war reinstates traditional gender roles that are implied to have previously fallen out of order: the patriotic spirit and the physical demands of

battle reinvigorate German men and feminize German women, reestablishing the bourgeois ideal of domesticity as the social norm.

E. Werner (pen name of Elisabeth Bürstenbinder) became known primarily through her serialized publications in the *Gartenlaube* and, along with Wilhelmine Heimgang, she became part of the so-called second generation of women authors in the magazine, who followed in the footsteps of E. Marlitt.⁸⁷ In the 1850s and '60s, Marlitt had become the poster child for the periodical's characteristic style of serialized fiction and established very specific patterns that she repeated formulaically throughout her body of work. Bonter identifies the basic plot elements of Marlitt's fiction, such as the encounter of a childlike woman with an older man, whose initial animosity toward each other inevitably develops into romantic interest; the self-sufficient heroine who has an insatiable need for independence and freedom; the inexperience of the heroine in matters of love; or the obligatory happy ending.⁸⁸ While Werner recognized the success of this model and adapted elements of it to her own writing, she added a few of her own. Tatlock quotes the somewhat cautious praise of Werner by Otto Heller, a turn-of-the-century German professor at Washington University in St. Louis usually skeptical of the quality of German women writers. Despite his reservations, Heller saw her as superior to Marlitt because of the wider variety of character types she employed in her stories and her "kindly attachment for misfit individuals"⁸⁹ in her novels. Graf, on the other hand, sees the main difference between Marlitt and Werner in their motives for writing. According to him, Werner's goal in her profession was never emancipatory, and instead of seeing writing as a means of social advancement, she was more interested in its psychological value.⁹⁰ Her rise to fame was made possible by her *Gartenlaube* publications in the 1870s, which introduced her to a large

readership,⁹¹ and the popularity of her works lasted for decades, surviving even the collapse of Imperial Germany.⁹² A few of her novels underwent new editions even as late as the 1950s.⁹³

My inspiration to explore Werner's texts owes much to Tatlock's extensive work on this author, and her thorough research—especially her analyses of Werner's works in the monograph *German Writing, American Reading*—presents a point of departure for my own study. In her writing on Werner, Tatlock has focused on topics such as her impact on popular German literature of the nineteenth century, her connection to other women authors of the period, the reception of her works in American translation, and the gender relations she presents in her texts. I expand upon Tatlock's scholarship by examining depictions of gender in Werner's novels in the context of German unification. The first of these novels began its serialized run in *Die Gartenlaube* a few months after the foundation of the German Empire and just before the end of the Franco-Prussian War in the spring of 1871.

Ein Held der Feder opens on the banks of the Mississippi, where Jane Forest, heiress to a large fortune, discovers at her father's deathbed that she has a brother whom her parents had lost in a crowd at the docks as they were preparing to embark on their voyage to America as German emigrants. It is her father's dying wish that she searches for her long-lost brother in Germany. Jane becomes engaged to Henry Alison, an American business man who seems primarily interested in Jane's millions, but asks her fiancé to delay their wedding plans for one year while she grieves for her father and searches for her brother in Germany. After Alison begrudgingly agrees, Jane travels to Bonn, where she stays with relatives to whom she cannot quite warm up. Also living in the house are Professor Walther Fernow, a withdrawn and somewhat sickly young man, and his oafish manservant, Friedrich.

Jane and Fernow seem to have an antagonistic relationship at first, but France's declaration of war against Prussia awakens an unsuspected energy within Fernow, and Jane becomes increasingly intrigued by him. Fernow leaves to fight in the war and within a matter of weeks he is transformed from an unassuming weakling into the hero of his company. Elsewhere, Alison meets up with Jane as she looks for her brother in France based on a clue that revealed that he has enlisted as a soldier. By chance, they encounter Fernow's company, and recognizing Fernow's transformation, Alison starts to view him as a threat to his engagement to Jane. He challenges him to a duel, but Fernow asks to postpone it until he has fulfilled his duty in the war. Meanwhile, after mistakenly suspecting that Fernow is her brother, Jane realizes that it is actually Friedrich, but soon after this discovery, Friedrich is killed by the French in an ambush. Jane returns to Bonn, and once the war is over, Alison comes to claim her. Having recognized that she is in love with Fernow, Jane argues with Alison and tries to buy herself out of the "contract" they made by offering him her millions in exchange for her freedom, but he does not budge until she falls to her knees before him and pleads to be released. Alison realizes he has lost her and withdraws the engagement, thus allowing Jane to stay in Germany with Fernow.

Werner's portrayal of Germanness aligns with some of the depictions observed in the previous section. In my discussions of *Zwillingsöhne* and *Colberg* I have already explored how the myth of a "people in arms" based on an idealized view of the Wars of Liberation influenced the way in which German literature presented the role that the bourgeoisie played in the military and thus promoted a sense of national community. By participating in the discourse on the German army during the Franco-Prussian War, Werner perpetuates this notion of the bourgeois soldier. Breuilly explains that media depictions in 1870-71 of the Prusso-German army transformed the way it was viewed and began to contrast the army "favourably with the servile,

lower class instrument of Napoleon III and the barbaric armed mob in the army and irregular military formations of the Third Republic.”⁹⁴ After all, if German officers were “presented as cultivated men not out of place in a Parisian salon,”⁹⁵ it was impossible to imagine them as killers and less problematic to highlight their heroism. Germany’s victory over France was therefore seen not only as a military success but also, and perhaps more importantly, as the success of German culture, of “the high ideals and moral qualities”⁹⁶ that German soldiers carried with them into battle.

As a professor, Fernow represents an unlikely candidate for a heroic soldier, but his status as a scholar merges with his patriotism to produce an unstoppable force. In his first intimate conversation with Jane, their exchange escalates to a heated argument when Jane unfavorably compares the Rhine to the mighty Mississippi. Fernow delivers an impassioned speech about the virtues of the Rhine, which makes up for its deficiency of magnitude by evoking “den Zauber der Vergangenheit, die Geschichte von Völkern, die Poesie von Jahrhunderten” (52). Taken aback for a moment by Fernow’s poetic streak, Jane finally dismisses the German propensity for poetry as mere “thatenloses Träumen” (54) and thereby insults the professor more deeply than when she criticized his academic pursuits. Rather than his profession, it is Fernow’s love of the *Heimat* that finally brings to the fore his masculine qualities, and therefore he understands Jane’s dismissal as undermining not only Germany’s status as a nation, but also his status as a man. In this scene, Werner already invokes Germany’s superiority over other nations in terms of cultural heritage, a theme that will be reinforced in the further course of the novel.

Once the war against France is announced, Fernow gives his poetic spirit free rein by composing and publishing a newspaper article brimming with pathos, which Jane’s guardian and travel companion, Atkins, praises as having “Schwung und Feuer” and characterizes as a piece

that will light up the agitated city like a powder keg (78). The article is entitled “Aufruf an das deutsche Volk” and is thus almost certainly meant to recall the appeal “An mein Volk,” which Frederick William III published in March 1813 in order to garner support among Prussians and other Germans for a war against Napoleon. Fernow’s ability to channel his passion into lyrical form is presented as an expression of the German genius that permeates the entire nation and is heroized in Werner’s depiction of Fernow’s entrance into military service. In the army, it is not only his daring attitude, but also his ability to generate enthusiasm for the patriotic cause that earns Fernow the respect and admiration of his fellow soldiers. One of his compatriots assures him, “wenn die Franzosen einen Barden besäßen, der sie vor der Schlacht mit ähnlichen Gesängen begeisterte, so hätten sie uns mehr zu schaffen gemacht” (111). The success of the German army is therefore primarily understood not as a result of its military prowess but of the cultural spirit that its soldiers, figured here as decidedly bourgeois, carry with them into battle. Furthermore, the transformation of the sleepy *deutsche Michel* is a permanent one, and Dr. Behrend’s fear that Fernow “legt mit dem Degen auch den Dichter beiseite” (192) is ultimately proved as unwarranted when Jane recognizes that Fernow “so voll und heiß zu lieben verstand, wie er es verstanden hatte, statt der Feder daheim am friedlichen Schreibtisch draußen im Felde das Schwert zu führen” (220). Although he has once again replaced the sword with the pen, Fernow is not the reclusive bookworm he was before, but instead a passionate lover. The conclusion of the novel suggests that the rising up and unification of Germany has permanently altered both him and the German nation and has brought forth their true spirit.

Just as the war is necessary to expose Fernow’s Germanness, it also plays a significant role in redefining Jane as a German woman. Although she had denied her German roots throughout her life, even going so far as to scorn the German character as “beschränkt und

dürftig” (51), Jane’s return to the homeland of her ancestors and her witnessing of the events of 1870-71 eventually reclaims her for the German nation. The fact that Werner even recognizes Jane’s reclamation as a distinct possibility most likely owes something to the perception of German emigrants in late-nineteenth-century Germany. Belkum claims that emigrants were never considered fully “lost” to the nation in the first place, and it was understood that they carried their nationality with them, even if they had fully adapted to life in their new country. In *Gartenlaube* essays on German populations in foreign countries, “even much later generations, those born in the new country, were often identified as ‘our compatriots.’”⁹⁷ Werner’s treatment of the Forest family as latent Germans corresponds to this view of German emigrants.

Jane’s father, an old idealist and revolutionary who was forced to leave Germany for political reasons after 1848 (19) and who then seemed to break off altogether the ties to his homeland once he became a self-made man in America, is unable to hide his nostalgia any longer as he nears the end of his life, undergoing a “deathbed conversion” and professing his love for Germany in his dying moments (24). Atkins, the Forests’ longstanding family friend, explains to Alison that even twenty years in America were unable to erase the late Forest’s attachment to his homeland, and he fears that Jane, despite having been raised as an American and never having set foot in Germany, has inherited this characteristic from her father—it is “das deutsche Blut” that he fears will assert itself once Jane returns to her native land (120-21). His fears prove justified when Jane finally (re-)discovers the idealism that once drove her father “zu opfern, was ihm Freiheit hieß” (203), thereby renouncing her fortune and hoping to free herself from Alison in order to stay in Germany. Even prior to that moment, however, as soon as Jane signals her willingness to abandon the pride that Werner characterizes as a result of her American upbringing, and then summons all her strength to apologize for the first time for her

rude treatment of Fernow, he immediately rechristens her into “Johanna” (95). Ultimately, Jane’s rehabilitation as a German is only possible by means of her integration into the German national space, which in turn makes possible the reestablishment of normative gender roles for both Fernow and Jane.

In the elucidation that Frevert offers of the development in the linguistic understanding of the terms “man” and “woman,” she discovers that nineteenth-century German lexicons indicate a peak in the extent to which Germans differentiated between masculinity and femininity. Frevert determines that the 1893 edition of the *Brockhaus* constructs “eine klare Hierarchie der Geschlechterverschiedenheit: je höher der allgemeine zivilisatorische Entwicklungsstand, desto ausgeprägter die Differenz.”⁹⁸ Accompanying this belief that a highly civilized society must display a high degree of distinction between men and woman was the notion that the most advanced stage of a civilized society was only reached once women were allowed to focus solely on their domestic role within the family, and the exclusively male authors of lexicon entries in nineteenth-century Germany agreed that this stage was “im bürgerlichen Zeitalter erreicht, und zwar vor allen anderen Ländern in Deutschland.”⁹⁹ Belgum confirms Frevert’s findings in her description of the magazine’s portrayal of American women, who were certainly praised for their virtues in conducting a household, but whose achievements were attributed to the influence of immigrant women from Germany. Thus, for a significant portion of nineteenth-century Germans, “ideal feminine domesticity is a German cultural virtue.”¹⁰⁰

Jane’s metamorphosis in the course of the novel from businesslike American to feminine German woman reveals that Werner acknowledged, at least to some degree, these perceived cultural differences. Jane’s initial introduction through Atkins’s words contrasts her to her mother, who was “immer krank, immer zu Thränen und Szenen geneigt, voll Sentimentalität und

Ueberspanntheit – eine echte Deutsche” (13). According to Atkins, Jane has inherited none of these features from her mother’s side and instead takes after her father, “Zug um Zug” (13). Her inclination toward masculinely coded patterns of behavior is expressed in her interaction with the men in her life. For example, the promise she makes to her father of searching for her long-lost brother is sealed between them with a handshake, “wie unter Männern” (23). Her exchanges with Alison repeatedly reveal, “daß Jane ihm gewachsen war, daß ihre Energie der seinigen nichts nachgab” (67), thus suggesting that she considers herself his equal. In general, almost nothing in their interaction, despite a five-month separation from each other, betrays that they are engaged (64).

During her stay in Germany, however, Jane adopts more feminine features. For example, as she meets Alison for the first time since she left America, she appears to him more beautiful than he had ever seen her (64). Her conversations with Fernow, although often ending on a sour note, become progressively gentler. The aforementioned scene of her apology for her behavior is later followed by an encounter in France, when Fernow once again refers to her as “Johanna” and for a moment melts her cold demeanor (137). The reader thus gains the impression that Jane’s feminization occurs alongside her Germanization, which is substantially influenced by the impact that Fernow leaves on her. Ultimately, however, Jane must be the one to complete her own transformation. By showing to Alison her willingness to sacrifice in exchange for her freedom both her wealth, the secondary marker of her American identity, and her claim to being equal to a man, the primary marker of her American identity, Jane makes clear that she is now a German woman. As she sinks to the ground before Alison and pleadingly gazes upon him with tears in her eyes, her “Wesen war so seltsam verwandelt, so ganz anders als die Jane Forest, die er bisher gekannt” (207). It is therefore her submissiveness, heretofore foreign to Jane’s

behavior, that convinces Alison that she is forever lost to him because she has been reintegrated into the framework of German femininity.

Tatlock maintains that a pattern common to many of Werner's novels is that "proper femininity enables the achievement of proper masculinity."¹⁰¹ She also notes that Werner tends "to focus on male protagonists' accession to their manly place in the social and political order" and that this access is usually tied to their attachment to the proper heroine who "does her part to affirm the hero's manhood."¹⁰² In *Ein Held der Feder*, Jane's feminization is therefore essential in affirming Fernow's masculinity and is emblematic of the establishment of the "proper" gender order in the postwar empire. According to Frevert, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarship on gender saw women as incapable of escaping a social role that their biological sex had impressed on them like a "nicht abwaschbaren Stempel,"¹⁰³ and within this discourse, Jane's performance of a normative feminine role at the end of the novel can be interpreted as a return to what was regarded a predetermined set of behaviors in the first place. The flipside of this gender coin, however, was that a "male is only a male now and again,"¹⁰⁴ as Rousseau asserts in *Émile*, and as a consequence, masculinity could be acquired and in fact *had* to be acquired by a man who wished to be successful in the fulfillment of his social duties.

Fernow attains his masculinity by means of his enlistment in the Prussian army and participation in the war. Tatlock compares Werner's initial descriptions of the reserved professor to the humorous portrayals of eccentrics and bookworms in the paintings of Carl Spitzweg,¹⁰⁵ and indeed, the depiction of Fernow as "der sanftmütigste und harmloseste Mensch von der Welt" (40) bears a certain resemblance to the *Schlafmützigkeit* observed in the character of Herrmann von Fels, while his "grenzenlose Abspannung" and "Reizbarkeit" (42) suggest symptoms commonly associated with neurasthenia. Dr. Stephan, seemingly applying the

wisdom of Turnvater Jahn, recommends to Fernow taking a prolonged break from his work and instead taking up physical activity that will “den Körper tüchtig anstrengen” (45). By enlisting as a soldier, Fernow interprets the doctor’s advice in a most extreme way, but the change in lifestyle proves effective. A mere six weeks of military service transform Fernow into a hypermasculine version of himself, expressed by a disappearance of all signs of physical weakness and an abundance of features signaling healthy manhood: a suntanned face, a mane barely contained by his helmet, a wild beard sprouting from his chin, and hands that have lost any sign of tenderness (112). If any doubt remains as to Fernow’s newly gained vitality, Werner makes sure to dispel it by reassuring the reader that upon his return to Bonn, the professor has become a hero among the city’s female population (193). The acceptance of his reinvigorated masculinity, however, hinges on its approval by Jane and an attachment to her recently discovered femininity. Because Fernow can handle a pen equally as well as a sword (220), he displays a mix of intellectual and physical ability that becomes a new German ideal. By contrast, Friedrich, equipped merely “mit einem Paar kräftiger Arme” (89) but lacking intelligence and the will to assert himself, “represents a male type that is superfluous to the new German family,”¹⁰⁶ as Tatlock rightly points out. As the embodiment of the cultured warrior, it is actually Fernow who represents the masculine ideal in 1870s Germany.

Ein Held der Feder thus credits the Franco-Prussian War not only with bringing about German unification but also with essentially restoring a social order that had previously come under attack. The conclusion of the novel restores normative gender roles, reclaiming Jane as a German woman in the process, and reframes the unification as an achievement of the bourgeoisie, since it is supposedly a timid professor’s poetic appeal to the nation that mobilizes the masses and his heroic acts in battle that help repel the looming threat from the archenemy. His vigor and

energy not only earn Jane's love, but in addition "domesticate" her and transform her masculinely coded behavior into the German ideal of femininity. The plot and themes of Werner's novel find surprising correspondence to a novella by Paul Heyse, published in 1873. It is widely known that Heyse held the so-called "Gartenlauberomane" in low esteem and that Marlitt stood "ganz unten auf seiner privaten Werteskala."¹⁰⁷ To express his poor opinion of her, he coined the term "Marlitteratur," which became a derogatory term that, according to Graf, authors of lesser popularity than Marlitt used to dismiss her writing.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, Heyse wrote those types of texts as well on occasion—Bonter finds that *Der Roman der Stiftsdame*, for example, follows a Marlittesque plot structure¹⁰⁹—and even a shorter piece like *Er soll dein Herr sein* shows striking thematic similarities to Werner's *Ein Held der Feder*.

As in Werner's novel, the action in *Er soll dein Herr sein* begins at the outset of the Franco-Prussian War, but it is set in a location described merely as a "bayrische[] Garnisonsstadt" (4:381). Rosamaria, the female protagonist, is a young widow of a deceased army major and is besieged with suitors. She is not interested in remarriage, however, and enjoys the independence that widowhood affords her. Two of her most tenacious suitors are a stout captain and a flirtatious lieutenant, whose attention she enjoys, but whom she does not seriously consider potential marriage material. She is instead interested in a young sculptor, Eduard, but because he has openly displayed his jealousy in the past without actually being involved with Rosamaria, she has been avoiding him for the sake of propriety.

As the local army battalion is preparing to move out and join the other German armies at the Rhine, Eduard appears again near Rosamaria's garden to bid her farewell. She asks him to stay in town for two more days in order to celebrate her upcoming birthday and then join the rest of the group with a small delay. Eduard agrees all too readily, but as he hides out in the clock

tower, waiting for his fellow soldiers to leave town in the morning, his guilty conscience gives him no rest and he decides that he cannot neglect his duty to the fatherland. He moves out with the others in the morning, leaving behind a letter to explain his broken promise to Rosamaria. During the war, Eduard writes to her once again, hoping to discover whether she has forgiven him, but Rosamaria never writes back to him. Upon his return, he is discouraged and has no hopes of regaining her favor. Following a dinner hosted by Rosamaria, however, to which he, the major, and the lieutenant are invited, Rosamaria sends rejection letters to the other two suitors and instead promises to become Eduard's wife and to take him as her "Herr."

Like Werner, Heyse depicts the battle for German unity not primarily as a war of armies but as a war of ideals. Like Fernow, the male protagonist of Heyse's novella is also defined by his artistic spirit. Eduard is introduced as an up-and-coming sculptor who is beginning to make a living and become famous through his work (4:388). Furthermore, as an aspiring officer in the *Landwehr* (4:388), Eduard is endowed with the potential heroism and vitality of a soldier, but because he is not in the army professionally, he remains within the realm of the bourgeois and is not associated with the possibly negative connotations of army officers. Eduard's status thus allows Heyse to contrast him with the comically drawn captain and lieutenant, whose engagement with the arts is mere dilettantism—the captain plays "ganz artig Fagott," while the lieutenant is a "passabler Bariton" (4:385). In their competition for Rosamaria's attention, the officers put on display their skills in singing and playing instruments or in game-hunting and horse-riding, none of which is particularly useful for everyday activities; instead they represent the ostentatious abilities of an increasingly vestigial aristocratic caste. While Rosamaria's other two suitors are professional soldiers, the war is not Eduard's true calling; he serves as a soldier only temporarily.

It is therefore worth noting that Heyse defines the German struggle not as one directed against France, but presents it instead as a striving for positive goals. At the soldiers' final feast before setting out for the front, their thoughts of "Vaterland und Freiheit" (4:382) imbue the event with a sacred atmosphere and the last sleep they will enjoy in their homeland in a long time brings dreams of "Befreiung" (4:401). Similarly, in his farewell letter to Rosamaria, Eduard writes of a time "nach glorreich erkämpftem Frieden" (4:403), rather than using the more common expression "erkämpfter *Sieg*" and thereby obfuscating the fact that there is an opponent in this battle. Heyse thus suggests that the German struggle has peaceful and intellectual aims and submits to the discourse already observed in *Ein Held der Feder*, which accords to Germanness morally noble qualities that emerged from liberal and bourgeois ideals.

Similarly to Werner's novel, Heyse's novella views the Franco-Prussian War as an affirmation of German masculinity. Unlike Fernow, however, Eduard is initially described as a vivacious young man who has little in common with the sleepy and neurasthenic professor. Heyse introduces him as "ein sehr talentvoller, wackerer und schmucker Mensch" (4:388) possessing "zwei feurige Künstleraugen" (4:396). From the very start, therefore, Eduard's physical appearance establishes the fortitude of his character. He resembles Fernow in his devotion to his *Heimat*. The first intimate conversation between Fernow and Jane is mirrored in the meeting between Eduard and Rosamaria at the fence of her flower garden; Eduard waxes poetic about crossing the Rhine shoulder to shoulder "mit *allen* deutschen Brüdern" (4:390; original emphasis). The fervor of his impassioned speech causes him to perspire, and this visible excitement about the war thus reveals that his vigor is tied to his powerful feelings toward the nation.

Rosamaria is simultaneously impressed by Eduard's enthusiasm and jealous that "seine Beredsamkeit, die einzig dem Vaterlande galt" (4:390), is not instead directed toward her. Her urging him to stay behind in the town for her birthday results directly from this jealousy, and she therefore generates the conflict between Eduard's personal happiness and his patriotic duty. Rosamaria's demand compromises the previously established masculinity of Eduard's character. She effectively emasculates Eduard by forcing him to hide in the clock tower, thus removing him from public view and preventing him from bonding with his brothers in arms. The clock tower, furthermore, is the domain of Eduard's aunt Christel, who took on the role of nursemaid ("Kinderfrau"; 4:392) and raised the young man after his parents' death. By returning to this space Eduard reenters a state of childhood and immaturity. His decision to stay behind returns Eduard to a childlike dependence and renders him a mama's boy, "an ein Schürzband gebunden im verborgenen daheim" (4:401), thereby completing his emasculation at the hands of his beloved.

Eduard concludes that he must affirm his masculinity before he can claim Rosamaria as his bride. Observing the other men from his hiding place in the tower as they return to their homes after the feast, Eduard notes that they seem somehow ennobled—"besonders ehrwürdig"—by the prospect of fighting in the war, while he is ashamed of being better off than they (4:398). He no longer feels content in hiding "unter den Weibern" (4:401) while he sees all the other men dripping with the masculine imagery of honor and duty gathering under the "Fahne des Vaterlandes" and wielding their "*Mannesschwert*" in its defense (4:401; emphasis added). This obvious evocation of masculine virtues is reinforced in Eduard's farewell letter to Rosamaria in which he explains that staying in the town and abandoning his comrades would for him "gegen den Mann geh[en]" (4:403). Although this idiomatic turn of phrase commonly

expresses that an action or event defies proper or accepted conduct, or simply bothers the speaker,¹¹⁰ the word choice should not be overlooked in this instance, since from Eduard's point of view staying behind would also defy his principles of masculine behavior. He therefore believes he must forego his love for Rosamaria until he has proven himself worthy of it. Predictably, the experience of combat achieves the desired effect and Eduard's "ehrenvoll" performance in battle earns him the rank of *Landwehrleutnant* (4:405). Although he has suffered from typhus in the war's final months, Eduard is only further invigorated by his convalescence, which gives his face an "interessante Blässe, die das Feuer seiner Augen nur leuchtender machte" (4:407). He thus returns home having regained his masculinity, but as in *Ein Held der Feder*, the male protagonist's restoration is merely one half of the equation and in the end must be attached to the proper type of femininity.

Like Jane Forest, Rosamaria must accept traditional gender roles and find satisfaction in playing the normative feminine role in order to make possible the happy ending that brings together the two lovers and implicitly ensures the proper social order in the empire. Her husband's death has left Rosamaria with a degree of financial security, which translates into her developed sense of social independence and thus forms a further parallel to Werner's female protagonist. Because of her sometimes inconsiderate or even ruthless treatment of her various suitors, Rosamaria is compared by her jealous neighbors to the Lorelei. Far from being a femme fatale who enjoys watching men "am Felsen ihrer Unnahbarkeit ... zerschellen" (4:384), however, she is actually merely cautious because she married her first husband without feeling affection for him. If she chose her second husband by following her heart, she would make sure to avoid the tyranny to which she was subjected in her first marriage by a man who had "seine Gewohnheit, zu kommandieren, von der Stadtgarnison auf seine junge Frau übertragen" (4:384).

In keeping with the biblical decree that a husband shall rule over his wife,¹¹¹ Rosamaria concedes to Eduard that she would fulfill her duty to be a loyal wife to him, but she refuses to be subservient: “er solle freilich ‘ihr Herr’ sein, sie aber auch ‘seine Herrin’” (4:392). She thus asserts a claim to gender equality similar to that of Jane before her eventual transformation, and she thereby undermines not only social and religious norms, but also Eduard’s masculine prerogative.

As I have noted above, Rosamaria’s desire to exercise her own authority challenges Eduard’s sense of duty to the state and the nation. Once Eduard explains in his letter, however, the significance of his mission for his fatherland, a sudden transformation takes place in Rosamaria’s character as well. She discovers her own wartime responsibility as a woman to the nation and redirects the energy she once spent on her finery toward producing dressing material, wool blankets, and winter shirts for the soldiers at the front and toward helping the local *Frauenverein* (4:404). Just as Eduard had to renounce his love of her for the sake of a greater cause, she renounces Eduard and devotes herself entirely to the war effort, rather than any one particular person involved in it, and therefore sends no letters or gifts to him or anyone else.

The change in Rosamaria’s character manifests in an external metamorphosis as well. Upon the soldiers’ return in the spring of 1871, her entire house transforms into a blooming garden, and she herself, along with her most beautiful friends, is described as greeting the parade of war heroes from her balcony as part of an anthropomorphized bouquet of flowers (4:405). Amidst this explosion of feminine imagery signifying Rosamaria’s return to traditional feminine behavior, she sends from her balcony a solitary Provence rose, a symbolic “ambassador of love,”¹¹² which lands right in Eduard’s lap (4:406). With this erotic gesture, Rosamaria first implies that she is ready to submit herself to Eduard and later explicitly indicates that she has

abandoned any aspirations of gender equality by taking Eduard as her “Herr” and promising to be “nicht deine Herrin, sondern deine treue und gehorsame Frau” (4:409).

As pointed out in the above analysis of *Ein Held der Feder*, war is here once again presented as a process necessary for reestablishing normative relations between men and women, which had been challenged previously by a strong female character. Eduard overcomes his crisis of masculinity by fulfilling “seine Schuldigkeit” (4:406) to the nation and thus becomes worthy of claiming Rosamaria as his bride. In the final paragraph, the clock tower is then remodeled into a symbol of masculine power, as Eduard gazes from the tower window upon Rosamaria’s glowing figure on her flower-adorned balcony (4:410). The examinations of *Ein Held der Feder* and *Er soll dein Herr sein* thus offer examples of German authors publishing in the immediate postwar period who presented the Franco-Prussian War as an event that confirmed not only a German national but also a gender identity. In both works, one is intimately tied to the other, suggesting that the nation is ultimately a force that imposes order upon and defines the proper conduct of its subjects. Once the war was over, however, the new German state was founded, and the euphoria of unification had subsided, Germans’ focus shifted inward and onto defining Germanness *within* the confines of the society of the new empire. The following works by Werner and Heyse explore aspects of German masculinity outside of the military context.

“Weib und Heimat und Familie”: Post-Unification German Masculinity

The texts examined in the previous sections focus primarily on male characters whose masculinity only comes to the fore or is restored when they take on roles as soldiers and prove themselves as heroes in the battlefield. The frequency with which one encounters such story lines in German literature of this period might suggest a militarization of civil society in the

German Empire. After all, Frevert observes, the figure of the *Reserveleutnant* became the paramount role model for bourgeois men around the turn of the twentieth century and military standards increasingly began shaping everyday interactions.¹¹³ Despite the abundance of militaristic imagery in the depiction of men, however, it was not the only type that was accepted as the normative model.

As the victory celebrations gave way to daily routines, the young state faced the challenge of bringing together Germans from different backgrounds after the common enemy had been defeated. Speirs asserts that outward unification “made the achievement of inner unity into something even more acutely problematic than before,”¹¹⁴ insofar as the existing conflicts between regional and national loyalties had not been spontaneously resolved by political unity. Belgum explains that *Die Gartenlaube* addressed this problem of identification after 1871 by essentially ignoring it. The segment “Land und Leute,” which presented to readers the various and far-flung German-speaking regions, “continued to present the nation in terms of a sum of lands, a collection of ‘fatherlands,’”¹¹⁵ even after unification, thus creating a geography of the empire that shifted focus away from urban life and toward depictions of rural scenes that, according to Belgum, “were most easily tied to the continuity or constancy of a national identity.”¹¹⁶ In his telling of the national story in *Die Ahnen*, Freytag also stays away from the seats of power in the new empire and, as Tatlock notes, “seeks the pith of the nation rather in insignificant individuals living their lives in relative obscurity in the provinces, removed from the new capital city.”¹¹⁷

One can also observe this post-unification literary turn inward in Werner’s novel *Am Altar* and Heyse’s novella *Das Glück von Rothenburg*. Both of these texts feature provincial settings, yet they address issues that the nation is facing on a larger scale. In each case, the

external *Erbfeind* found in the previously examined works is replaced by a local Other who compromises the integrity of German national identity, and in response the bourgeoisie is hailed as the vanguard of Germanness and the protector of its values. The male protagonists of these two works struggle to maintain models of behavior that are at odds with their bourgeois heritage and are thus under threat of being excluded from the national community. Both characters are eventually “reclaimed” for the *Heimat* by being locked into traditional marital roles as family men in provincial towns. After being led astray, they rediscover the virtues of domesticity and genuineness that identify their masculinity as bourgeois—and therefore also as German.

As Werner was writing *Am Altar* in 1871, the so-called *Kulturkampf* that would mark the 1870s as a decade of intense opposition to Catholicism in Imperial Germany was already making itself felt, and soon the May Laws of 1873 would officially limit the powers that the Catholic Church had until then enjoyed in the German territories.¹¹⁸ The antagonism between Protestant and Catholic Germans is therefore at the core of the novel’s plot. Werner’s text, however, touches upon several other themes already observed in *Ein Held der Feder* and reframes them for the different context of *Am Altar*. The Catholic Church and aristocracy take the place of the French as the vilified Other, while the two main models of bourgeois masculinity in the text take the form not of soldiers, but instead of a landowner and a monk. Through these characters, bourgeois values are once again presented as those that define the success of the nation and carry forward German liberal and democratic ideals. Ultimately, the assertion of powerful bourgeois masculine traits prevails over impotent aristocratic traits, and the plot concludes by pairing each man with the appropriate woman, thus establishing proper gender roles and expelling the alien influences from the social order of the *Heimat*.

The novel's chief protagonist is Bruno, the son of a Protestant middle-class woman and the aristocratic Otfried von Rhaneck, the youngest son of an old Catholic family from South Germany. After the oldest of the Rhaneck brothers died prematurely, the responsibilities of the heir were passed on to Otfried because the middle brother had entered the priesthood. Upon the middle brother's demand, Rhaneck renounced his marriage to his Protestant wife and signed over Bruno's fate to the church. Bruno, who has lived his entire life as a Catholic monk, has never found out his true heritage and does not know that Count Rhaneck is his father. In the meantime, Count Rhaneck has entered a loveless marriage to a Catholic woman whom he deemed a more socially appropriate match and who eventually gave birth to another son, also named Otfried.

When Bernhard Günther, a North German middle-class landowner, settles between the Catholic monastery and the Rhanecks' estate, he brings along his younger sister, Lucie, who becomes both Bruno's and Otfried's object of desire. Initially charmed by Otfried's debonair manner, Lucie later distances herself from him upon the strong urging of Bruno, who despises his brother without knowing of their relation to each other. Bruno struggles with his feelings for Lucie, and his resentment of the Catholic Church, fuelled by its oppressive treatment of its subjects and the restrictions it places on his own life, grows by the day. Deciding to take matters into his own hands, Bruno begins preaching heretical ideas to a congregation in a nearby mountain village, but his actions lead his uncle, the prelate of the monastery, to plot his murder in an effort to silence him. After Otfried is mistakenly killed instead of his half-brother, however, Bruno discovers his uncle's plans and also learns the truth about his heritage. In his outrage, he declares his vow to the church null and void because it was made without full knowledge of the facts. He reveals his uncle's plot to the public, thereby disgracing both him and the Church. Freed from the shackles that prevented him from openly expressing his love for

Lucie, Bruno proposes to marry her and also takes up studies to become a Protestant pastor, thus ensuring his full conversion at the end of the novel.

From the very outset of the novel, Werner presents Catholicism as an unnatural force in the provincial mountain community and connects it explicitly to the ruling aristocracy in order to highlight its artifice and outdated, medieval character. She describes the young Ottfried's attitude toward his faith as primarily reflected in his reverence "vor dem Priestergewande und vor den äußeren Zeremonien der Religion" (57) and implies thereby a superficial understanding of God and Christianity, which consists merely of a series of empty gestures. Almost immediately, Werner transfers this superficiality onto the family relationships of the Rhanecks, depicting them also as devoid of all genuine content: "die äußeren Formen der Ehrerbietung und Rücksicht wurden im Rhaneckschen Hause streng aufrecht erhalten, aber die Formen waren hier eben auch alles, sie mußten das Herz ersetzen, das nun einmal in allen Beziehungen dieser Familie zu einander zu fehlen schien" (57). Thus, Werner suggests that the essence of the community is undermined by Catholics and aristocrats, who are incapable of establishing true interpersonal connections and who therefore weaken the bonds between themselves and others. She emphasizes this point once more in the warning that Bruno issues to Lucie: "Aber was Sie Liebe nennen, kann der Graf nicht mehr empfinden, wenn er es überhaupt jemals empfunden hat. Er ist einer reinen Zuneigung nicht wert" (89). As a result of his upbringing, Ottfried and his family are incapable of true devotion or loyalty and are therefore not worthy of affection or inclusion into the local community.

Furthermore, Werner renders Catholicism as characteristically un-German in its violation of the ideals of liberty and free thought. Bruno first experiences the cruelty of the Catholic Church in the prelate's treatment of a peasant who had strayed from the faith by accepting

Protestant teachings and who is now seeking the sacrament as he is about to die. Even though the peasant has recently saved a priest from drowning and has served the monastery dutifully in the past, and in spite of Bruno's pleas to administer the sacrament to him before his death, the prelate refuses to do so unless the man professes his loyalty to the Catholic Church (105). Bruno himself is warned to beware of his heart and his head, since neither has a place in the church: "Das erste ist hier nicht von nöten, und der zweite nur da, wo er im Dienste der Kirche gefordert wird" (106). Thus, personal freedom and critical thought, the linchpins of the Enlightenment that shaped the development of German national liberalism in the nineteenth century, are dismissed by the prelate in one sweeping statement that goes against Bruno's very nature. Ultimately, the failure of the Catholic Church to capture the hearts of the mountain population becomes the reason behind its failure to retain power following the prelate's dismissal. With the removal of his strong central control over the region "im Kampfe gegen die Neuzeit" (241), the influence of the monastery wanes rather quickly and this almost immediate decay of its power implies that Catholicism must not have been native to the area in the first place. In fact, the prelate's reassignment to an honorary position in Rome indicates quite openly the un-German roots of the Catholic faith and thus implies the return of Germanness to the small South German community.

The initial challenge to the prelate's aristocratic Catholic control over the region appears in the form of Bernhard Günther, who embodies some of the same virtues that Freytag believed typical of the bourgeoisie and therefore also bestowed upon his protagonists, namely honesty, sense of duty, and industry.¹¹⁹ Günther's property is located squarely "zwischen Aristokratie und Klerus" (20) and the confidence with which he has settled between the count's and the prelate's estates represents metaphorically the increasing status and confidence of the

bourgeoisie in confrontation with the aristocratic and clerical estates. Count Rhaneck is impressed with Günther's boldness, but he also refers to him as a "Bauer" and considers him an upstart for settling among them, "als wäre er unsresgleichen" (29). Günther's audacity thus earns him both the respect and ire of his neighbors, whose remarks reveal the obvious envy in their tone. The prelate implicitly ties Günther's North German heritage with his diligence that has dramatically increased the productivity and profitability of the once-defunct property he has purchased (30). The narrator credits his "rastlose Thätigkeit" and "riesigen Unternehmungsgeist" (39), i.e., the aforementioned bourgeois virtues, with creating riches from seeming nothingness in an almost godlike fashion. This apparently easy success earns Günther Count Rhaneck's contempt of the "Emporkömmling[]" (54), but the path to his success was paved by twenty years "voll Sorge und Arbeit, voll endlosen Mühens und rastlosen Ringens" (114), which those who envy him often disregard. He thus counters the accusation of being a parvenu and asserts the rightfulness of the status he enjoys as one that was earned by hard work and creativity.

A ball hosted by Baron Brankow, one of the local noblemen, further tests Günther's and Lucie's suitability for the aristocratic circles that they have joined, and they prove that they can keep pace with the Rhanecks and their friends. Günther gradually becomes the focus of entertainment among the aristocratic guests at the ball and Lucie, who had never before attended a larger social event, charms young Ottfried and remains his dance partner throughout the evening (60-61). When Günther recognizes the potential threat that Ottfried poses to his sister's virtue, he steps in and demands that Lucie refrain from further dancing because he fears that the unusual activity might excite her too much and have adverse effects on her health. Narrowly skirting insult to the young count, who thought to have already secured another dance with Lucie,

Günther skillfully phrases his objection in a manner that sounds polite but intercepts any objection in advance (“klang sehr höflich, aber sie schnitt alle und jede Einwendung von vornherein ab”; 64). By showing the siblings’ highly successful navigation of an event supposedly outside of their social sphere, Werner suggests that the bourgeoisie is a socially mobile class capable of rubbing elbows with the aristocracy while maintaining the moral values that define it. Moreover, the qualities characterizing the middle class are presented as innate in its members, who cannot suppress their true nature even when they adapt their outward behavior to circles that are actually foreign to them. This inborn bourgeois character ultimately makes possible Bruno’s restoration as well.

Like Fernow in *Ein Held der Feder*, Bruno is an odd choice for a male protagonist. He is described as a reclusive thinker, but at the same time, the monastery prior’s accusation that Bruno “denkt zu viel” (37; original emphasis) suggests that he harbors a disobedience that the prior can read in his eyes (37). Indeed, as in some of the previously examined protagonists, it is Bruno’s eyes that first reveal his vitality, a “düster[es] Feuer der großen, tiefliegenden Augen” (31), forming a stark contrast to his otherwise pallid countenance. Despite his grave and cold appearance, Bruno compares favorably to his half-brother Ottfried, who lacks Bruno’s “feurige Lebhaftigkeit” and “energische Ruhe” (52). Ottfried is repeatedly described in terms such as “lemblos” and almost immediately contrasted to the “energisch” Bruno (145). The use of adjectives such as “feurig,” “energisch,” and “lebhaft” in the descriptions of Bruno clearly designates him as a strong masculine type and makes him the opposite of his brother. In fact, the prelate claims in the end, Ottfried “war der schwächliche, verweichlichte Sproß seiner unbedeutenden Mutter” (243), while he claims Bruno as the one possessing the strong blood of the Rhanecks. Considering the tremendous influence over Ottfried’s character that the prelate

attributes to his aristocratic mother, he discounts all too easily the influence that a middle-class mother's heritage could exert on Bruno.

Bruno is indeed resentful of Count Rhaneck for removing him from the sphere that he regards as proper for him and for forcing an existence on him that is alien to his nature. He would have preferred instead the life of a peasant or day laborer, “*der im Schweiß seines Angesichts das saure Brot verdienen muß*” (95). Here, Bruno's sense of duty and diligence as a bourgeois surfaces in protest of a life in which he was simply given everything he needed. When Bruno begins proselytizing on behalf of the “*Gegenpartei*” (126) the prelate himself blames “*das alte trotzige Protestantenblut*” (130) coursing through his nephew's veins, which he tried to suppress by slipping a monk's habit on him (217). Bruno ultimately refuses to submit to the Catholic Church or to the aristocracy once he has discovered his true heritage, and his mother's bloodline thus proves too powerful to be suppressed. In a sense, Bruno's recovery on behalf of the German Protestant bourgeoisie resembles the reclamation of Jane Forest: no matter how much effort his guardians exerted in effecting his conversion, they cannot prevent him from eventually returning to the sphere from which he came. Once Bruno proclaims, “*ich weiß jetzt, wohin ich gehöre*” (237), the “*natural*” order is restored in which he can marry Lucie. In what at first seems like an insignificant line at the end of the penultimate chapter, Werner confirms that her protagonist is now allowed to forge once and for all the bonds that connect all humans—“*Weib und Heimat und Familie*” (239)—and thus establishes his masculinity firmly within a normative social framework.

Werner's novel presents the story of a regional power struggle that reflects larger trends in German society at the time of her work's publication. She identifies the threat to Germanness as a force inside the empire and presents the middle class as the group responsible for defending

what she regards as German norms and values. The conclusion of *Am Altar* thus paints Germany as Protestant, bourgeois, and masculine and expels the Catholic Church and the aristocracy because they do not represent those ideals. In the novella *Das Glück von Rothenburg* (1881), Heyse casts the bourgeoisie in a similar role. Heyse had published his first novel, *Kinder der Welt*, in 1873 and took the opportunity to display in public for the first time his liberal convictions and to engage more openly with the social issues of his day.¹²⁰ The novel offers a critical view of society in the young German Empire and tries to point to an “alternative place in society” for its bourgeois protagonists away from Berlin and in a small-town setting.¹²¹ In *Rothenburg*, Heyse further explores the provincial setting as a bourgeois haven and presents an artist under threat of being removed from this *Heimat* by an outsider who “infiltrates” his home space and seduces him with her exoticism. He must reconcile his artistic aspirations with his bourgeois lifestyle in order to reestablish a socially acceptable form of masculinity.

The opening of the novella reveals that the protagonist, Hans Doppler, is traveling home on a train from Nuremberg to Rothenburg on the last day of the Easter holidays. The train is filled to the brim, which forces the conductor to upgrade Doppler to a first-class cabin at the last moment, where he meets a strange woman who turns out to be, despite her flawless German, the wife of a Russian general. Doppler introduces himself as an artist specializing in architectural paintings and shows her some of his work. The woman assures him that he has talent and strongly implies that he is wasting it by spending his best years in a provincial town. Instead, she suggests that he should travel with her to Italy, where he can explore the majesty of Roman architecture. Inclined to accept the offer, Doppler asks the Russian if she would accompany him to Rothenburg in order to state her case to his wife, Christel, and convince her to let him take the trip to Italy. Thus the woman decides to lodge in Rothenburg for a few days.

Doppler begins to behave strangely after making the Russian woman's acquaintance, and starts to put on airs of superiority. As he is showing the town to her, nothing seems quite good enough any longer. It also becomes clear that he is completely taken in by her exotic appearance and worldly manner. Once the Russian woman finally does visit Doppler's home, she is so impressed with Christel, whom she had imagined altogether differently, and with the warmth and cozy atmosphere she has created in their house that she never even mentions the plan to which she and Doppler agreed on the train. When Doppler tries to leave town with the Russian the next day, she is surprised that he would leave behind his happiness for a plunge into the unknown. In fact, she envies *him* because she has never been able to escape loneliness despite all the freedom she enjoys and would not want to tear him away from his family bliss. Doppler has already found the ultimate ideal for which she has striven all her life.

The primary source of tension in *Das Glück von Rothenburg* springs from Doppler's encounter with the Russian woman and his subsequent aspiration to "elevate" himself into her sphere. The Eastern European Other is thus portrayed as a seductress: her exoticism is dangerous insofar as it is foreign to Doppler's bourgeois existence and threatens to undermine his role as husband and father. The crisis of masculinity that Doppler undergoes during the Russian's visit of Rothenburg is deeply tied to the "crisis of profession" that he experiences simultaneously, which confronts him with the question whether he can fully realize himself as an artist if he is confined to the restrictive walls of a Franconian small town. Heyse goes to great lengths to present the provincial setting as Doppler's *Heimat* and to reaffirm traditional marriage as the highest bourgeois ideal, discrediting the aristocratic outsider in the process and returning Doppler to his rightful social position as a middle-class family man.

The erotic tension between Doppler and the Russian woman becomes obvious as soon as Doppler joins her in the first-class cabin. In a scene that bears elements of a voyeuristic fantasy, the artist begins to draw a sketch of the sleeping woman, thus transgressing the social boundary between men and women, an act that the Russian considers criminal (5). She exudes an “eigentümliche[n] Duft” (4) that draws Doppler into the higher spheres that she represents. The narrator’s descriptions of the foreigner, however, are by no means positive. The reader’s first glimpse of her reveals that she has slunk into the corner of the cabin “wie eine schwarze Eidechse” (3), and this negative imagery is later expanded when Doppler gains the impression that neither worldlings nor holy men could escape her, “wenn sie ihr Netz nach ihnen auswerfen wollte” (27). Conforming to the literary conventions of his time, Heyse depicts the Russian woman as an “oriental”, whose realm appears as “eine Welt der sündigen ‘Fleischeslust’ und zügelloser Sinnlichkeit.”¹²² The Russian therefore possesses the characteristics of a femme fatale who can ensnare men and drive them to their ruin, but precisely this dangerousness, stemming from her unrestrained freedom (14), appeals to Doppler and makes her all the more attractive to him, even as he feels “immer deutlicher die Macht, die diese Frau über ihn gewann” (31). She is a libertine who, unlike Doppler himself, smokes cigarettes (14) and reads French novels (4) and is thus acquainted with a larger world that remains a mystery for the provincial artist. His interaction with the Russian allows Doppler access to this unknown world, in which he feels like an “Eindringling” (4) from the start but which he desperately wants to join. Ultimately, the Russian woman recognizes that Doppler truly does not belong to her sphere, but she has awakened in him the desire to strive to be something that he is not and has thus compromised his entire existence up to that point.

In fact, Doppler has the traditional markings of a bourgeois. Heyse's first description of him presents the artist as dressed in "schlichten Sonntagskleidern" (3), and the narrator later reveals that Doppler enjoyed a traditional middle-class education, which enabled him to study at an art academy in Munich and prepare to make the almost mandatory artistic pilgrimage to Italy (9). Doppler, however, forsook the opportunity of traveling to Italy after visiting Rothenburg for a few quick landscape studies, where he was spellbound by the comforts of the small town (9). Now he is practically bound to the town by the promise he made to his father-in-law, "daß ich [seine Tochter] ihm nicht aus dem Hause nähme, solange er lebte, und meine Kunst hauptsächlich auf die Verherrlichung seiner teuren Stadt verwendete" (10-11). As a result, his life has become entwined with the life of Rothenburg to such a degree that even his house is "in die Stadtmauer hineingebaut" (21). Doppler himself has thus become an institution in the provincial nest.

Neither the narrator nor Doppler, however, disparages the small-town character of Rothenburg; in fact, Doppler compares it to Jerusalem when he describes the town's topography to his new acquaintance (7) and thus exposes the high esteem in which he holds his hometown. It is indeed the Russian who first calls into question the possibility of reconciling Doppler's identity as husband and father with his profession. She cannot imagine that "eine echte, freie Künstlerseele" can be fulfilled "durch ein hausbackenes Familienglück" (12). Her remarks clearly strike a chord with Doppler and cause him to doubt the choices he has made in his life. When he returns home that evening, the bourgeois *Gemütlichkeit* that he enjoyed heretofore has transformed in his eyes into a *Spießbürgerlichkeit* that leaves him dissatisfied with the layout of his home and its simple but clean appointments (22).

Doppler feels that embracing this lifestyle has compromised his artistic integrity and his striving for higher ideals, which leads him to compare himself to the subject of Schiller's poem "Pegasus im Joche": "Ein gewöhnliches Pferd, wenn es auch Rasse hätte, das sich in den Pflug spannen läßt und darin aushält, zeigt dadurch eben, daß es keine Flügel hat. Aber es taugte doch vielleicht zu etwas Besserem als zum Ackergaul" (12). He feels that living among the citizens of the sleepy town has stifled his spirit and his fear is confirmed when the Russian notes that he has now taken on the same "Pietätsblick" (28) as has everyone else who lives there. His eyes are missing the spark that identifies the vitality of the previously examined protagonists. The Russian implies with her comment that Doppler has lost his will and masculine drive along the way, but the foreigner's adventurous nature now elicits for a moment "einen feurigen Blick" (30) from his eyes.

Doppler thus comes to regard his erstwhile happiness in Rothenburg as a yoke preventing him from achieving something extraordinary, of which he may well be capable. In such close proximity to the Russian woman he feels, "[als] würden mir Flügel wachsen und mich hinaustragen weit über das Gewöhnliche" (31). By thus extending the reference to Schiller's poem, Doppler suggests that the noblewoman could free him from what he now sees as a life of lowly servitude and that he could regain his vigor if she freed him from his bonds to the town, even temporarily. As a sign of his rebellion, Doppler now rejects the black suit he wore the previous day and instead dons his *Maleranzug*, which he had not worn since his arrival in Rothenburg, in order to be viewed as different from all the other citizens and to signal his determination, "sich ... seiner Künstlerschaft nicht länger [zu] schämen" (25). By making an outward show of the embrace of his profession, Doppler intends to communicate that he is distancing himself from his provincial bourgeois surroundings. He seeks distinction from the

commonplace and hopes to become more like his Russian acquaintance by forcibly cutting off his roots to the town.

This self-imposed alienation, however, proves to be a more difficult process for Doppler than he had imagined. After all, he is a verifiable descendant of Heinrich Toppler (8), a historically significant mayor of Rothenburg, whose acquisition and rehabilitation of ill-kept properties surrounding the town and whose introduction of a money economy into a community still heavily reliant on a barter system elevated the town to a South German regional power in the fourteenth century. Doppler's name alone therefore maintains a direct connection to the town's history and lore. In fact, as I explained in the introduction to this chapter, it is the reference to a long history and its manifestation in the present that helped Freytag define his notion of Germanness. The Russian woman even points out that Rothenburg resembles a "deutsches Pompeji" (12), both in the sense that its spires and oriel windows are elements of a glorious past that has survived into the present and that it is, in her opinion, a dead city. During her tour of the town, she compares the quaint inhabitants of Rothenburg to a "große, wohlerzogene Familie" (28), to which she also assigns Doppler himself.

The image of the provincial town as a group of people forged together by a common history evokes the aforementioned metaphor of the national family, for which the regional setting acts as a metonym. The Russian woman, by contrast, belongs to no such community since she lacks "historische[n] Sinn" (29), according to Doppler's observation. Heyse once again reveals his adherence to German literary conventions of the nineteenth century by imagining "Slawen ... als zivilisatorisch rückständige und triebhafte 'Völker,' die im Gegensatz zu den 'Kulturvölkern' (d.h. Deutschen) weder eine bruchlos kontinuierliche Vergangenheit besäßen, noch eine viel versprechende ... Zukunft."¹²³ The woman further reveals her unmoored existence by referring

to Russia as her “sogenannte[] Heimat” (39) to which she feels no obvious connection.¹²⁴ Even the absence of any name that would refer to her heritage distinguishes her from Doppler and the other Rothenburghers. The Russian woman’s ultimate realization that Doppler has already found happiness implies that his rootedness in the region and its history forms a significant component of his identity as a bourgeois and as a German.

Heyse, moreover, reinforces his idealization of life in Rothenburg by highlighting its clean and healthy atmosphere. A common byword in the town is, “In Rothenburg ob der Tauber / Ist das Mühl- und Beckenwerk sauber” (26), which is intended as praise of its baked goods. Especially Doppler’s family, however, is presented as the epitome of soundness in both body and spirit. Heyse endows Christel with a “frischen roten Mund voll blanker Zähne” (23) and an accompanying “reine, warme Menschenstimme” (38) that infuses her song with power and ardor. Similarly, their children appear “schön und blühend” (37) when they are introduced to their father’s guest and thus stand in stark contrast to Christel’s perception of Russian children as “ganz zerlumpt und dazu ungewaschen” (25). The final revelation that the Russian woman’s apparent vitality is an illusion created by an abundance of makeup and a false braid (46) contrasts starkly with the depiction of Doppler’s healthy family. Heyse thereby makes clear that his protagonist has been blinded by the aristocrat’s impressive outward appearance and that the vitality he seeks to “regain” by joining her is more readily found in his own home.

Heyse’s portrayal of bourgeois femininity is in keeping with gender roles that scholars of the nineteenth century have observed elsewhere. In her analysis of bourgeois social identities, Frevert explores, among others, the writings of Adam Müller, a German philosopher of the late romantic period, who proposed the dichotomy between animalistic masculine characteristics and plant-like feminine characteristics as a basic dividing principle of humanity. Applying Müller’s

ideas to her own observations, Frevert arrives at the notion that in the nineteenth century man's purpose was defined by his profession, while woman's purpose was defined by her "plant-like" being as the aspiration toward beauty and pleasantness. This dichotomy ultimately figured men as bourgeois and in contrast assigned a noble quality to women, whose purpose was to elevate the social status of men.¹²⁵

Christel embodies precisely this notion of femininity. Heyse repeatedly links her to the earth and the plant world. In response to Doppler's reminder that she should clean up the children because their hands are soiled from playing in the garden, Christel reminds him, "Erde ist übrigens kein Schmutz" (34), thereby implying that they need not be ashamed of their proximity to life's lower strata—both in terms of their closeness to nature and their relatively low social status. Furthermore, when she is complimented by the Russian on her flower garden, Christel responds that she has "eine glückliche Hand mit Kindern und Blumen, das ist mein einziges Talent" (39). Her capability to generate life in the form of children and flowers casts Christel in the role of Mother Nature. The text thus assigns to her a symbolic value similar to that already observed in the depiction of Erdmuthe von Fels. The Russian woman, who never had any children of her own, recognizes that she herself has "bisher nichts Höheres gefunden ... als den stillen, klugen, warmen Blick Ihrer kleinen Frau, den Frieden in ihrer altmodischen Wohnstube und jene glückliche Hand in der Kind- und Blumenzucht, die beiden so frische Farben anzaubert" (44).

While Doppler seeks to elevate his status and is prepared to abandon his family in pursuit of higher ideals, he does not recognize that it is not the sophisticated aristocrat but indeed his small-town wife whose nobility will enhance his life and elevate it to a higher sphere. The conclusion of the novella thus allows Doppler to rediscover his role as a bourgeois family man

and reintegrates him into the small-town setting that has been confirmed as his home and a place of belonging. To cement further Rothenburg's status as *Heimat* and reiterate the expulsion of foreign elements, Heyse has Christel utter the following final sentence: "Die Tiber mag ein ganz schöner Fluß sein – aber mit der Tauber läßt sie sich doch gewiß nicht vergleichen!" (46) The two rivers thus take on a doubly metonymical meaning. First, they evoke the respective cities with which they are associated, namely Rome and Rothenburg; the cities, in turn, stand for the states to which they belong. It is worth noting that while Rome is a common representative of Italy as a whole, Rothenburg is rather unusual in representing Germany. The obvious discrepancy in the status of these two places within the context of their respective countries suggests that Heyse is emphasizing the importance of provincial life for the understanding of German middle-class values. Like Bruno in Werner's *Am Altar*, Hans Doppler is bound by blood to his bourgeois heritage and is ultimately reminded that his wife, family, and *Heimat* are his highest ideals and that they are just as worthy of his art as the attractions of Rome.

The analyses of the works I have presented in this chapter have revealed several common threads among them. First, the selected works depict Germans as one people with shared origins and values and often draw upon the metaphor of a "national family" in order to reinforce the notion that Germany is indeed more than a collection of disparate states, even as the differences among these states are held up as something uniquely German. Another element these texts share is an emphasis on the achievement or display of masculinity through armed conflict. Nevertheless, they do not promote an understanding of masculinity solely based on militaristic virtues, but instead suggest that it is precisely the balance of physical strength and will of the soldier with bourgeois moral integrity and of *Bildung* which defines German men. Last, they also overlap in their glorification of the Protestant bourgeoisie as the bearer of German national

culture and in their promotion of a lifestyle that regards the attainment of domestic bliss as the norm for German men. The fear of German *Verweichlichung* that emerged during the Napoleonic Wars is still present in these works, but appears merely as a challenge that is ultimately overcome by the male protagonists. This virile German masculinity is in the end firmly established as a pillar that supports the nation.

It is, furthermore, worth noting that Heyse, who was highly regarded by both literary elites and the wider German readership in the second half of the nineteenth century, dealt in precisely the kinds of plots, themes, and clichés that were common in what was considered popular literature and what Heyse himself condemned as writing of a lower quality.¹²⁶ In *German Writing, American Reading*, Tatlock devotes an entire section to “The Reconciliation of Art and Life” in a bourgeois setting using the examples of E. Werner’s *Gesprengte Fesseln* (1874) and Wilhelmine Heimgang’s *Eine unbedeutende Frau* (1891) to show that these women writers also grappled with the theme of artists struggling to find fulfillment in traditional marriage, and she concluded that the achievement of proper masculinity depended on proper femininity.¹²⁷ The fact that Heyse’s texts resemble those of other popular authors of the period merely suggests that he was attuned to the tastes of his readership and recognized the plots and themes that resonated with a wide audience. As we will see, the normative image of German men observed in the works presented in this chapter was at the same time countered by alternative literary visions of Germanness and unconventional definitions of masculinity. The following chapter examines how some of Heyse’s, Werner’s, and François’s contemporaries challenged common representations of German masculinity.

Notes:

1. Kirsten Belgum, *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 18.
2. Ibid, 26.
3. Ibid, 27.
4. Ibid, 26.
5. Eric Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.
6. Roman Lach, "'Ein starker Hall aus Auerhorn': germanische Simulationen im historischen Roman der Gründerzeit," in *Mythos Ursprung: Modelle der Arché zwischen Antike und Moderne*, ed. Constanze Baum (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2011), 154-55.
7. Ibid, 155.
8. Ibid, 153.
9. Elystan Griffiths, "A Nation of Provincials? German Identity in Gustav Freytag's Novel Cycle *Die Ahnen*," *Monatshefte für deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur* 96.2 (2004): 227.
10. Lynne Tatlock, "'In the Heart of the Heart of the Country': Regional Histories as National History in Freytag's *Die Ahnen* (1872-80)," in *A companion to German realism, 1848-1900*, ed. Todd Kontje (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002), 88-89.
11. Griffiths, "Nation of Provincials," 230.
12. Elystan Griffiths, "Provincialism, Private Life, and the Marginal Hero: Germany after Unification in the Works of Gustav Freytag, Friedrich Spielhagen, and Paul Heyse," in *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, ed. Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 211.
13. Uta Schuch, "*Die im Schatten stand*": *Studien zum Werk einer vergessenen Schriftstellerin: Louise von François* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994), 46.
14. Linda Kraus Worley, "Louise von François (1817-1893): Scripting a Life," *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Neueren Germanistik* 28 (1989): 165.
15. Barbara Burns, *The Prose Fiction of Louise von François (1817-1893)* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006): 16.
16. Scheidemann lists "die Schlachtfelder von Roßbach, Leipzig, and Lützen, wo Gustav Adolf gefallen ist," as examples of historically significant military sites in the area. Uta Scheidemann, "Erzählen zwischen konservativen Überlieferungen und freien Standpunkten: Über Louise von François," *Die Horen* 37.3 (1992): 62.
17. Schuch, 46.
18. Caroline Bland, "The Triumph of Moderation? The 'Wars of Liberation' in the Writing of Louise von François," in *Women Against Napoleon: Historical and Fictional Responses to his Rise and Legacy*, ed. Waltraud Maierhofer, Gertrud M. Roesch, and Caroline Bland (Frankfurt; New York: Campus Verlag, 2007): 223.
19. Schuch, 66.
20. Burns, 43.
21. Thomas C. Fox, "A Woman's Post: Gender and Nation in Historical Fiction by Louise von François," in *A Companion to German Realism, 1848-1900*, ed. Todd Kontje (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002): 110.
22. Griffiths, "Provincialism," 211.
23. Boyd Mullan, "From Bavaria to Berlin: Stations in Paul Heyse's Career as a Patriotic Dramatist," *Euphorion* 95.2 (2001): 133.
24. Jere H. Link, "Patriotism and Theater Politics in the Second Reich: Paul Heyse's 'Colberg,'" in *Essays in European History: Selected From the Annual Meetings of the Southern Historical Association, 1988-1989 – Vol. II*, ed. June K. Burton and Carolyn W. White (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996), 48.
25. Ibid, 49.
26. Bland, 225.
27. Mullan, 160.
28. Link, 51.
29. Ibid, 52. The popularity of the Kolberg myth as a nationalistic emblem of German resilience endured into the twentieth century and even spawned a Nazi-era propaganda film. Mullan maintains, however, that the myth

- had received other literary treatments predating Heyse's drama, and that the film adaptation differs to such a degree from Heyse's version that it would be difficult to assert its direct cooption by Veit Harlan in 1944. Mullan, 158n54.
30. Griffiths, "Provincialism," 213.
 31. Mullan, 165.
 32. Thomas Fox, "Louise von François Rediscovered," in *Autoren damals und heute: Literaturgeschichtliche Beispiele veränderter Wirkungshorizonte*, ed. Gerhard P. Knapp (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991), 316.
 33. Schuch, 9.
 34. For a more detailed review of critical reactions to the works of Louise von François, please consult Thomas C. Fox, "Rediscovered," 308-10.
 35. Gustav Freytag, "Ein Roman von Louise François," review of *Die letzte Reckenburgerin*, by Louise von François, *Im neuen Reich* 8.2 (1872): 300.
 36. *Ibid.*, 300.
 37. Burns, 20-21.
 38. *Ibid.*, 22.
 39. Ronald Speirs, "German Literature and the Foundation of the Second Empire," in *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, ed. Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 186.
 40. Belgum, 77.
 41. Regina Hartmann, "Von 'Bruderkrieg,' 'Erbfeind' und der Reichsgründung in der Lyrik der *Gartenlaube* zwischen 1867 und 1871," in *Literatur und Nation: die Gründung des Deutschen Reiches 1871 in der deutschsprachigen Literatur*, ed. Klaus Amann and Karl Wagner (Vienna: Böhlau, 1996), 96.
 42. Lionel Thomas, "Luise von François: 'Dichterin von Gottes Gnaden,'" *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Literary & Historical Section* 11.2 (1964): 9.
 43. Hartmann, 103.
 44. Charlotte Woodford, "Contrasting Discourses of Nationalism in Historical Novels by Freytag and Fontane," in *German Literature, History and the Nation: Papers from the Conference 'The Fragile Tradition,' Cambridge 2002*, ed. Christian Emden and David R. Midgley (Bern; Oxford: Peter Lang, 2004), 160.
 45. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, s.v. "Muth," accessed April 16, 2012, <http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/>.
 46. Bland, 235.
 47. Hagemann's presentation of terms taken from German literature of the Napoleonic period shows how closely François followed the established patterns in her depiction of German-coded Herrmann and French-coded Raul: "Die Deutschen' wurden in der Tagesliteratur als 'fromm', 'tugendhaft' und 'innerlich', als 'treu', 'redlich' und 'gerecht' vor allem aber 'ehrhaft' und 'wehrhaft' charakterisiert und auf diese Weise mit den 'Tugenden' ausgestattet, die von erwachsenen männlichen Bürgern erwünscht wurden. 'Die Franzosen' hingegen wurden als 'äußerlich', 'gewandt' und 'fein', als 'spiegelglatt', 'falsch' und 'oberflächlich, als 'wollüstig' und 'unzüchtig' charakterisiert, also mit allgemein als 'weibisch' bezeichneten, dem höfischen Adel zugeschriebenen Eigenschaften abgewertet." Karen Hagemann, "Publizistische Diskurse: Entwürfe von Nation, Krieg und Geschlecht," in "*Männlicher Muth und Teutsche Ehre*": *Nation, Militär und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002), 237.
 48. Speirs, 189.
 49. Representations of Napoleon Bonaparte such as this would have been recognized by German readers familiar with his descriptions in the writings of Madame de Staël, who painted him as a being "more or less than man" and detected "even somewhat of Italian imagination in narratives which allowed of gaiety." Even though his Italian heritage is sometimes emphasized in this way, he is effectively rendered as *sui generis*, beyond what one would call human. Madame de Staël, *Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution*, ed. Aurelian Crăiuțu, newly rev. trans. (Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 2008), 409.
 50. Bland, 228.
 51. *Ibid.*, 231.
 52. Fox, "A Woman's Post," 117.
 53. *Ibid.*, 123.
 54. Ute Frevert, "*Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann*": *Geschlechter-Differenzen in der Moderne* (Munich: Beck, 1995), 23.

55. Thomas, 16.
56. Tiiu V. Laane, "Louise von François's Critical Perspectives on Society," *European Studies Journal* 8.2 (Fall 1991): 19.
57. Laane, 20.
58. Bland, 239.
59. John Breuilly, "Nationalism and the First Unification," in *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, ed. Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 113.
60. Michael John, "Between Estate and Profession: Lawyers and the Development of the Legal Profession in Nineteenth-Century Germany," in *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*, ed. David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans (London; New York: Routledge: 1991): 165.
61. Ibid, 190.
62. Griffiths, "Provincialism," 213-14.
63. Bland, 241.
64. Mullan, 131.
65. Ibid, 137.
66. Jürgen Joachimsthaler, "'Wucherblumen auf Ruinen': Nationalliterarische (Des)Integration bei Paul Heyse," in *Nationale Identität aus germanistischer Perspektive*, ed. Maria Katarzyna Lasatowicz (Opole: Wydawn. Uniwersyteckiego, 1998), 222.
67. Ibid, 218.
68. Mullan, 164.
69. Thomas Nipperdey, "Der große Umbruch," in *Deutsche Geschichte* (Munich: C.H. Beck: 1998), 1:11.
70. She tells Heinrich: "Du wardst ein Andrer, und wie viel ich leide, / Seit wir vom *Heiligsten* verschieden denken, / Das wissen meine Nächte." (346; emphasis added)
71. In *Le Mistère du Siège d'Orleans*, the Conte du Vendosme utters the following in reference to Joan of Arc: "Qu'elle est plaisante en fais, en dis, / Belle et blanche comme la rose." *Le Mistère du Siège d'Orleans*, ed. MM.F. Guessard and E. de Certain (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1862), 592. A translation of these lines can be found in Lucy Foster Madison's *Joan of Arc: "Sweet she is in words and deeds, / Fair and white as the white rose."* Lucy Foster Madison, *Joan of Arc: The Warrior Maid* (1919, Project Gutenberg, 2010), 43, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/34474/34474-h/34474-h.htm>.
72. Joachimsthaler, 221.
73. Mullan, 158.
74. Joachimsthaler, 219.
75. Ibid, 224.
76. Queen Louise was furthermore the embodiment of bourgeois virtues and a role model for German women in the nineteenth century: "Mehr noch als der König wurde die Königin im Zuge dieser Nationalisierung zum Symbol für das Leiden und die 'Erhebung' der 'preußischen Nation' stilisiert. Die im tiefsten Winter getrennt von Familie und Hof bis Memel flüchtende Königin erschien in der Tagesliteratur als das personalisierte Bild der jüngsten Geschichte. Ihr Leiden während der Flucht und der Besatzungszeit galt als Ausdruck des Leidens der gesamten 'preußischen Nation', ihre Standhaftigkeit und ihr Patriotismus erfüllten mit Hoffnung. Die ihr zugeschriebene Häuslichkeit, Sittlichkeit und Religiosität sowie ihr vermeintlicher Kampf gegen jede 'Ausländerei' sollten sie über ihren Tod hinaus zum Vorbild für die eingeforderte nationale Einkehr und Erneuerung machen." Hagemann, 357.
77. Griffiths, "Provincialism," 218.
78. Mullan, 160.
79. The term "Mannessinn" also appears in Schlegel's translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, specifically in Portia's line, "Ich habe Mannessinn, doch Weibeskraft" ("I have a man's mind, but a woman's might"; Act II, Scene 4). Considering that in Shakespeare's play Portia repeatedly disparages women and femininity, yet demands to be treated by Brutus more like his equal because of her association with respected men, one can interpret "Mannessinn" to mean the mental faculties that in the nineteenth century distinguished men from women. William Shakespeare, "Julius Cäsar," in *Shakespeares dramatische Werke*, trans. August Wilhelm von Schlegel and Ludwig Tieck, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Druck und Verlag von G. Reimer, 1844), 5:47.
80. Speirs, 187.
81. Hartmann, 102.

82. Belgum, 21.
83. Ibid, 26.
84. Hartmann, 100.
85. John Breuilley and Ronald Speirs, "The Concept of National Unification," in *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, ed. Ronald Speirs and John Breuilley (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 15.
86. Hartmann notes that *Gartenlaube* illustrations depicting scenes from soldiers' lives in the war often refrained from showing glorified battle scenes, but instead preferred to portray "die Helden in den Kampfpausen, eine Nahaufnahme sozusagen, die die Soldaten fast in idyllischer Umgebung beim Biwakieren zeigt." Hartmann, 102. Similarly, actual battles rarely take center stage in the two works discussed in this section and the soldiers appear primarily in domestic settings.
87. Andreas Graf, "'Ich bin dagegen, daß wir Frauen uns demonstrativ von den Männern trennen': Der Briefwechsel zwischen E. Werner (d.i. Elisabeth Bürstenbinder) und Joseph Kürschner 1881-1889," in *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 47 (1997): 230.
88. For a detailed exploration and critical discussion of Marlitt's plot structure, see Urszula Bonter, *Der Populärroman in der Nachfolge von E. Marlitt: Wilhelmine Heimbürg, Valeska Gräfin Bethusy-Huc, Eufemia von Adlersfeld-Ballestrem* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005), 28ff.
89. Otto Heller, "Women Writers of the Nineteenth Century," in *Studies in Modern German Literature* (Boston: Ginn, 1905), 257, quoted in Lynne Tatlock, *German Writing, American Reading: Women and the Import of Fiction, 1866-1917* (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2012), 46.
90. Graf, 231.
91. Ibid, 228.
92. Lynne Tatlock, "The Afterlife of Nineteenth-Century Popular Fiction and the German Imaginary: The Illustrated Collected Novels of E. Marlitt, W. Heimbürg, and E. Werner," in *Publishing Culture and the "Reading Nation": German Book History in the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Lynne Tatlock (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010), 119.
93. Graf, 228.
94. Breuilley, 115.
95. Ibid.
96. Speirs, 197.
97. Belgum, 47.
98. Frevert, 20.
99. Ibid, 39.
100. Belgum, 124.
101. Tatlock, *German Writing*, 141.
102. Tatlock, "Afterlife," 136-38.
103. Frevert, 58.
104. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Émile*, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1955), 324.
105. Tatlock, *German Writing*, 161.
106. Ibid, 163.
107. Urszula Bonter, *Das Romanwerk von Paul Heyse* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2008), 119.
108. Graf, 227.
109. Bonter, *Romanwerk*, 119.
110. Wander's *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon* references Emil Frommel's 1874 edition of his *Familienchronik* for the use of this idiom: "Die Tante war ein Nachtschmetterling, der erst nachts recht fliegen konnte; sie schlief bis in den hellen, lichten Tag hinein, des Nachts war sie aber nicht ins Bett zu kriegen. Das ging aber dem Vater entsetzlich gegen den Mann. Denn bei uns galt als Hausordnung, daß der liebe Gott die Nacht für den Schlaf und den Tag zum Wachen und Arbeiten gegeben." *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon*, comp. Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Wander (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1867-80), s.v. "Gegen den Mann gehen."
111. Whereas the passage in Luther's Bible ends with the words "und er soll dein Herr sein," the corresponding passage in the 21st Century King James Version reads: "Unto the woman He said, 'I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception. In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee'" (Genesis 3:16).

112. *Zentifolie* is commonly known in English as the Provence rose or cabbage rose, which Beverly Seaton identifies as “the ambassador of love,” referencing E.W.G. Wirt’s *Flora’s Dictionary* as the source of this definition. Beverly Seaton, *The Language of Flowers: A History* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 191.
113. Frevert, 220.
114. Speirs, 198.
115. Belgum, 34.
116. Belgum, 36.
117. Tatlock, “Regional Histories,” 88.
118. Tatlock, *German Writing*, 113.
119. Tatlock, “Regional Histories,” 88.
120. Bonter, *Romanwerk*, 13.
121. Griffiths, “Provincialism,” 217.
122. Izabela Surynt, *Das "ferne", "unheimliche" Land: Gustav Freytags Polen* (Dresden: Thelem bei w.e.b., 2004), 272.
123. *Ibid*, 189.
124. As I have mentioned in the introductory chapter, an aristocrat’s disconnectedness from her country of origin may also be a reflection of the European nobility’s sense of belonging to a system of titles and affiliations that transcended national boundaries or loyalties.
125. Frevert, 141-42.
126. Without intending to undermine Heyse’s literary accomplishments, I would wish to explore his writings more extensively and compare them to the texts of women writers who were his contemporaries. It would be interesting to examine to what extent similar literary styles were perceived differently at the time, based on the sex of the author.
127. Particularly Werner’s *Gesprengte Fesseln* shows a striking similarity to *Das Glück von Rothenburg*. It depicts a composer of operas who leaves his wife and life as a merchant in pursuit of an Italian diva and becomes a famous composer in Italy. Exhausted by his newly gained fame, he longs to return to Germany and it is up to his wife to confront the Italian diva and reclaim her husband. Tatlock, *German Writing*, 140.

Chapter Two: Alternative Masculinities of the *Gründerzeit* in the Works of Fontane, Raabe, and Storm

In chapter one, I wrote about a number of works published after 1870, examining the ways in which they perpetuated the notion of Germany as a homogeneous state and presented an image of German masculinity that conformed to the bourgeois ideals of honor, productivity, reliability, and strength of will and body. The present chapter presents a countervailing image by exploring the texts of three authors who problematized notions of both national and masculine identity during the same time period: Theodor Fontane, Wilhelm Raabe, and Theodor Storm. All three of these authors had been publishing actively since the 1850s or earlier, and thus the period under consideration here encompasses their mature creative phases. Fontane was best known for his poetry and non-fiction and had not published prose fiction before the 1870s, while Storm was still working toward perfecting his skills as a writer of novellas. Raabe, though past the pinnacle of popularity among his contemporary readers, continued to write prolifically until the turn of the century. Although these writers may not have been as widely recognized or as highly regarded by the majority of the contemporary bourgeois reading public as were Paul Heyse, E. Marlitt, or E. Werner, they nevertheless enjoyed a considerable readership in periodicals such as *Die Gartenlaube*, *Westermanns Monatshefte*, and *Deutsche Rundschau*. Therefore, the views these three authors put forth in their works cannot be dismissed as the writings of fringe elements of bourgeois society publishing for a select or elite readership. The venues that printed their texts ensured that their thoughts and ideas received a significant attention from readers in the German Empire.

The framework for my observations regarding the construction of masculine identity in the works discussed in this chapter is primarily indebted to insights gained from my reading of *Familienmänner*, Walter Erhart's influential study on the origins of modern masculinity in

Western literature at the turn of the twentieth century. The aims of Erhart's study are, in part, to dispel some of the stale myths governing the academic understanding of masculinity, i.e., to steer clear of employing the common stereotypes about power relationships or Oedipal desire¹ and to clear up some of the misconceptions of the notions of a masculine "public sphere" and a feminine "private sphere" that shaped gender relationships in nineteenth-century bourgeois society. Erhart argues that the image of the patriarch ruling over the family but otherwise being uninvolved in its affairs is just as simplified and false as the notion that women's roles were largely confined to managing domestic affairs.² Instead, Erhart argues, the boundaries between the public and the private spheres, and therefore between masculine and feminine gender roles, were quite porous. The private lives of women were reflected in public relationships and social structures because women often assumed the role of moral authority within their families and were therefore able to influence even the deepest corners of the public sphere.³ Similarly, men were persistently moving back and forth between their roles as family men and their roles as public figures, and it was in fact their ability to move across these boundaries that actually defined their masculinity and kept the construction of masculine identity in constant flux.⁴

Erhart's most significant and most innovative argument, however, is that modern masculinity possesses a narrative structure and that it is thus shaped by a historical understanding of the self.⁵ In fact, Erhart claims that historicism, particularly in the final quarter of the nineteenth century, conceived of history as a sequence of masculinely and femininely coded cycles and, for example, marked the period of *Minnesang* as relatively feminine, the era of Luther's Reformation as masculine, the beginning of the nineteenth century as feminine, and the end of the nineteenth century again as masculine.⁶ This gendered view of history contributed to the formation of an understanding of masculine identity as a narrative, rather than as a collection

of gender-specific traits, meaning that masculinity came to be defined by an individual's placement within his genealogical history, i.e., his agency in society was determined by his ability to integrate himself successfully into a narrative established by his forefathers.⁷ Erhart remarks that the changing understanding of masculine identity during the nineteenth century also can be observed in the shift of thematic focus of novels during the same time period:

Während der Roman des 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts—nach einer berühmten Formulierung Hegels—vorrangig die “Lehrjahre des Individuums” zu seinem Thema macht, schildert er in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts häufig die Geschichte von Familien und beschreibt dabei genau jene Bewegung, die Männlichkeit in eine Geschichte und in einen Text verwandelt: von der Mutter-Imago dieser jünglingshaften “Lehrjahre” zu den paternalen Erzählungen über Familie, vom Verlust der Herkunftsfamilie zur Bildung und Verknüpfung neuer Familien.⁸

In other words, over the course of the nineteenth century a man's identity and social status increasingly came to be understood as being determined by his placement within his family—not only within his immediate family unit but also within his entire family's history—and his ability (or inability) to continue the genealogical narrative.

All of the male characters depicted in the texts I discuss in this chapter are in some way engaged in a process of defining their position in a narrative of masculinity. While the characters examined in chapter one, however, are able to integrate successfully into the types of genealogical narratives described by Erhart, the ones discussed below try to define their masculinity in ways that exclude them from the genealogical line. Fontane often draws his protagonists from Berlin's aristocratic military circles and thus depicts men whose complex identities are at odds with restrictive and outdated traditions. Two of Raabe's characters, Noah

Buchius and the retired Regierungsrat Wunnigel, turn to collecting historical artifacts in the hopes of making themselves part of the historical lineage that those artifacts represent. The male protagonists of Storm's works often struggle to join the genealogical narrative and thus to lay claim to their masculine identity, but there are also those who seek alternative narratives of their own. The fact that the attempts of these characters either to accept or to reject established narratives of masculinity usually end fatally or in alienation from society indicates that gender identity in the German Empire was less clearly defined than the previously examined popular texts would indicate.

No Country for Young Men: Theodor Fontane's (Un-)Heroic Prussians

Today, Theodor Fontane's most widely recognized contribution to German literature is a series of so-called Berlin novels that he published in the late stage of his career—in fact, his output as a novelist is solely confined to this period—starting in the late 1870s and often depicting the declining status of the Prussian nobility. For a large portion of his career, however, Fontane was known among the German reading public as the author of patriotic or nationalistic poetry, travel writing, and journalism. His cycle of ballads entitled *Männer und Helden. Acht Preußenlieder* was published between 1846 and 1850 and quickly gained popularity as reading suited for the edification of both soldiers and youths.⁹ A similar appropriation of Fontane's works by the Prussian right wing also occurred in the 1860s following his publication of the *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*, which offered a favorable presentation of some of the old Prussian noble families. Although Fontane raised some objections to such interpretations of his texts, as he did with that of the *Preußenlieder*, Nürnberger points out that there are also “keine Hinweise darauf, daß Fontane sich gegen die Vereinnahmung gewehrt hätte.”¹⁰

While he had still held national liberal views in the period leading up to the 1848 revolution, Fontane adopted a more conservative perspective in the 1850s and 1860s, especially after joining the editorial staff of the highly conservative *Neue Preußische Zeitung*.¹¹ He became particularly pessimistic about the prospect of a unified Germany brought about by the people's participation in a democratic process, and instead he increasingly came to regard Prussian hegemony as the most viable way of creating a German state.¹² Prussian values, as Fontane understood them, eventually began to represent for him a type of heroism—which is one of the reasons that members of the Prussian aristocracy are presented favorably in the *Wanderungen*—but Fontane's notion of Prussian heroism did not extend to militaristic ideals. As he relates in an autobiographical entry,

Das Hochgefühl, bloß zu fallen um zu fallen, war mir fremd, und ich gratuliere mir noch nachträglich dazu, daß es mir fremd war. Heldentum ist eine wundervolle Sache, so ziemlich das Schönste, was es giebt [*sic*], aber es muß echt sein. Und zur Echtheit, auch in diesen Dingen, gehört Sinn und Verstand. Fehlt das, so habe ich dem Heldentum gegenüber sehr gemischte Gefühle.¹³

Consequently, Fontane's role in the volumes of the *Wanderungen* that appeared after the Prussian military victories of the 1860s and 1871, on the one hand, became increasingly that of the admonisher against a developing "Borussismus und Militarismus"¹⁴ in German society, which had little to do with the virtues he admired. On the other hand, the *Wanderungen* were intended to remind his readers that Prussia did not merely stand for obedience, but also for principled behavior and rebellion against the status quo.¹⁵ If Fontane's criticism of Prussia as the dominant force in the German Empire, as reflected in the depiction of lifeless and impotent aristocrats in the fiction of his late creative period, seems rather sharp, it must be understood

within the context of the exaggerated glorification of Prussia and its official heroes in the postwar period. Fontane would, however, never have gone so far as to challenge the legitimacy of a unified Germany.¹⁶

True to his own ideals, Fontane expressed his disenchantment with the status quo in his Berlin novels. While his first novel, *Vor dem Sturm*, still maintains the possibility of integrating the Prussian nobility into a German democratic society,¹⁷ his last completed novel, *Der Stechlin*, offers a much more pessimistic outlook: the nobles are no longer the column supporting the structure of the state, but are instead like the moss-covered roof pressing down on the structure and offering no protection against impending storms.¹⁸ The decadence of the aristocracy often finds expression in Fontane's novels in the representation of masculinities that are no longer sustainable. The military officers walking the streets of his Berlin are remnants of an outdated caste system and fail to live up to the glory of previous generations. Their self-destructive yet empty notion of honor frequently leads them to die by their own hand or by that of someone else, and if they do not die over the course of the novel, they are otherwise unable to continue their genealogical line. Fontane sees no future for the aristocracy in German society.

Before I move on to the main discussion of this section, I would like to present a few texts that exemplify Fontane's critique of the aristocracy, namely *Schach von Wuthenow*, *Irrungen—Wirrungen*, and *Stine*. The novella *Schach von Wuthenow*, first published in 1882 but set in 1806, perfectly demonstrates how erstwhile Prussian virtues, supposedly the guarantors of a strong will and disciplined behavior, transform into the causes of the downfall for the eponymous hero and actually initiate a failure in the genealogical succession. It portrays a captain in the Prussian *Regiment Gensdarmes*, who woos the widowed Madame Carayon, but ultimately, in a moment of weakness, seduces her daughter Victoire, whose beauty has been

marred by smallpox. Forced into marriage for the sake of propriety, Schach commits suicide because he believes that the ridicule he would face from his peers would be unbearable.

Schach's understanding of the concepts of honor and obedience no longer resembles the ideals embodied by Frederick II; nor does it contribute to his understanding of his own identity. Freiherr von Bülow, one of Schach's acquaintances, asserts that the Prussian soldiers of his time are merely the results of a process of "Dressur" (2:310): everything about them is superficial and mechanical performance without any thought or feeling behind it. Schach confirms Bülow's assessment when he blindly follows Prince Louis Ferdinand's proclamation "le laid c'est le beau" (2:320) and freely allows the prince's praise of Victoire to influence his own judgment when he seduces her (2:327). The extent to which Schach cedes his free will to his superior leads Erhart to note, "es sind fremde Phantasien, die Schachs Verführung steuern, fremde Diskurse, die ihm Entscheidungen des 'Herzens' unterschieben und ein ihm nicht zugehöriges Begehren simulieren."¹⁹ Schach is a blank slate onto which an officer of superior rank can inscribe any kind of desire; the "Dressur" of the Prussian soldier into an obedient subject has not missed its mark.

The exaggeration of the virtue of obedience has transformed it into a drawback, if not a vice, and has prevented Schach from achieving his ancestors' military prowess, thus making it impossible for him to continue the genealogical narrative of masculinity of his family. The gallery of ancestors in his family's manor is a physical representation of this genealogy. Heir to a martial legacy, Schach aspires to follow his ancestors in a line of succession, but as a mere cavalry captain he instead "rückt lediglich 'zwischen' die Generäle"²⁰ portrayed in the gallery, almost as if falling through the cracks of his family history. The militaristic form of masculinity represented by Schach, informed by an outdated honor code and blind obedience to authority, is

no longer sustainable and is thus dying out. Observing the decadence of the *Gründerzeit*, Fontane warns his readership of its dangers by presenting them with an image of a decadent society that in 1806 almost brought about the eradication of Prussia.²¹

Fontane paints quite different but similarly critical images of Prussian military nobility in his portrayals of Botho von Rienäcker and Waldemar von Haldern, the major characters of *Irrungen—Wirrungen* (1888) and *Stine* (1890), respectively. The plots of both novels revolve around Prussian officers and their romantic liaisons with working-class women. While Botho ultimately decides that it would be best for him to end his relationship with Lene Nimptsch and seek a wife in his own social sphere, Waldemar refuses to listen to the advice of his uncle and asks Ernestine Rehbein to marry him, only to be rejected by her and subsequently to take his own life. Although their decisions result in a different outcome for each of the characters, neither outcome is presented as positive. Botho recognizes the pointlessness of the aristocracy within the society. He explains to Lene that polite conversation is devoid of content and meaning, which makes it irrelevant (3:112), and he later remarks on the triviality of his own existence by examining the skills he has learned in life: “Ich kann ein Pferd stallmeistern, einen Kapaun tranchieren und ein Jeu machen. Das ist alles, und so hab ich denn die Wahl zwischen Kunstreiter, Oberkellner und Croupier” (3:169). However, Botho also recognizes that one’s heritage indeed determines one’s fate and that even living up to it can lead a person to ruin, but nevertheless to a lesser extent than not living up to it at all (3:171). For this reason, he decides to end his relationship with Lene and to take his place in the genealogical line by marrying his cousin Käthe, but he soon notices that he has himself ceased to fit in with his environment: “Bin ich nicht selbst aus Rand und Band? Bin ich nicht selber aus Ordnung und guter Sitte?”²² (3:216) As a result of his outsider status vis-à-vis both the aristocracy and the working class,

neither of Botho's relationships produces offspring²³ and he is unable to realign himself with the genealogical narrative of aristocratic masculinity.

Waldemar von Haldern exhibits the symptoms plaguing a decaying aristocratic caste, even more so than Botho von Rienäcker. The setting of the novel *Stine*, the Invalidenstrasse in Berlin, is particularly appropriate, since Waldemar is a veteran of the Franco-Prussian War whose physical disability has prematurely ended his military career. Edith H. Krause and Steven V. Hicks emphasize the aspect of disability evoked by the term "Invaliden" and suggest that the other characters encountered in that space are also in an ailing condition and are "in need of some form of reparation in order to achieve, gain, or maintain a satisfactory form of personal identity."²⁴ Waldemar, who suffers from the remnants of a physical disability he sustained in the Franco-Prussian War, is a poor embodiment of the Prussian soldier and stands in stark contrast to the images of soldier ideal observed in the previous chapter, such as Werner's figure of Walther Fernow. His participation in the war was very short-lived because he was shot down from his horse and crushed by the animal, which landed on top of him. While his comrades rushed from victory to victory, he spent the rest of the war confined to a bed (3:270-71), and although he subsequently received an Iron Cross, he never returned to military duty. Thus, Waldemar is an empty symbol of militaristic Prussian masculinity, maintaining the outward appearance of a soldier but lacking the qualities that define one.

On the other hand, Waldemar also suffers psychologically not only from the constraints his social class places upon him, but also from the recognition that he will never be able to achieve masculinity within his genealogical narrative: "Das Schlimmste war, daß ich im Hause selbst, bei meinen eignen [*sic*] Eltern, ein Fremder war. Und warum? Ich habe später darauf geachtet und es in mehr als einer Familie gesehn, wie hart Eltern gegen ihre Kinder sind, wenn

diese ganz bestimmten Wünschen und Erwartungen nicht entsprechen wollen” (3:300). Because Waldemar has failed to live up to his parents’ expectations, because he has failed to become a hero either in death or in swift recovery and a successful military career (3:301), he now occupies a space in-between and holds an indeterminate status that prevents him from integrating into either of these two narratives designated for him. He sees an escape to America as the solution to his dilemma and as a way of establishing an alternative masculine narrative in a society that, he believes, does not have the restrictive structures of Germany. Stine, however, responds to Waldemar’s idealistic notions by correcting them. “Es geht auch drüben nicht” (3:300), she tells him, not because Waldemar is wrong about his assessment of the opportunities available in America, but because he is wrong in his assessment of himself: “Dadurch, daß man anspruchslos sein will, ist man’s noch nicht; und es ist ein ander Ding, sich ein armes und einfaches Leben ausmalen oder es wirklich führen” (3:301). Like Botho, Waldemar is estranged from the social sphere into which he was born, but he would be just as much a stranger to the working class, and thus he is suitable neither for a narrative of hard-working masculinity nor for one of militaristic heroism. In fact, following his rejection by Stine, Waldemar becomes convinced of his “incompleteness” as he watches life around him in the streets and parks of Berlin, lost in self-reflective thoughts. Waking up from a daydream, he notices that he has been drawing semicircles on the ground in front of him and recognizes in them the involuntary symbol of his existence: “Kein Abschluß, keine Rundung, kein Vollbringen” (3:305). Like the semicircles that he draws on the ground, Waldemar is an incomplete figure, and as he recognizes that he has no place and possible legacy in this world, he concludes that suicide is the only way to end his half-existence.

The preceding overview of three of Fontane's Berlin novels indicate that by the 1880s the author had lost faith in the possibility of integrating the Prussian nobility into a German society in which one's status was increasingly defined in socio-economic terms. The male characters representing the hereditary aristocracy in his novels are trapped in outdated constructs of both class and masculinity and are unable to escape them even when they wish to do so. If Fontane believed that the nobility was an estate in decline and without a future in his vision of Germany, how did he portray other spheres of German society? Considering how critical Fontane was in his portrayal of Prussian officers' norms for masculine behavior, it is worth examining male characters in his works that do not belong to that circle. In the two works discussed below, Fontane explores a village community in the Harz region and the petit bourgeoisie of 1890s Berlin.

Ellernklipp was published in 1881, only a short time before the publication of *Schach von Wuthenow*. Like the Berlin novel, *Ellernklipp* takes place in a time period far removed from Fontane's own, namely in the years following the Seven Years' War. In this work, however, the location of the plot is also moved away from the center of Prussian culture to its fringes at the northern edge of the Harz Mountains. Despite both its temporal and physical removal from Fontane's time and space, the novel is connected to his critique of the *Gründerzeit* in its depiction of a former soldier who retires from service after the war, but maintains in his everyday life the traits associated with a militaristic ideal of masculinity, and destroys his son in order to uphold them.

Baltzer Bocholt is employed as a "Heidereiter," a type of forest ranger, in the Harz village Emmerode, where he lives with his son. The village pastor entrusts Bocholt with the care of Hilde, the illegitimate daughter of a local count, after her mother dies and she has no other

living or known relatives to take care of her. Both Bocholt and his son, Martin, are immediately drawn to Hilde's inexplicable charm, but as the two children grow older it becomes clear to Bocholt that Martin is, in fact, in love with his adopted sister. In a fit of jealousy, Bocholt confronts Martin at the edge of a nearby cliff and in the ensuing battle he pushes his son to his death in the thicket below. Martin's body is never discovered and Baltzer Bocholt is never suspected of a crime. Instead, he marries Hilde himself a few years later and she gives birth to his child. Because the child is sickly, however, the couple visits a doctor in a nearby town, but the physician is unable to help them. On the trip back to Emmerode, Bocholt travels near the location of his battle with Martin and believes to hear a voice from below the cliffs calling out for its father. Bocholt goes off the path and shoots himself with his rifle. His sick child dies the same day.

Fontane characterizes Bocholt as an authoritarian figure both at home and in the village. As an old soldier, Bocholt values order and discipline, and as soon as Hilde joins his household he instructs her that she should never be late because he loves punctuality (2:177). The extent to which Bocholt controls his household and exerts his power over his family becomes clear when the teenaged Hilde explains to Martin why she is afraid of their father: "Und er ist überall. Und daß ich dir's nur gesteh, es ist mir oft, als ob die Wände Ohren hätten und als wär ein Auge beständig um mich und über mir, das alles siehet" (2:231). Bocholt's affinity for discipline and his "all-seeing eye" establish him as the central figure of power who keeps his subjects under constant surveillance, thereby ensuring that they fear him even in his absence. His role of authority extends to the village community in his capacity as "Heidereiter," who primarily answers to the countess. Bocholt's ruthlessness and prowess with a rifle come to light when he shoots down a poacher in the line of duty. The housekeeper tells Martin, "dein Vater tut nichts

Halbes” (2:198) and explains to Hilde that she must not be scared of her father because he has carried over his competitive side in matters of life and death from his time as a soldier and because his current profession demands quick decisions in such situations (2:199). Bocholt’s uncompromising stance, his fondness for Prussian virtues, his skill with a weapon, and the power he exerts over others are all elements of his militaristic masculinity that sometimes clashes with the values of the villagers—for example, in the aftermath of his killing of the poacher—but is ultimately accepted by the community.

In contrast to his father, Martin represents a type of masculinity not identified by the assertion of power and displays of violence. While Hilde is afraid of Bocholt and sees him as her superior, Martin is sometimes even subordinate to her and is the one “der ihr in allem zu Willen war, ohne daß sie selber einen rechten Willen gehabt hätte” (2:180). Furthermore, Martin does not restrain outbursts of sentimentality, and thus he reveals a tear in his eye upon discovering that of all the little ships they had built and sent floating on a stream, the one bearing his name had wrecked while the one bearing Hilde’s had sailed on with another ship (2:181). Like Hilde, he fears Bocholt, but he recognizes that children should not fear their parents: “Ehren soll man sie und Respekt haben. Und wenn du das zusammentust, so hast du die Ehrfurcht. Und die Ehrfurcht, die ist gut. Aber *bloß* Furcht, das ist falsch und schlecht und feig. Und ich will es nicht länger!” (2:218, original emphasis) Martin realizes that they must escape the oppression of their father, but the only means he knows of doing so is joining the Prussian king’s army (2:230), i.e., submitting himself to a different power structure and ultimately being shaped into a soldier like Bocholt. His power fantasy is rather short-lived, however, because Hilde reminds him, “das ist nichts für dich” (2:231), suggesting that Martin is not cut out for the life of a soldier, but assuring him that she will be his if they only are patient.

Martin's alternative to Bocholt's militaristic performance of masculinity thus becomes a threat to the father. By expressing the wish to step out of Bocholt's shadow and to assume his role in the genealogical narrative—in other words, to succeed his father—Martin challenges Bocholt's position of power in the family. Moreover, by winning over Hilde for himself without subscribing to Bocholt's notions of masculine behavior, Martin undermines the legitimacy of his father's claim to manhood. This questioning of his legitimacy is precisely the reason why Bocholt sees his "Stolz" attacked (2:237) when he confronts his son on the cliff. In killing Martin, Bocholt eliminates what he sees as a "weaker"—yet, paradoxically, also threatening—type of masculinity incongruent with his own and terminates the natural genealogical progression. The father thus assumes the role intended for the son by marrying Hilde and thereby actually prevents the next generation from coming to fruition. Antje Harnisch notes that the *Bürgerliche Gesetzbuch* of 1896 explicitly forbids both sexual relations and marriage between adoptive parents and their adopted children,²⁵ which marks Bocholt's marriage as a violation of bourgeois law, but the text also designates it as a transgression of natural law.

The clearest indication of Bocholt's behavior as a transgression is the offspring resulting from his relationship to Hilde. The doctor who examines the child sees no chance of its survival: "Eures Kindes Herz ist krank, und es muß sterben" (2:257). It is telling that the child's heart, a symbol of life and vitality, is the source of its illness. The affliction strongly implies the decay Bocholt has brought upon his own family, while the doctor's proclamation of the child's condition and fate resembles a judgment and sentence upon the heir, who must bear the punishment for the sins of the father. The vitality of Bocholt's genealogical line is further called into question in the passages following the revelation of his child's impending death. A marksmen's competition is being held near the doctor's residence and Bocholt, the experienced

soldier, decides to put his skill on display for the other competitors. However, his former prowess with the rifle has all but disappeared and he is unable to hit the target despite multiple attempts. By having inserted himself into an inappropriate position in the genealogical narrative, Bocholt has not only discontinued it, but also undermined his own masculine identity. His glorification of militaristic ideals is self-destructive and threatens the core unit of bourgeois life, the family. Fontane's criticism of Bocholt echoes his criticism of the militarism he observes in *Gründerzeit* society. Much as the lingering influence of the Seven Years' War is visible in Bocholt's treatment of his family and is sanctioned by the community around him, the influence of the Franco-Prussian War is felt throughout the 1870s and 1880s and is shaping the character of the postwar generation with questionable virtues. The father's insistence on conformity with this problematic hegemonic narrative of masculinity leads to the destruction of the son, as it does in Martin's case, but I shall demonstrate in the following analysis of Fontane's posthumously published novel *Mathilde Möhring* that the son's compliance can lead to the same result.

While Fontane did not publish *Mathilde Möhring* during his lifetime, the manuscript for the novel was in an advanced enough state to allow for a posthumous publication run in *Die Gartenlaube* in 1906. Even though readers would not engage with the work until after the turn of the twentieth century, much of it was written during the same creative period as *Frau Jenny Treibel* and thus it reflects similar observations about Berlin society that the author makes in his texts of the late 1880s and early 1890s. However, his focus shifts in *Mathilde Möhring* from the upper to the lower echelons of the bourgeoisie. The novel presents the series of events that unfolds after Hugo Großmann, a student of law, moves into the room of a small apartment sublet by Mathilde Möhring and her mother. Mathilde immediately recognizes Hugo as the "professional student" type, and when the young man eventually asks her to marry him, she

agrees only under the condition that he will finish his degree. After the wedding, Hugo undergoes a rigorous study program organized and led by Mathilde, and he indeed passes the bar exam. Mathilde, however, does not believe that Hugo has enough ambition to become successful in Berlin and instead responds in his name to a job notice seeking a candidate for an open mayoral position in a provincial town. With the help of Mathilde's shrewd advice, Hugo becomes successful at his new job, but the demands of the position cause his health to deteriorate quickly, and the prolonged exposure to cold weather during an ice-skating outing delivers the final blow in the form of pneumonia. After Hugo's death, Mathilde returns to Berlin as a mayor's widow, having thus slightly improved her status. She intends to pursue a teaching career, and the final pages of the novel imply that she will be able to find a reputable position as a private tutor because of the connections she has made as Mayor Großmann's wife.

The reversal of traditional gender roles taking place in the novel is quite obvious and, as noted by Sabine Schmidt, existing scholarship on *Mathilde Möhring* generally acknowledges this reversal to be a major theme of the text, even if scholars cannot agree on whether it should be interpreted as a positive depiction of female empowerment or a negative depiction of decadent masculinity.²⁶ One can certainly draw parallels between the depiction of the increasing assertion of control of Mathilde Möhring and of Jenny Treibel over the respective male characters under their influence. David S. Johnson, for example, has pointed to the "growing crisis of confidence in the authority and legitimacy of the hegemonic model of bourgeois masculinity"²⁷ in the portrayals of both Hugo Großmann and Leopold Treibel. Examining the role reversal presented in *Mathilde Möhring*, however, Schmidt also disputes the notion that Mathilde and Hugo are locked in a simple relationship of a perpetrator taking advantage of a helpless victim and highlights the symbiotic nature of that relationship, in which both parties stand to gain something

by assuming the role traditionally reserved for the other.²⁸ Petra Kuhnau even argues that the role reversal is, in fact, necessary in order to reestablish at least a semblance of a traditionally acceptable distribution of gender roles insofar as it transforms Hugo Großmann from a struggling student into a public official.²⁹ While I agree that Hugo initially benefits from his marriage to Mathilde and thus should not be viewed as the victim of a calculating social climber, his resulting compliance in meeting social expectations is detrimental to his self-image. Ultimately, Hugo's conformity to hegemonic bourgeois masculinity causes his downfall, as reflected in his physical decline and death.

In tracing the characterization of Hugo Großmann in the novel, the reader must be careful to distinguish between the second-hand descriptions of him as observed from Mathilde's perspective and those made by the narrator or Hugo himself. Mathilde is the one who describes Hugo as indecisive: "Gleich ja oder nein sagen, das können nicht viele, und der schon gewiß nicht" (6:228). She is the one who recognizes in him a lack of ambition in the way in which he settled for their apartment as just good enough for him (6:228-29), and she is also the one who denies Hugo's virility in spite of his dense bushy beard (6:232), traditionally one of the primary indicators of strong masculinity. According to Mathilde, Hugo still hovers in an in-between state, "zwischen Student und Referendarius" (6:231), and therefore he has yet to achieve anything. Until then, he will merely stand at the threshold to manhood, but she will need to offer him the necessary incentive to take a step in the "proper" direction.

However, Hugo does have interests and pursuits in his life. It is clear that he has a sense and appreciation for aesthetics and the arts. While his law books are still nicely bound and lie on his desk in nearly pristine condition, his copy of Schiller "steckt voller Lesezeichen und Eselsohren" (6:234). His dream and aspiration is to be an artist himself, even though he

recognizes that this dream would be construed as a weakness for a man with his social background: “Es ist sonderbar, daß mir alles Praktische widerstreitet. Man kann es eine Schwäche nennen, aber vielleicht ist es auch eine Stärke. Wenn ich solche schöne Person durch die Luft fliegen sehe, bin ich ganz benommen und eigentlich beinah glücklich! Ich hätte doch wohl auch so was werden müssen” (6:269). If Hugo seems indecisive about his career, it is because he recognizes the conflict between the practical and the artistic. In the passage above, Hugo observes the freedom the trapeze artist must be experiencing and the mere thought of it fills him with happiness.³⁰ Later, once he is trapped in the monotony of life as a small-town mayor, Hugo thinks of his actor friend Rybinski in Berlin and “beneidete ihn um das Leben in der *freien Kunst*” (6:292, emphasis added).

The freedom that Hugo associates with the arts, however, is offset by the notion that the enjoyment of such activities of “leisure . . . undermines the foundations of bourgeois masculine identity.”³¹ Furthermore, Hugo’s primary model of an artistic type of masculinity is represented by Rybinski, whose background and habits clash with bourgeois propriety. His full name is Hans *von* Rybinski, and thus his aristocratic background offers him different avenues in life from those available to Hugo. In fact, Rybinski insinuates that acting is an inappropriate career path even for him until he becomes famous, which is the reason why he is leaving off the “von” from his name for the time being and protecting his family’s reputation (6:238). Moreover, even at the end of the nineteenth century, the profession of acting is associated with loose morals, and in Rybinski’s case this immorality is reflected in his promiscuity. He openly admits that he does not believe in romantic love, referring to it as “Larifari” (6:238) or nonsense, and once he does announce his engagement to an actress named Bella he regards it as something potentially fleeting, saying “aber natürlich kann so was auch wieder zurückgehen...” (6:257). Indeed, Bella

does not remain his fiancée for long, and over the course of the novel Rybinski becomes engaged two more times. His behavior threatens bourgeois norms, and Mathilde fears that Rybinski might negatively influence Hugo's attitude toward marriage. When Hugo proposes to marry her, she responds that it may take a long time until the actual wedding, and when Hugo suggests that there are other, more modern ways of going about marriage, Mathilde sarcastically suggests, "Rybinski-Wege?" (6:253) She explicitly regards the actor as a "Gefahr" (6:261) to her shaping Hugo into a bourgeois man.³²

Hugo's indecisiveness is therefore an expression of the struggle between two clashing types of masculinity. On the one hand, he is extremely aware of his genealogical narrative and the heritage he represents as a "Bürgermeistersohn" (6:253); on the other hand, he also identifies with a form of masculinity that his environment repeatedly defines as threatening and dangerous. His proposal to marry Mathilde is thus the first difficult decision that he makes on his own in the novel because he believes that she can help him meet social expectations with regard to his masculinity. He recognizes her as an "echtes, deutsches Mädchen" (6:252), implying that he can become an "echter, deutscher Mann" by virtue of association. The function of the declensions and the comma in this phrase is significant, insofar as it indicates that both "echt" and "deutsch" are adjectives describing the noun that follows. Therefore, Mathilde is both a "real girl" and a "German girl" at once, rather than a "truly German girl." This phrasing suggests that Hugo understands that he must achieve not only masculinity, but also Germanness in order to be socially acceptable, and he is only able to do so by integrating himself into his genealogical narrative and taking on his father's profession.

However, his entrance into this genealogical line does not represent his personality, "sondern ordnet ihn vielmehr in ein genealogisches Werte- und Verhaltenssystem ein,"³³ and it

suppresses any expression of his artistic temperament. Thus, in his attempt to adopt his father's masculine identity as his own, Hugo is in a situation similar to Martin Bocholt's, but unlike Hilde, who prevents Martin from becoming a soldier and thus perpetuating his father's militarism, Mathilde facilitates her partner's assumption of an identity that is not his own. While Baltzer Bocholt kills Martin in the true sense of the term, Hugo is killed by his father in a figurative sense.³⁴ The longer Hugo tries to insert himself into a role he is not meant to perform, a role incongruent with a masculine ideal he has renounced but wishes he had not, the more his health deteriorates. His assumed masculinity destroys his individuality, in turn destroying Hugo along with it.

Both *Ellernklipp* and *Mathilde Möhring* demonstrate that Fontane regarded the construction of masculine identity in post-unification Germany as a complex and problematic process. The founders' generation was essentially composed of men who had contributed to the establishment of a German state, either by participating in the war from which the state emerged or by being active in the booming economy of the postwar period. They operated within a gender framework that glorified masculine traits that they saw as the guarantors of this success, such as strong willpower, discipline, and productivity. Fontane's texts suggest that a new generation of men, who were either unable or unwilling to be part of this formation, would be utterly rejected by the older generation and would fall into a crisis of identity. As shown by the example of Hugo Großmann, even conformity to the expectations of the fathers' generation does not guarantee successful integration into the genealogical masculine narrative, and the effort it would demand of a person would lead to what Johnson describes as "exhaustion."³⁵ The same can be said of the German nobility depicted in Fontane's works. As becomes evident in discussions of *Irrungen—Wirrungen* and *Stine*, and to a certain degree also of *Schach von*

Wuthenow, Fontane presents a hereditary aristocracy trapped by outdated modes of thinking that can coexist with neither contemporary economic structures nor modern social formations.

Fontane's novels convey a sense of pessimism about the future of a German nation that leaves no room for young men.

History as a Genealogical Narrative: Wilhelm Raabe's Collectors

Although Wilhelm Raabe held complex political beliefs, one can say that he was a national liberal at his core.³⁶ Throughout his life, he supported the goal of a unified Germany and expected regional concerns to be moved aside in favor of national concerns. His political idealism was particularly pronounced after the failed revolution of 1848 and before unification in 1871, during which period he sought to provide his readership with a "usable past"³⁷ by means of historical fiction set in key eras of German history. However, Raabe also had a conservative side. While living in Stuttgart, for example, he dismissed Swabian resistance to increasing Prussian hegemony over other German states as regional shortsightedness and showed little understanding for their opposition, regardless of the legitimacy of such concerns.³⁸ Despite such views, Raabe was not an unequivocal supporter of Prussia and its politics, but rather he shared the nineteenth-century national liberal desire to see Germany's prestige elevated in the form of a nation-state and thus brought "into consonance with its prestige as the 'land of poets and thinkers.'"³⁹ If it became necessary for Prussia to exert dominance over other German states in order to achieve this end, Raabe felt that the means were justified.

Raabe's texts often react negatively to foreigners staging battles on German soil—*Das Odfeld* offers merely one example of his engagement with this theme—and it is especially the French who are most frequently assigned the role of the invading force.⁴⁰ It is important to note,

however, that the author's negative depiction of foreigners does not represent his wholesale rejection of interaction with other cultures, but that he opposes what he sees as a historically recurring cycle of destruction of German lands by foreign forces.⁴¹ Raabe is acutely aware of the high cost of war and expresses his dismay quite clearly in his fiction. For example, *Des Reiches Krone* (1870) highlights the senselessness of war by depicting a German soldier who returns victorious from the Hussite Wars, but has contracted leprosy and must therefore lead a life of isolation from society, effectively also ending the social existence of his beloved, who decides to tend to him and other lepers in the colony outside the city.⁴² The novella *Deutscher Adel* (1878/79) is explicitly set during the Franco-Prussian War, but the war itself never takes center stage and the narrative instead focuses on the family and friends a German soldier left at home. Once the young man is finally introduced to the reader, he lies wounded in an infirmary and has befriended the French soldier next to him, a situation that highlights the absurdity of the killing taking place at the front.⁴³

Stories such as these suggest that Raabe was particularly opposed to the expression of German national identity by means of warfare against other nations or cultures. It is rather one's exploration of history that becomes a means of interacting with a perceived national community, as I will show in my analysis of *Das Odfeld* and *Wunnigel*. The protagonists of these two works, Magister Buchius and Regierungsrat Wunnigel, are collectors of antique objects who try to establish a connection between themselves and what they consider to be their German heritage. While they surround themselves with objects that tell the story of a nation (or at least *one* story), they necessarily place themselves within that continuum and try to define themselves by means of their collections. At the same time, the historical narrative they create by collecting antique objects also serves as a genealogical narrative—the story of their ancestors—and thus leads to an

overlap between their national and gender identities. In each case, therefore, the character's success or failure in participating in the narrative of the nation also determines his success or failure in participating in the narrative of masculinity.

Das Odfeld is one of Raabe's late works, in which he demonstrates the full extent of the virtuosity he acquired as a writer over the course of nearly four decades: the historical events depicted in the novel are well researched, his narrative style has lost some of the intrusive character it had in his earlier works, and he shapes a tight plot and carefully builds layers of meaning upon each other to form a cohesive whole. In his annotations to the novel, Hans Oppermann calls attention to the fact that the creation period of the novel coincided with the *Septennatswahlen* of 1887, which were preceded by a dissolution of parliament following an argument over Bismarck's proposed increase to the size of the standing army, and thus may explain what Hans Oppermann calls the "vaterländische[] Gesinnung"⁴⁴ of the text. Eric Downing makes a similar observation and points out that the novel's publication in 1888 took place with the prospect of another war against France looming in the background.⁴⁵ The setting of the novel in 1761 during the Seven Years' War, therefore, seems more than mere coincidence and suggests that Raabe displaced a commentary on his own time period into the distant past.

The entire plot of *Das Odfeld* occurs in a period of roughly twenty-four hours in the vicinity of Brunswick, and thus incidentally in the region where Raabe himself grew up. Magister Noah Buchius, a retired *Gymnasium* professor living at the Amelungsborn monastery, observes an aerial battle between two flocks of ravens above the Odfeld, an expanse near the monastery. He interprets it as a dire portent of things to come, and his premonition is proved correct when a brigade of French soldiers sacks the monastery overnight. After an initial struggle, Buchius manages to escape, along with four others: Thedel von Münchhausen, a former

student of his; Mamsell Selinde von Fegebanck, a young woman living at the monastery; and a servant couple, Heinrich Schelze and Wieschen. Buchius leads the group across the foggy Odfeld and finds refuge in a cave he had previously discovered during his archaeological explorations of the surrounding area. They are eventually detected by a group of Scottish soldiers and brought before Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick, who recognizes Wieschen based on a memento he had given to her during a previous encounter. Buchius is able to convince the duke to have them escorted back safely to the monastery, while Münchhausen decides to join Ferdinand's ranks and go into battle. On the way back to the monastery, the group crosses the Odfeld once more and the discovery of Münchhausen's corpse in the mud leads Buchius to lament the sacrifices demanded by war.

Downing explains that nineteenth-century German historians had a tendency to remake the classical world in the image of Germany and that the process of "fashioning a German self-identity" relied on "a volatile mixture of imaginary aggression against the foreign and narcissistic assertion of the self,"⁴⁶ and it is precisely this kind of definition of the German nation that Raabe rejects in *Das Odfeld*. In a story presenting a vignette of a minor battle in the Seven Years' War, Noah Buchius becomes an unlikely hero and a model for Raabe's notion of German masculinity. Raabe offers an image of Germany, i.e., Prussia, in the novel as a fragmented conglomerate of principalities with unclear loyalties and a complicated network of identification. The French are on the opposite side of Prussia in the global conflict that is the Seven Years' War, but the aristocratic Mamsell Selinde harbors a romantic attachment to them, even preferring them to Luckner's hussars, who fought on the side of Prussia: "Die Lucknerschen neulich waren ganz andere Flegel, und meinethalben lieber das ganze Haus voll von den weißen Dragonern [i.e., the French] als ein halb Dutzend von den roten Husaren in Stube, Kammer, Küche und

Keller!” (17:87) Selinde’s sentiment indicates that civilians in this society do not immediately identify with the military and political forces that are presumably “on their side.” The French troops who sack the monastery are portrayed as bloodthirsty animals,⁴⁷ and terms such as “Neugallier” (17:104) employed by the narrator paint them as a barbarian horde. At the same time the Scotsmen, who are allied with Prussia and treat Buchius’s group rather crudely upon discovering them in the cave, are described as “überseeische[] Wilde[]” (17:173) who care very little for the well-being of civilians. The similarities in the descriptions of the French and Scottish troops indicate that Germans’ distinction between friend and foe during this historical period was unclear, to say the least.

The reader gains the impression that Prussia’s alliances are shallow and arbitrary and that Prussians therefore lack a clear understanding of themselves in relation to both foreigners and to Germans from other states. Downing demonstrates how Raabe problematizes Buchius’s imagined German community in his recollection of historically significant “German” battles against supposedly external forces: “Armin und Germanicus, Sachse und Franke, die Liga und der Schwed...” (17:28) Buchius compares these battles to the current conflict between Ferdinand and de Broglie, but his comparison is flawed because the presumed other in each of the instances listed above (Germanicus, Franke, Schwed) has Germanic roots and thus does not actually represent an external foe.⁴⁸ By establishing this false comparison, Raabe undermines the process of defining German nationhood negatively against an imagined other and implicitly raises the question of what actually constitutes an “appropriate” model for German community.

In *Das Odfeld*, Raabe in fact presents two possible examples of how that model would look in the form of Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick and Noah Buchius. In the midst of the horror and bloodshed of battle Ferdinand represents a beacon of civilization. He is the only political

and military leader who elicits sympathy from the members of Buchius's group. Thedel von Münchhausen repeatedly salutes Ferdinand's health⁴⁹ and upon the group's encounter with the duke even the narrator, channeling Buchius's thoughts, exclaims variations of "three cheers for prince Ferdinand" in four different languages (17:181). For them, Ferdinand is on the one hand a more approachable and tangible figure than the remote and relatively abstract Frederick II, and as a local noble, he also arouses their sense of regional belonging. On the other hand, Ferdinand embodies qualities that connect him to a wider community. Sammons emphasizes his humble and humane behavior, which mirrors Buchius's own and should not be taken for granted in a noble's interaction with commoners,⁵⁰ while Downing proposes that the ease with which Ferdinand navigates between three different languages, his generosity, and his courteous behavior are indicative of a cosmopolitanism which, paired with his regional allegiance, forms the basis for affiliation with a notion of Germany much more in line with Raabe's own understanding of it.⁵¹

Noah Buchius represents a counterpart to Ferdinand of Brunswick. Like Ferdinand, Buchius is not restricted by the boundaries of the region where he spent his entire life. His extensive knowledge of ancient Greek and Latin and his deep familiarity with the philosophers and orators of Western antiquity opens his world to the experience of a rich past and contributes to the construction of affiliation with a wide range of elements from this cultural heritage. The central symbol for this constructed affiliation is the Odfeld itself. From the start, Buchius and the narrator interchangeably refer to it as "Campus Odini" and "Wodans Feld," thereby erasing linguistic barriers of the past and compressing cultural mythologies into one point. Buchius draws a direct line between his present and both the Germanic and the Roman past. Downing

explains, however, that Raabe's interpretation of the name Odfeld as "Odin's Field" is most likely a deliberate mistranslation, and he suggests that the more likely origin of the syllable "Od-" is the Germanic rune "Odal," which signifies ancestry or inheritance and therefore adds an additional layer of Germanic lore on top of the already established symbolic meaning of this site for the novel.⁵² This coexistence of a Germanic and classical world implies that in his understanding of himself as a German man Buchius does not reshape the classical world or appropriate it to reflect the structures of the time in which he lives. Instead, he acknowledges the "inherent conflict between (and within), both the German and the classical"⁵³ and incorporates aspects of both heritages into his thoughts and behavior.

Buchius's setup of his room at the monastery reflects this interplay of competing and conflicting elements: his cell is a museum that recalls the tumultuous history of the surrounding area, replete with items he has extracted from the "Odal-Feld," the ancestral ground. Everything is carefully numbered and labeled, thereby placing the seemingly unrelated objects into a network of signification. In this network, a Roman knight's spur occupies a spot proximate to the decorative ring of a Cheruscan noble; a mallet Buchius believes to have belonged to one of Charlemagne's officers is of significance equal to that of the bone of a skeleton he thinks belonged to a human who witnessed the biblical Deluge;⁵⁴ and an ox-horn presumably used by barbarian bards during religious rituals shares this space with the remains of a wooden statue depicting the Virgin Mary and said to have performed innumerable miracles (17:42-43). Although these items stem from different historical periods or from warring cultures and competing religious traditions, they are brought into context with each other not only by virtue of occupying the same space, but also by Buchius's interpretative process that embeds them within a narrative; for, it is Buchius who identifies what the objects represent and thus gives meaning to

them, and by surrounding himself with these excavated treasures he implicitly carves out a position for himself within this narrative as well.

The collection of antiques fulfills the same function for Buchius as the ancestral gallery fulfills for Schach von Wuthenow, which I have described above. On the one hand it traces his genealogical heritage—or at least he pieces together from the relics in his collection a genealogy as he understands it, going back to German and classical antiquity—and on the other hand it informs the ideals that he strives to uphold in his own life. Similar to Schach’s ancestral gallery, the “ancestral gallery” of Noah Buchius also represents a narrative of masculinity, as I will explain below, within which he seeks to place or to which he compares himself. However, the form of masculinity brought out by this narrative is not informed by the heroic ideals that transform introverted dreamers into warriors, as observed in some of the works discussed in chapter one, but instead by the virtues of patience and wisdom.

While Buchius is certainly not a warrior and sometimes appears ridiculous in his embodiment of the ancient world, he does possess a sense of honor and dignity, as evidenced by his behavior during the French attack on the monastery. As the noise raised by the French brigade draws closer, Buchius puts on his hat, takes up his cane, and awaits their arrival “wie ein richtiger alter Römer beim Einbruch der Gallier” (17:103). Recalling Livy’s account of the Roman senators calmly awaiting the invading Gauls inside their homes, Buchius emulates their behavior because he deems it an appropriate model. Ancient Rome makes up a significant component of his consciousness and his perception of the world, even to the extent that he would apply the values of the Classical world to his own time—they inform his notion of masculine behavior.

Buchius's actual act of courage in the novel consists of safely guiding his group to a hiding spot in a cave he had discovered and set up as his sanctuary when his students' pranks had become too much to bear: "Heute – jetzt seid ihr alle – auch Er, lieber von Münchhausen, hier willkommen, wo ich mir bei den Tieren der Wildnis als Einsiedler ein Unterkommen ausgemachet [*sic*] hatte, wann – mir euere Lustigkeit im Kloster ein wenig zu arg wurde, lieber Monsieur Thedel" (17:137). Buchius's initial discovery of the cave was prompted by his timidity and a withdrawal from the social world, but without it he would not have become the hero to his companions.⁵⁵ This act of heroism, however, is somewhat ambivalent, since its goal is to hide from the battle that is bound to ensue at any moment. In the given situation, however, it is the wisest decision Buchius can make.

It is clear that living up to his ideals invigorates Buchius even in his old age: "So hatte er nie und nimmer sich in der Welt Trubel lebendig gefühlt wie in dieser schlimmen, ratlosen Stunde auf Wodans Felde, dem Odfelde" (17:125-26). While he does not participate in the death and destruction around him and while he does not choose sides in the conflict, Buchius does act according to his convictions and abilities and is finally able to develop a sense of self-worth by taking charge of leading the group to the cave: "‘Ich!’ sagte Magister Buchius, und er hatte noch niemals in seinem an die Seite gedrückten, scheuen, schweigsamen, überschrieenen, überlächelten, überlachten Dasein den Accentus so kraftvoll auf das persönlichste aller Fürwörter gelegt wie jetzt" (17:135).

The depiction of Buchius is placed opposite the much more aggressive and militaristic type of masculinity embodied by Thedel von Münchhausen. He puts his physical strength and agility on display in his daring rescue of Mamsell Selinde from the hands of the French soldiers at the monastery (17: 98-100), and his assertiveness in the pursuit of her affection causes Selinde

to complain about the rescue, as if Münchhausen had abducted her (17:122). In his willingness and readiness to fight, Thedel stands in stark contrast to both Noah Buchius and Duke Ferdinand. The former does everything to avoid being drawn into the surrounding conflict, and the latter reluctantly participates in it because his social rank demands it, but he recognizes the immense casualties demanded by war: “Quelle guerre! Welch ein Krieg! Welch ein Krieg, welch eine Schlächterei ohne Ende!” (17:175) When Thedel decides to join Ferdinand’s ranks and loudly proclaims his enthusiasm to ride into battle and spill his blood for his lord, Ferdinand can only shake his head and sigh at the young man’s foolhardiness (17:185). Raabe underscores his criticism of militaristic expressions of masculinity by bringing Buchius, Selinde, Heinrich, and Wieschen safely back to the monastery, but leaving Münchhausen dead on the battlefield of the Odfeld.

The shocking discovery of his favorite former student trampled into the ground leaves the relatively stoic Buchius unable to contain an expression of his sorrow. The senselessness of Münchhausen’s sacrifice shakes him to the core as he exclaims, “O Gott, o Gott, so jung und so ein guter Junge und um solch eine Dummheit, die ihn doch gar nichts anging! Und so ein lieber, lieber Junge!” (17:204) Buchius considers Thedel’s death foolish because he sacrificed himself for a cause with which he identified, but which in truth did not actually concern him. The group affiliation that he constructed for himself was ultimately *destructive* and unsustainable, but it represents precisely the type of behavioral patterns among German men that Raabe observed and disapproved of in his own time. One cannot help, therefore, read Buchius’s eulogy for Thedel von Münchhausen with a sense of irony. There was no actual “Glorie” for him on the battlefield because he had only joined Ferdinand’s army that very day and there was no “teutsche[s] Vaterland” (17:207) to speak of at the time for which he could have given his life. Instead, he is

only swallowed up by the Odfeld and will now become merely one of the relics waiting to be unearthed centuries later by another collector, perhaps someone like Regierungsrat Wunnigel.

Wunnigel began a serialized run in *Westermanns Monatshefte* in 1877, but unlike *Das Odfeld* it does not relocate its plot in the distant past. Instead, the setting is a small town in “Mitteldeutschland” and the year is approximately 1872—only one year after German unification. Although at first sight the novella does not share many structural features with *Das Odfeld*—the timeline stretches across an unidentified period, the narrator is relatively chatty and regularly breaks into the plot, and the tone of the tale is primarily humorous with a touch of tragedy at the end—the central figure, the eponymous retired Regierungsrat Wunnigel, is a collector of historical objects like Buchius. *Wunnigel* provides a counterpart to *Das Odfeld* by presenting a character whose relationship to his collected objects is almost the opposite of Noah Buchius’s relationship to his, and who as a result fails to integrate himself into a narrative of masculinity.

In the novella *Wunnigel*, Heinrich Weyland is a doctor whose family has lived in the aforementioned small town since the sixteenth century, and he occupies a house that has been passed down from generation to generation. Their relics and memorabilia are still arranged throughout the entire house. Wunnigel is passing through the town when his daughter Anselma falls ill, causing him to stop at the local inn and seek help from Weyland. It is obvious from the start that Weyland is smitten with the pretty young woman. He determines that Wunnigel’s constant travel, relentless hunt for “antiques,” and utter disregard for the quality of their lodging is to blame for Anselma’s condition, and he prescribes rest if she is to convalesce. While he is waiting for his daughter’s condition to improve, Wunnigel becomes enamored of the historical treasures in Weyland’s house, while Weyland becomes increasingly enamored of Anselma. The

two young people eventually decide to marry, and Wunnigel leaves for Italy to give the newlyweds some space. Upon his return, the couple notices that he seems strangely disturbed by his experience there. It is slowly revealed that Wunnigel also got married on his trip, in his case to a woman of limited means who believed that he was a man of means. Once his travel money was spent she found out the truth; Wunnigel arranged a bill of exchange on Weyland's house, and left Italy in a hurry. Back in Germany, he is plagued by the predicament in which he has placed himself and simply withdraws from the world, taking off his clothes, going to bed, and refusing to get up. When Sesamoff, a Russian count and acquaintance of Wunnigel's new wife, comes to assess the value of the house and becomes interested in the artifacts, Weyland explains that he is actually their rightful owner and that the items are not for sale. Wunnigel never leaves his bed and dies only a few months later.

As in *Das Odfeld*, it is once again history and the collection of historical items that forms the basis for the construction of national affiliation and masculine behavior in *Wunnigel*. The initial introduction of Heinrich Weyland almost glosses over the physical description of the character himself and instead launches into a pages-long retelling of his family history, contained within the walls of the family library. The oldest relic of his ancestors is an inscription quoting the Latin poet Martial, dated 1598 and etched into a window overlooking the town, which immediately connects the Weyland family to the Classical world and establishes a claim to a certain cultural-historical heritage. Since then, Heinrich Weyland's forefathers consist of a group of collectors, scholars, travelers, and soldiers who all had some role to play in fostering a German culture, be it through their survival of the Thirty Years' War (13:13-14), their study of Spinozistic philosophy (13:14), or their contribution to the Wars of Liberation (13:15). They all

left some kind of trace of their existence which is now preserved in one of the most sacred spaces of a bourgeois household, the library.

The first impression the reader gains of Weyland is, therefore, that he is steeped in Germanic cultural history and that his defining characteristics are so closely associated with this history to cause the narrator to introduce the character in terms of this heritage. Wunnigel, on the other hand, appears much more enigmatic. It is unclear at first where he comes from and his first name is never even revealed to the reader. As a traveler, Wunnigel takes up temporary residence at the inn, itself a symbol of transience not only because its function is to host guests for short periods of time, but also because the building is a former hunting lodge that fell into disrepair after being abandoned by its aristocratic owners and was subsequently repurposed by the locals.⁵⁶ Although he cannot boast a collection of family heirlooms like Weyland's, Wunnigel nevertheless lays claim to a German heritage in two ways. The first is his daughter Anselma, whose name noticeably stands out as one with a Germanic origin⁵⁷ and thus conceivably places her father into a Germanic tradition as well. The absence of a mother, however, is rather conspicuous and casts a shadow of doubt over Wunnigel's claim of fatherhood, and therefore also his individual history. At a time when there was no possibility of genetic testing only women were able to confirm with certainty the progenitor of their children, as explained by nineteenth-century literary critic Leo Berg: "Die Männer haben keine Kinder, nur Frauen haben Kinder. Der Mann weiß nie, ob er der Vater seines Kindes ist. ... Der moderne Mensch hat keinen anderen Unsterblichkeitsglauben als das Fortleben in seinen Kindern und Werken. Er steht also kahl da und wird vom nächsten Blitze ausgelöscht werden."⁵⁸ If Anselma represents both Wunnigel's heritage and his legacy, then the neglected state in which Dr. Weyland finds her on his first visit lying on a shabby bed with "bäuerlichen

Kissen und Decken” (13:32) also reveals Wunnigel’s neglect in cultivating his relationship to the national community.

Wunnigel’s second claim to Germanness is his passion for collecting. Like Buchius, he collects items that seem to have a certain historical value, but unlike Buchius, he does not excavate objects from his home region. Instead, he travels wherever his search takes him and gathers the items from whomever is willing to give them away or sell them. When explaining his passion to Weyland, Wunnigel employs a metaphor that presents him negatively, comparing his manner of collecting to a raptor descending on carrion (13:35). Therefore, there is nothing about the items collected by Wunnigel that could inherently connect their history to his; they do not stem from an “ancestral ground.” Moreover, whereas the objects Buchius collects are disconnected from their original purpose (like the Roman soldier’s spur or Charlemagne’s officer’s mallet) and are then endowed with meaning by Buchius himself, the artifacts collected by Wunnigel are signifiers without signifieds: locks without keys and door handles without doors (13:35-36) that are not further explained or cataloged by their collector and simply fill out his wardrobe and his room without representing any historical network. Unlike the heirlooms in Weyland’s family library, a collection that has come about organically as an “accumulation” of history and that has actual meaning for the physician insofar as it places him within a historical and genealogical narrative, the antiques in Wunnigel’s possession do not share a common past, which makes them mere collectibles, as noted by Katharina Grätz, that share only one point of intersection, namely Wunnigel himself.⁵⁹ Thus, the historical narrative occupied by Wunnigel is his own construction representing a fantasy without relation to actual historical reference.

Following Weyland’s first meeting with Anselma, the young physician has a dream vision of her traversing every crevice of his home space and paying a visit to and interacting with

each of his ancestors (13:43-44) as if she belonged with them all along, or as if Wunnigel's claim to her were illegitimate. Once he and Anselma marry, Weyland has finally succeeded in embedding her into his genealogical narrative and in confirming his masculinity.⁶⁰ However, by doing so, Weyland has utterly unmoored Wunnigel, who now has no bearing and drifts away to Italy, conventionally regarded by one German literary tradition as a space of questionable morals.⁶¹ There Wunnigel attempts to assert his own masculinity by entering into a farcical marriage, a marriage doomed from the start because it is based on false assumptions about Wunnigel's means. Upon his return to Germany, Wunnigel blames Anselma—and implicitly also Weyland—for his aimlessness:

“Du bist allein schuld daran, Mädchen! Ganz allein – einzig und allein du!” schrie Wunnigel aus seiner Sofaecke und trieb Töchterchen durch den unvermuteten Aufschrei bleich und bebend gegen die Wand zurück.

“Wieso denn? Warum denn Anselma?” fragte der Schwiegersohn ebenso rasch wie sein Weib.

“Weil sie es war, der die Vorsehung die Leitung meines Schicksals in die Hand gab, und weil sie höchst unkindlicherweise mich um dich, mein Sohn, verlassen und allen Zufälligkeiten unbewachter Lebensstimmungen überlassen hat!” (13:124)

In an inversion of genealogical progression, Wunnigel is incapable of constructing his own narrative of masculinity and would instead prefer to entrust his fate to the guidance of his daughter, who heretofore had defined him both as a German and as a man and is now lost to him.

To regain what he has lost, Wunnigel attempts to usurp ownership of Weyland's heirlooms and foolishly implies to Count Sesamoff that he could purchase the artifacts, but he is shocked when the count indeed comes to the town from St. Petersburg to inspect the contents of

the library (13:140-41), thereby testing the veracity of Wunnigel's claim. Weyland must once again assert his claims and explain that he is the rightful owner of the house and its contents. Wunnigel had assumed that he could take control of Weyland's narrative because he does not properly understand the "ownership" of history. Once Weyland has successfully proved to Sesamoff that he is the actual owner of the artifacts, Sesamoff must be content with the acquisition of Wunnigel's relatively worthless collection, and Wunnigel the collector cannot continue the practice that has heretofore defined his existence, namely laying claim to pieces of history that nobody else has claimed. As a result, there is no longer a place for him in this society and he turns his face to the wall, awaiting his death in the true sense of the word. Only after Wunnigel dies is it possible for a new generation of Weylands to enter the world, as Anselma gives birth in quick succession to several boys (13:170). One can therefore interpret Wunnigel as a threat to Weyland's narrative of bourgeois masculinity.

The model of bourgeois masculinity that Raabe presents in *Wunnigel* aligns closely with the traditional constellations of bourgeois masculinity already observed in chapter one in such works as *Ein Held der Feder*. Heinrich Weyland is a young and dedicated doctor with blond hair who is quite popular in his town, especially among young unmarried women and their mothers (13:11). The outcome of the novella suggests that Raabe was more comfortable promoting this more conventional model of masculinity than the model represented by the retired *Regierungsrat*. Only ten years later, however, Raabe seems to change his mind and creates in Noah Buchius a protagonist who is a retired scholar, has no wife and no offspring, and is more a bookworm than a hero. Nevertheless, the author depicts him as a positive and, more importantly, sustainable model of a German man. The main difference between Buchius and Wunnigel lies in their relationship to history as a basis for establishing both a sense of national belonging and

masculinity. While Buchius is completely immersed in a historical narrative that he lives and breathes, adopting elements of both a European and a Germanic cultural-historical heritage as his own, Wunnigel sees history merely as a commodity to be traded and has only a superficial connection to the objects he collects. Furthermore, Wunnigel's death in shame and bankruptcy is potentially also Raabe's way of criticizing the materialistic and superficial pursuits of the *Gründerzeit*, a criticism also found in the works by Theodor Storm discussed below.

Fleeing a Life of Social Restrictions: Theodor Storm's Misfits

Theodor Storm was a bit of an oddity in the circle of nineteenth-century German writers whom he considered his peers. In an era of drastic political changes and intense social anxieties, Storm was persistent in claiming his relatively “unpolitical” stance “compared with Mommsen or even Fontane,”⁶² and his writing exhibits a regional flavor instead of offering a grand approach to portraying a national German community in the vein of Gustav Freytag's *Die Ahnen*, for example. Nevertheless, Storm was not entirely disconnected from the discourses that shaped public opinion in the second half of the nineteenth century, as evidenced by his publication record in periodicals with national circulation like *Westermanns Monatshefte* and *Deutsche Rundschau*. Although his prose texts often seem peculiarly distant from the issues of their day—be it in the time period they depict,⁶³ in the subject matter they treat,⁶⁴ or in the language used by the characters⁶⁵—the fact that interest in the research of Storm's works persists to this day indicates that there is more to Theodor Storm than the mere “Provinzialsimpelei”⁶⁶ of which he was famously accused by Theodor Fontane.⁶⁷

Storm's interest in giving his readers a glimpse into the psyche of his characters has made his novellas depicting family crises, generational conflicts, and notions of hereditary guilt a

favorite subject of Storm scholarship.⁶⁸ Beginning with *Aquis submersus* (1876), at the latest, a motif begins to appear in and shape Storm's novellas that can be traced in many of his works up to *Der Schimmelreiter* (1888): the destruction of the (bourgeois) family. Storm does not formulate his intention of portraying the decaying family until 1881 in a letter addressed to his friend Heinrich Schleiden: "Der Inhalt [der Novelle *Der Herr Etatsrat*] ist die Zerstörung der Familie oder vielmehr 'die Familie in der Zerstörung.'" ⁶⁹ Nevertheless, one can already observe the features of this motif in *Aquis submersus* and *Carsten Curator* (1878). Of particular interest to me, however, is the theme of troubled masculinity, which is present in Storm's works starting with his first novella, *Immensee* (1850), but which does not emerge as a truly recurring theme until his late creative period. In the texts published after 1872, Storm frequently casts his protagonists as men who struggle either to assume prescriptive gender roles, such as Heinrich Carstens, Archimedes Sternow, and John Glücksstern, or to refuse them, such as Hinrich Fehse and Hans Kirch. These struggles almost always lead to death.

Death most commonly takes the form of drowning in Storm's prose.⁷⁰ Having spent most of his life near the North Sea coast, Storm was surely intimately familiar with water's potential for destruction. A number of scholars have pointed out the significance of water for the literary and artistic representation of femininity. Elisabeth Bronfen, for example, explains that the feminine often "serves as a cipher conjoining the threat of sexuality with that of death"⁷¹ and that the dual nature of water as an element mirrors this ability both to create and to destroy.⁷² Particularly Klaus Theweleit's discussion, however, of psychological connotations of water-based imagery, such as streams ("Ströme"), floodwaters ("Fluten"), oceans, and lakes, is useful for an exploration of Storm's works. Psychoanalysts connect streams to a flow of energy or a

charge.⁷³ Thus, an orgasm is often defined as a “Strömen”, or an “Abströmen,”⁷⁴ i.e., a release. This metaphor demonstrates the incredible force attributed to a stream.

Criticizing Freud’s idea of the “ozeanische Gefühl” from *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Theweleit interprets his adamant defense of the sharply defined contours of the ego as almost a fear of this oceanic feeling that represents the source of everything, be it God or Nature.⁷⁵ It is a fear of “den ‘Fluten’ und der ‘Lava,’ die aus dem Innern des soldatischen Mannes hervorbrechen können.”⁷⁶ Theweleit therefore interprets masculinity as a type of defense mechanism acting both against the threatening force of femininity from without and uncontrollable force of desire from within. It is possible to read Storm’s drowning male characters as examples of a masculinity unable to withstand this twofold pressure acting on it. This observation in turn raises the question whether it is possible for men to escape the confines of socially sanctioned forms of masculinity at all without suffering fatal consequences, a question also raised by Storm’s novellas *Draußen im Heidedorf* and *Hans und Heinz Kirch*.

When Storm began writing *Draußen im Heidedorf*, he believed to have discovered a “new tone”⁷⁷ with this novella and the work is generally considered to mark the beginning of his late creative period.⁷⁸ Indeed, Storm moved away drastically from the idyllic depiction of landscapes that characterized his previous works toward a more sober depiction of the destructiveness of the elements.⁷⁹ The shift in tone may have been influenced in part by the monumental changes taking place in German society at the time. Storm began writing the work in 1871 and published it in 1872, in the midst of the founders’ boom and the broad restructuring of German life. Especially rural life was rapidly transforming in the second half of the nineteenth century. Even though agriculture still claimed 49% of the German labor force in 1880,⁸⁰ its share in the labor force had shrunk substantially since the 1850s because investment

in industries outside of agriculture had increased fourfold during that time.⁸¹ While the founding years were an age of “entrepreneurs and investors,”⁸² they were also a time of massive emigration, particularly from the countryside.⁸³ The complexities of this period, characterized by Germany’s belated entrance into the industrial age and by an increased emphasis on outward appearance over underlying substance,⁸⁴ all find expression in a relatively unusual setting even for Storm: a heath village in northern Germany.

Draußen im Heidedorf is told from the perspective of a local judge who comes to the village to investigate the disappearance of Hinrich Fehse. Fehse is a peasant who is hopelessly in love with Margrethe Glansky, a seamstress and midwife’s daughter living on the outskirts of this community. Although Hinrich tries to buy her affection with expensive gifts, Margrethe is not committed to him and keeps him at arm’s length. Worried that Hinrich will sell off his livelihood in pursuit of Margrethe, the local sexton arranges a marriage between him and Anne-Marieken, a rich farmer’s daughter. In addition, the sexton convinces Margrethe to take a position as a seamstress in a town far enough away to help Hinrich forget about her. For some time it seems as if Hinrich’s life might improve, but as soon as Margrethe returns to the village Hinrich starts visiting her again and selling his family’s property to buy gifts for her. When his wife falls ill Hinrich thinks she might die and becomes hopeful that this would give him the opportunity to marry Margrethe. Even though Anne-Marieken convalesces, Hinrich decides to sell off every asset he owns. He comes to Margrethe’s house one stormy night and asks her to accompany him to America, but she refuses. Utterly crushed, Hinrich goes home and lies down. Disturbed by Hinrich’s reaction, Margrethe follows him to his house hoping to talk to him that same night, and when she sees that the lights are still on inside, she looks through one of the windows. Hinrich catches a glimpse of her, leaves the house searching for her in the storm, and

is not seen again. As the judge is conducting his investigation, some peasants discover that Hinrich has drowned in a nearby bog.

Although the setting might lead its readers to classify *Draußen im Heidedorf* as a “Dorfgeschichte”⁸⁵ and to make assumptions about its content and themes based on that classification, the text actually offers a wider range of interpretations. Hinrich is experiencing an identity crisis: his community confines him to the existence of a peasant, but he does not wish to be a peasant, he does not conceive of himself as such, and he does not operate within the parameters of that lifestyle. Aiko Onken makes the convincing observation that Hinrich Fehse’s name already contains an opposition of identities. Citing the name’s definition from the *Duden Familiennamen*, Onken explains that “Fehse” stems from the Middle High German word *vöse*, a term meaning “chaff,” but also used as a designation for grain growers or peasants and potentially given to a person with the intention of mocking.⁸⁶ Onken contrasts the lowly meaning of Hinrich’s family name with the relatively powerful connotation evoked by his first name, a variant of “Heinrich,” i.e., “ruler.”⁸⁷ The moment in the novella when Hinrich hesitates to sign his family name on the marriage document after he has already signed his first name (2:75), represents for Onken a schism in his identity and a rejection of the profession designated by his family name.⁸⁸

While Onken goes on to analyze the effect of modernization on perceptions of individuality in the text, I would like to follow a different avenue of interpretation. Fehse’s family name expresses his genealogical narrative and determines his identity as a man. It restricts Hinrich to being a farmer, and within the confines of this identity the only socially acceptable course for him is to marry a farmer’s daughter. Hinrich, however, is not willing to integrate himself into this narrative. In fact, he cannot make use of his family’s traditional means

of production; his behavior indicates instead that he wishes to be an investor—in short, he is potentially a *Gründertyp*. The reader never sees Hinrich perform the duties of a farmer, and instead the sexton remarks that he “verkauft . . . was los und fest ist, Futter und Saatroggen” (2:77). The narrator witnesses Hinrich’s purchase of two frail-looking horses and later discovers that he had sold two geldings earlier the same day. Considering that he is selling off the seeds and other items necessary for his survival as a farmer and transforming them into liquid assets, one can conclude that Hinrich is renouncing his farmer heritage, even going so far as to proclaim, “ich bin kein Bauer mehr...” (2:93). By abandoning his means of production and taking up trade as his main source of income, he is participating in the kinds of business practices popular during the founders’ boom.

Hinrich’s renunciation and elimination of everything that might identify him as a farmer also has the effect of making him increasingly dependent on spending as a means of asserting his masculinity. Following his father’s death, the family faces financial ruin and stands to lose all their possessions unless they can find money to pay off their debts. Hinrich is completely powerless in this situation and is emasculated by the circumstances surrounding his marriage to Anne-Marieken. He requires her substantial dowry to save the family and to provide a new source of funds for himself. More importantly, however, Hinrich has absolutely no say in the marriage arrangement, since it is entirely orchestrated by the sexton. He is denied participation in the “traffic in women”⁸⁹ and therefore also the final step to adult manhood. A comment the sexton’s wife makes to the judge underlines Hinrich’s ultimate inability to achieve full maturity: “denn mit sich selber umzugehen, was doch die größte Kunst vom Menschenleben ist, das hat er immer noch nicht lernen können” (2:84). In fact, the story she relates about Hinrich’s youth reveals that his pursuit of Margrethe has led to his prolonged disappearance in the past and

makes it clear that he has developed a fixation on her, which manifests itself in his failed progression into mature masculinity. Recognizing this failure, but unwilling to integrate himself into the genealogical narrative of masculinity indicated by his family name, Hinrich overcompensates for it by means of his ostentatious spending habits, the aim of which is to win over Margrethe. His buying power thus becomes an alternate expression of masculinity.

Hinrich's alternative masculinity experiences a crisis when he actually confronts Margrethe and offers her the choice of emigrating with him to America. He presents her with a bag of gold and feels confident that it will be enough to accomplish the intended bargain and to enable him to make a marriage arrangement on his own. When Margrethe rejects his advances yet again, however, the masculinity he has constructed on the basis of buying power collapses. Unable to maintain this masculine narrative any longer, he renounces it just as he renounced his prescribed occupation and disposes of its symbol, the sack of gold, by throwing it into the well in front of Margrethe's house, proclaiming "ich brauch's nun nicht mehr" (2:94). Hinrich thus effectively drowns his masculinity.

Nevertheless, all is not yet lost for him at this time. When Hinrich returns home from his meeting with Margrethe, he has the opportunity to assume the role he had once rejected, but the dilemma presented by the schism between his heritage and his aspirations still plagues him, as evidenced by an observation his mother makes: "Aber er schlief wohl nicht, denn er warf sich fleißig herum und stöhnte auch wohl so vor sich hin; wir waren das schon an ihm gewohnt, Herr Amtsvogt" (2:97). When shortly thereafter, however, Hinrich glimpses Margrethe's face in the window, she appears to him at the height of her animalistic sexuality⁹⁰ and is described at that moment as a "Tier" with "weißen, spitzen Zähne[n] und ... schwarzen Augen" (2:98). Hinrich can resist her no longer and gets up from his bed to follow her, but on his way out he passes by

the crib where he notices his son and heir. As he contemplates one last time the possibility of returning to his prescribed genealogical narrative, he voices his powerlessness to do so by muttering to himself: “Das Kind! Das Kind!” (2:99) The reminder of his heritage is not enough to convince Hinrich to stay, and he goes into the storm to pursue Margrethe once again. Hinrich has lost his “Kampf gegen weibliche Sexualität,”⁹¹ and his masculine “Körperpanzer” is neither able to withstand Margrethe’s threatening form of femininity nor to suppress his socially unacceptable sexual desires. The submersion of the sack of gold, representing a form of masculinity alternative to that of the genealogical narrative, anticipates his own submersion in the cold water of the bog where the locals eventually discover him and reinforces a reading in line with Theweleit’s notion of masculinity under twofold pressure, in which Hinrich succumbs both to the force of Margrethe’s sexualized femininity and his own uncontrollable sexual desire.

The novella thus demonstrates that the dilemma presented by alternative forms of masculinity is also relevant to a countryside setting. Like Fontane’s aristocratic Prussian officers in Berlin, Hinrich struggles with a notion of masculinity that he either finds outdated or at least not applicable to himself. As he attempts to escape the parameters of a narrative of masculinity to which social expectations are trying to confine him, he meets resistance from all sides, including from the object of his sexual desire. Hinrich wishes to escape to the New World because it represents a space of limited social restrictions and an opportunity for a man to reinvent himself without the burdens of traditions or heritage. As such, America constitutes the direct opposite of Germany in the 1870s and 1880s, which was in the process of rediscovering (or reinventing) and affirming its traditions. Ultimately, however, Hinrich gives up his struggle to assert his alternate form of masculinity—and therefore also his plans for leaving Germany—because it fails to achieve legitimacy in the eyes of Margrethe. Since Hinrich has already

rejected the possibility of achieving masculinity by taking possession of his genealogical narrative, there is no other remaining alternative for him but death.

A scenario depicting an identity crisis in similar ways unfolds in *Hans und Heinz Kirch*, a novella Storm published in 1882, ten years after *Draußen im Heidedorf*. Here, Storm returns to the bourgeois milieu and presents its virtues of productivity and diligence as a focal point in the work. Thomas Baltensweiler pinpoints this “Erwerbssinn” as one of the major themes addressed by German fiction in the second half of the nineteenth century—from Gustav Freytag to Thomas Mann—and argues that Storm takes it up frequently in his late works, for example in *Carsten Curator*, *Hans und Heinz Kirch*, and *Der Schimmelreiter*.⁹² The bourgeois sense for acquisition and the drive for success create pressure to conform to a particular lifestyle and a particular model of masculinity, and as *Hans und Heinz Kirch* shows, any model representing an alternative is rejected outright by the German bourgeoisie.

Hans Kirch is an ambitious man and a social climber who expects his son Heinz to take on his legacy. Heinz, however, has a bit of a rebellious streak and shows a lack of discipline that alarms his father. On the eve of the day that will see Heinz set out to follow in his father’s footsteps and seek his fortune as a sailor, he stays out past the town’s curfew with his childhood sweetheart, Wieb. Hans is furious at his son and they part on a sour note. During his absence at sea, Heinz only writes home twice—the second time, Hans flat-out refuses to accept the letter because Heinz did not pay the postage and the father declines to accept the charges. Years pass without further word from Heinz until someone looking remarkably like him appears at a nearby tavern. Once Hans picks up his son and brings him home, it becomes evident that Heinz did not amount to anything and does not share his father’s ambitions. Fed up with Heinz, Hans casts him out and accuses him of being an impostor, based on a rumor that arises around town. This is

the last time anybody sees Heinz in his hometown. Some time after Heinz's departure, Hans has a dream vision of his son drenched with water and knows instinctively that he has died. Filled with the regret of a father who has cast out his son twice, Hans now looks out onto the sea and wonders what has happened to Heinz.

Hans Kirch is the epitome of a self-made man who worked himself up from a sailor to a respectable member of his town and who therefore possesses a keen sense for the value of money, verging almost on miserliness (3:60-61). Storm's description of Hans Kirch leads Baltensweiler to characterize him quite definitively as a *Gründertyp*.⁹³ This designation is indeed appropriate, since Hans has made the bulk of his fortune as a sea trader and has married a woman who is herself a hawker and therefore a trader of goods. Their combined wealth then allows them to invest in property and establish a business, thus paving their path to social ascent (3:60). Descriptions of Heinz state, on the one hand, that he is the spitting image of his father (3:61), but on the other hand, Heinz's figure is more reminiscent of his mother (3:61), and his lack of dedication to his schoolwork reveals hints of laziness not detectable in the father (3:68). Furthermore, Heinz is fond of isolating himself from the rest of society, together with his girlfriend, Wieb, and of saying to her, "wir wollen weit von all den schlechten Menschen fort" (3:67), thus exhibiting a contempt for his community or for social structures. Hans hopes that a life at sea will provide Heinz with the same opportunities that it provided him and that his son will amass a fortune or at least rise in rank, but Heinz returns home the way he left: a simple sailor.

One must not assume that Heinz's failure to live up to his father's expectations should be attributed to laziness or that returning home as a "mere" sailor makes him a good-for-nothing. The scars on his face and on his arms (3:93) indicate that he has led a life of hardship and his

response to his sister's question as to whether he has had to perform difficult tasks makes it clear that he is used to "allerlei Arbeit" (3:93). In fact, Heinz feels restless in his father's house and frequently visits the docks in order to exchange a few words with the other sailors or to observe them at their work, loading and unloading ships (3:94). Heinz is clearly drawn to this life and is longing to return to it. In the eyes of his father, however, Heinz is a failure because he has abandoned the genealogical masculine narrative he was expected to adopt as his own. Quite to the contrary, Heinz's alternative form of masculinity threatens the bourgeois, domestic, family-oriented masculinity embodied by Hans. Hans initially believes that he can reintegrate his son into the "proper" narrative not only by reintroducing him to his household, but also by offering him entry into the family business. However, Heinz refuses to have those structures imposed upon him. He shows very little interest in his father's account books (3:94) and he rejects his sister's suggestion to take the "Steuermannsexamen," which would allow him to reach the rank of captain,⁹⁴ because he has "manche alte Bark auch ohne das gesteuert" (3:98). He does not see a reason for taking the exam because passing it would merely lock into an institutional framework an ability he already possesses.

In one instance Heinz reveals that he might be interested in "settling down" after all and joining the framework he otherwise rejects, namely with regard to Wieb. Like Margrethe Glansky, however, Wieb is a woman from the fringes of the town community. Wieb's mother is a "Wäscherin, die ihr Kind sauberer hielt als, leider, ihren Ruf" (3:65) and she is rumored to be involved with more than one man, which makes her a pariah alien to proper bourgeois society. Heinz pays no heed to the talk of the other children and makes Wieb his childhood confidante. She is the only one who accompanies him when he isolates himself from everybody else, most notably on the night when he breaks the town curfew. They row out into the harbor on a small

boat, and it is immediately apparent that this is a forbidden space and a forbidden element: the moon is the only light illuminating the darkness and it heightens the sexual appeal of Wieb by making her appear “so groß und schlank, daß er erst fast verzagte, ob sie es wirklich sei” (3:70) and by highlighting her luxuriant blond hair, which she has left uncovered that evening and which heightens her Lorelei-like qualities. It is in this highly sexualized space that Wieb entrusts Heinz with the ring that is to serve him as a constant reminder of her.

After Heinz returns to his hometown, he once again seeks out Wieb, who now works at a tavern emanating a “rote[n] Schein” (3:110) into the night. When Heinz enters the tavern, it soon becomes apparent that Wieb has followed in her mother’s footsteps and works at a place of ill repute. As if he were suggesting that he can rescue her and elevate them from their current existence, Heinz reprises his old question to Wieb (“Wollen wir weit von all den bösen Menschen fort?”, 3:114) and presents her with the keepsake she had given to him years ago. The ring evokes marriage and suggests that Heinz has not completely rejected all bourgeois institutions, but it is entirely impossible for either Heinz or Wieb to be part of them. Wieb’s profession as a barmaid borders on prostitution and violates the codes of bourgeois morality. The exchange of Wieb’s ring representing their bond was also conducted in a space outside the margins of bourgeois society and was therefore inappropriate.

During his life at sea, Heinz has constructed a masculinity, the modes of which are irreconcilable with those of bourgeois masculinity. Moreover, even if he wished to take possession of his genealogical narrative in order to achieve the type of masculinity represented by Hans Kirch, he would not be able to do so because his position in that narrative is now occupied by his brother-in-law Christian, who is precisely the kind of son to Hans that Heinz is not:

Der ganze Ehrgeiz des Hauses schien jedenfalls, wenn auch in anderer Form, jetzt von dem Tochtermann vertreten zu werden; Herr Christian Martens hatte nicht geruht, bis die Familie unter den Mitgliedern der Harmoniegesellschaft figurierte, von der bekannt war, daß nur angesehenere Bürger zugelassen wurden. Der junge Ehemann war, wovon der Schwiegervater sich zeitig und gründlich überzeugt hatte, ein treuer Arbeiter und keineswegs ein Verschwender; aber – für einen feinen Mann gelten, mit den Honoratioren einen vertraulichen Händedruck wechseln, etwa noch eine schwergoldene Kette auf brauner Sammetweste, das mußte er daneben haben. (3:86)

Christian embodies the bourgeois virtues of diligence and thrift, and he has successfully elevated the family into the circle of the town's bourgeois notables. Hans's plan for his son has been brought to fruition by his son-in-law instead, meaning that there is now no place for Heinz in it. Heinz's reintroduction into the Kirch household thus calls his identity into question from the very beginning. When he first reappears in the town after his long absence, he has already ceased to be Heinz Kirch and is introduced to both the reader and to Hans under the generic moniker he has adopted, John Smidt (3:89). His claim to the name Heinz Kirch is further undermined by a rumor that arises based on his strange behavior and the absence of an anchor tattoo Heinz should have on his arm, and claims that the person pretending to be Heinz is actually Hasselfritz, "ein Knabe aus dem Armenhause, der gleichzeitig mit Heinz zur See gegangen war und gleich diesem seitdem nichts von sich hatte hören lassen" (3:98).

Because Heinz is unwilling, or unable, to meet the expectations of a bourgeois society, his position in the Kirch genealogy is summarily denied to him by both the town community and his father, and he is instead relegated in status to the working-class poor, for it is inconceivable that the son of Hans Kirch, a *Gründer* and now a model bourgeois, would have returned without

having amounted to anything. Shortly after Hans casts out Heinz based on his doubt of Heinz's identity, Wieb is able to confirm that the man was indeed his son. Despite the confirmation and the pleas from both Wieb and his daughter, Hans refuses to search for Heinz, saying, "mag er geheißten haben, wie er will, der diesmal unter meinem Dach geschlafen hat; mein Heinz hat schon vor siebzehn Jahren mich verlassen" (3:121-22). By rejecting his father's values, Heinz has lost access to his genealogical narrative of masculinity. Therefore, the title *Storm* originally intended for his work, "Hans Kirch und Heinz,"⁹⁵ appropriately reflects Heinz's lack of a family name when he is banished from the unit responsible for shaping socially productive, i.e., bourgeois, men and women.

As a result, Heinz returns to the sea and makes it his permanent home, unlike his father, who lived at sea temporarily and used it as a means to establish himself on land. Here Theweleit's description of the image of the ocean in Western literature becomes useful, because he identifies the ocean as a place where one can "sich hineinstürzen, sich auflösen, namenlos werden und das eben nicht in einem regressiven Sinn; es sind Aufbrüche, Grenzüberschreitungen um Neuland zu entdecken und neue Ströme, ... Deterritorialisierungen, nicht 'Alte Heimat' und auch nicht neue."⁹⁶ For Heinz, the sea thus represents an escape from the constraints of his father's bourgeois existence, but at the same time, it constitutes a forbidden space and one that can be unpredictable and lead men to temptation. Heinz is not interested in his genealogical narrative and leaves behind his "Alte Heimat"—his bourgeois family and the space that is at that time being integrated into the German Empire—and by dissolving and becoming nameless in this sea he irrevocably gives up that part of his birthright.

Like Hinrich Fehse, Heinz Kirch is a male character who does not belong in the German society depicted by Storm and ultimately meets his fate in a watery grave. Does the premature

mortality of these characters suggest that it was unimaginable for Storm to present notions of masculinity not in line with those held by the German bourgeoisie? There can be no unambiguous answer to this question. In the two novellas discussed here, Storm certainly presents misfits who are unproductive and lack both thrift and diligence and who therefore cannot find a place in German (bourgeois) society of the 1870s and 1880s, but at the same time it is not clear that he presents their exclusion from that society as a permanent state or a justified outcome of their otherness. The end of *Draußen im Heidedorf* reveals that Margrethe Glansky, also an outsider in the village community, has disappeared as well: “sie soll in, ich weiß nicht, welche große Stadt gezogen und dort in der Menschenflut verschollen sein” (2:101). Like Heinz Kirch, she is engulfed by an ocean, albeit an ocean of people, but unlike in the case of Heinz, the dissolution of her self is not fatal.

On the one hand, therefore, the big city represents a space in German society that permits the existence of gender identities otherwise seen as threatening to bourgeois morality; on the other hand, the conclusion of *Hans und Heinz Kirch* offers the possibility of “redemption” to outcasts. Hans Kirch is visibly filled with regret about his rejection of Heinz and longingly gazes out onto the ocean asking the question, “wo ist Heinz Kirch geblieben?” (3:127) The narrator echoes this question in the novella’s final sentence (3:130) and thus reiterates that Heinz’s absence has created a gap in the community he has left behind. The repeated inquiry about Heinz’s whereabouts implies his father’s willingness to try once again to reintegrate him into the bourgeois home space—his paternal love for Heinz is not fully extinguished and thus mirrors a *patriae amor* that has not entirely given up on its native son. While Storm has temporarily expelled the misfits from his image of German society, he has left open a possibility of their eventual inclusion and acceptance in it.

Is it, therefore, actually valid to read these stories as their authors' rejection of hegemonic masculinity in German society? Their stance seems, at times, somewhat ambivalent. After all, one could interpret Storm's banishment of the misfits in his texts as a form of punishment for their failure to continue the genealogical chain. Raabe's Noah Buchius is indeed a sustainable model of German masculinity in the short term, but he leaves behind no heirs who could continue his legacy, and thus he cannot be viewed as an *outright* rejection of the traditional type of virile masculine behavior represented by Münchhausen. Last, the death of the sons in Fontane's novels may be understood as the result of their failure to conform to the models of strong masculinity set by their fathers. These texts thus could potentially function as "cautionary tales" that illustrate the dangers of nonconformity with the social norm. On the other hand, the amount of masculine weakness depicted in the works of these authors demonstrates how difficult it actually is to sustain what are considered normative standards of masculinity. The alternatives that are offered are not necessarily successful in supplanting stereotypes, but they most certainly problematize notions of masculinity idealized in the works of writers such as François, Heyse, and Werner. They suggest that German men cannot be confined to merely one set of characteristics and, as a different perspective of Storm's and Fontane's works will show in the following chapter, that there were indeed multiple and competing notions of German masculinity in Imperial Germany.

Notes:

1. Walter Erhart, *Familienmänner: Über den literarischen Ursprung moderner Männlichkeit* (Munich: W. Fink, 2001), 8.
2. Ibid, 8-9.
3. Ibid, 47.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid, 9.
6. Ibid, 149-50.
7. Ibid, 9-10.
8. Ibid, 56-57.
9. Helmuth Nürnberger notes that the *Preußenlieder* found their way into periodicals as well as anthologies, such as the *Soldatenfreund* and the *Kinderfreund*. Helmuth Nürnberger, "Geschichte und Politik bei Theodor Fontane," in *Theodor Fontane: Dichter der Deutschen Einheit*, ed. Bernd Heidenreich and Frank-Lothar Kroll (Berlin: BWV, 2003), 16.
10. Ibid, 17.
11. Dietmar Storch, "Theodor Fontane und die Reichsgründung," in *Theodor Fontane: Dichter der Deutschen Einheit*, ed. Bernd Heidenreich and Frank-Lothar Kroll (Berlin: BWV, 2003), 55.
12. Ibid, 56.
13. Theodor Fontane, "Der achtzehnte März," in *Von Zwanzig bis Dreißig: Autobiographisches*, ed. Otto Drude (Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1987), 398.
14. Michael Gratzke, "'Das Opfer war Gebot, war Leidenschaft': Männlichkeit und Heldentum in Fontanes *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*," in *Masculinities in German Culture*, ed. Sarah Colvin and Peter Davies (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2008), 76.
15. Ibid, 78.
16. Storch, "Reichsgründung," 66.
17. Friedrich Scherer, "Fontane und das Wilhelminische Deutschland," in *Theodor Fontane: Dichter der Deutschen Einheit*, ed. Bernd Heidenreich and Frank-Lothar Kroll (Berlin: BWV, 2003), 83.
18. Ibid, 84-85.
19. Erhart, *Familienmänner*, 178.
20. Ibid, 182-83. For Erhart, the term "zwischen" is significant insofar as Fontane also employs it in his description of the female ancestors' portraits, which hang interjacent ("dazwischen") to the male ancestors' portraits, thus aligning Schach more clearly with his female ancestors rather than the male ones.
21. Gabriele Brandstetter and Gerhard Neumann, "'Le laid c'est le beau': Liebesdiskurs und Geschlechterrolle in Fontanes Roman *Schach von Wuthenow*," *DVLG* 72.2 (Jun. 1998): 249.
22. The more commonly observed version of this idiomatic expression is "außer Rand und Band." However, Botho's introspective moment is preceded a few lines earlier by the sentence, "er habe nicht Lust, der gnädigen Frau ... einen aus Rand und Band gegangenen Haushalt zu überliefern" (3:216). Thus, the sentence I quote above is meant to form a parallel to the already encountered expression "aus Rand und Band gehen," i.e., "to go out of control."
23. Urte Helduser goes so far as to argue that the text offers enough evidence to imply Botho's infertility and she designates him as an "homme fragile." Urte Helduser, "pater incertus. Zum Motiv von 'Unfruchtbarkeit' in Theodor Fontanes *Irrungen Wirrungen*," in *Krankheit und Geschlecht: Diskursive Affären zwischen Literatur und Medizin*, ed. Tanja Nusser and Elisabeth Strowick (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2002), 168; 172.
24. Edith H. Krause and Steven V. Hicks, "Illusion and Dissolution: Fontane's *Stine*," *German Studies Review* 18.2 (May 1995): 227. Such an interpretation of the term "Invalide" is certainly more in line with a more contemporary understanding of the term. Fontane's nineteenth-century readers would have been more likely to associate the term primarily with military veterans, "Soldaten, welche im Feld oder im Frieden zur Erfüllung ihres Berufs untauglich geworden sind." (*Meyers Konversationslexikon*, s.v. "Invaliden," accessed January 19, 2013, <http://www.retrobibliothek.de/retrobib/>)
25. Antje Harnisch, *Keller, Raabe, Fontane: Geschlecht, Sexualität und Familie im bürgerlichen Realismus* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1994): 131.

26. Sabine Schmidt, “‘fast männlich’: Zu Genderdiskurs und Rollentausch in Theodor Fontanes *Mathilde Möhring*,” in “*Weiber weiblich, Männer männlich*”? *Zum Geschlechterdiskurs in Theodor Fontanes Romanen*, ed. Sabina Becker and Sascha Kiefer (Tübingen: Francke, 2005), 229.
27. David S. Johnson, “The Ironies of Degeneration: The Dilemmas of Bourgeois Masculinity in Theodor Fontane’s *Frau Jenny Treibel* and *Mathilde Möhring*,” *Monatshefte* 102.2 (Summer 2010): 148.
28. Schmidt, “‘fast männlich,’” 239.
29. Petra Kuhnau, “Symbolik der Hysterie: Zur Darstellung nervöser Männer und Frauen bei Fontane,” in “*Weiber weiblich, Männer männlich*”? *Zum Geschlechterdiskurs in Theodor Fontanes Romanen*, ed. Sabina Becker and Sascha Kiefer (Tübingen: Francke, 2005), 39.
30. The trapeze motif is reminiscent of the swing in Fontane’s *Effi Briest* (1896), which symbolizes for the protagonist a bygone carefree time and the allure of danger.
31. Johnson, “Ironies of Degeneration,” 148.
32. The Polish background implied by Rybinski’s name is certainly another reason for Mathilde’s distrust of him as a role model for Hugo. Kristin Kopp identifies sexual excess in the conduct of Polish characters as a recurring motif of nineteenth-century German fiction, as well as the infiltration of the imperial center by “a virile subject from the periphery.” The treatment of Eastern European gender tropes in German literature would present a productive pursuit for a future project, but it is beyond the scope of this study. Kristin Kopp, “A German Dracula: Fontane’s *Effi Briest* and the Anxiety of a Reverse-Diffusional Slavic Flood,” in *Germany’s Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012), 120.
33. Schmidt, “‘fast männlich,’” 238-39.
34. Of course, Mathilde’s ambition contributes to the deterioration of Hugo’s health, and as Schmidt points out, previous scholarship on the subject has often depicted Hugo as “the victim” and Mathilde as “the perpetrator,” but I am interested in an alternative interpretation of Hugo’s downfall as a function of his self-perception as a man. *Ibid*, 230.
35. Johnson, “Ironies of Degeneration,” 157.
36. Jeffrey L. Sammons, *Wilhelm Raabe: The Fiction of the Alternative Community* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1987), 88.
37. Irene S. Di Maio, “Nation and Gender in Wilhelm Raabe’s Pre-Unification Historical Narratives,” in *Wilhelm Raabe: Global Themes—International Perspectives*, ed. Dirk Göttsche and Florian Krobb (London: Legenda, 2009), 114.
38. Sammons, *Alternative Community*, 89.
39. *Ibid*, 97.
40. *Ibid*, 98.
41. Di Maio, “Nation and Gender,” 123.
42. *Ibid*, 122.
43. Sammons, *Alternative Community*, 103.
44. Hans Oppermann, “*Das Odfeld*,” in *Wilhelm Raabe: Sämtliche Werke* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966): 402.
45. Eric Downing, “No Direction Home: Wilhelm Raabe’s *Das Odfeld* and the Archaeology of Identity,” *DVLG* 82.1 (Mar. 2008): 61.
46. *Ibid*, 59.
47. The French soldiers’ chant first introduced in chapter eleven, and repeatedly invoked in subsequent pages, is quite striking in the brutality of its imagery: “Venons, saignons, / Venons, pendons, / Venons à cinquante, cinq cents!” (17:105).
48. Downing, “No Direction Home,” 70.
49. Münchhausen peppers his speeches with variations of “Vivat Ferdinandus Dux” throughout the novel (17:76, 108, 132, 145, 155, 169, 185, 186).
50. Sammons, *Alternative Community*, 127.
51. Downing, “No Direction Home,” 77.
52. *Ibid*, 64.
53. *Ibid*, 84.
54. The discovery of these remains is most likely a reference to the discovery of a fossil described by Johann Jakob Scheuchzer in *Lithographia Helvetica* (1726) as *Homo diluvii testis*, meaning “human witness of the Deluge” and referred to in German by Scheuchzer as “Sündflutmensch.” The fossil was later reexamined and

- determined to be an extinct species of giant salamander. *Meyers Konversationslexikon*, 4th ed., s.v. “Andriās Scheuchzēri,” accessed July 31, 2013, <http://www.retrobibliothek.de/retrobib/seite.html?id=100760>.
55. Thedel von Münchhausen explicitly and enthusiastically refers to Buchius as “ein Held, ein Heros” (17:146).
 56. Katharina Grätz points out that the change in ownership, purpose, and décor of the hunting lodge marks this site as one that is swept up by the currents of historical change. It serves as a contrast to the home of Heinrich Weyland, which accumulates history and conserves “die Zeugnisse vergangenen Lebens.” Katharina Grätz, “Erbe und Sammler in Wilhelm Raabes ‘Wunnigel’: Der Zerfall einer literarhistorischen Allianz,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 116.4 (1997): 530.
 57. The name consists of the elements “ans” (God) and “helm” (helmet) and has the figurative meaning of “protector of God.” *The Penguin Dictionary of First Names*, comp. David Pickering (New York: Penguin, 2004), s.v. “Anselm.”
 58. Leo Berg, *Das sexuelle Problem in Kunst und Leben*, 5th ed. (Berlin, 2001), 36, quoted in Urte Helduser, “*pater incertus*,” 164.
 59. Grätz, “Erbe und Sammler,” 541.
 60. Citing Gayle Rubin’s essay “The Traffic in Women,” Walter Erhart explains that the bourgeois “Familiengesellschaft” of the nineteenth century was not only defined by individual family units, but also by the system of trade in which sons were expected to form their own family units and daughters circulated between families as objects of exchange. The sons’ masculinity was thus determined by their ability to conduct these trades. Erhart, *Familienmänner*, 58.
 61. Of course, it was also significant for writers and intellectuals, such as Goethe or Winckelmann, and their understanding of aesthetics and art.
 62. David A. Jackson, *Theodor Storm: The Life and Works of a Democratic Humanitarian* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 34.
 63. For example, *Renate* takes place around the turn of the eighteenth century and much of *Zur Chronik von Grieshuus* is set in the seventeenth century.
 64. The basic plot of *Draußen im Heidedorf*, for example, revolves around the investigation of the disappearance and death of a peasant in a small village community in Schleswig-Holstein.
 65. Storm sprinkles bits of Low German into many of his prose works, but *Bötjer Basch* stands out as one novella with particularly frequent occurrences of this dialect.
 66. Regina Fasold, *Theodor Storm* (Stuttgart; Weimar: Metzler, 1997), 31.
 67. Practically every major scholarly work on Theodor Storm makes sure to cite Fontane’s criticism of Storm’s “Husumerei” and “Provinzialsimpelei” from his Storm-essay published in 1896: both Jackson and Fasold cover it in their discussions of Storm’s and Fontane’s relationship, Peter Goldammer references it in the introductory chapter to a volume on narrative strategies and patriarchy in Storm’s work, as does Louise Forssell in the introduction to her monograph on the treatment of masculinity in Storm’s late prose, to name just a few. The intention of this reference is usually to bring up a common criticism of Storm’s writing (by a famous contemporary, no less) and to proceed to “vindicate” the author by showing that upon further analysis there are more complex and universal themes in Storm’s writing than critics such as Fontane would argue.
 68. The notion of *culpa patris*, i.e., the father’s guilt, extends as a common thread through many of Storm’s novellas and has been widely acknowledged as a major motif in his fiction. The idea that the genetic stock can potentially deteriorate from generation to generation is one that increasingly preoccupied Storm as he became more familiar with Darwin’s theories on heredity, but as Goldammer notes, he imbued these theories with an almost mystical element of “Erbsünde” and imagined it fatalistically as part of the laws of nature. Because this element of Storm’s works has received significant attention, it does not figure into my main argument in this section, but it is certainly connected to it. Peter Goldammer, “Culpa patris? Theodor Storms Verhältnis zu seinem Sohn Hans und seine Spiegelung in den Novellen ‘Carsten Curator’ und ‘Hans und Heinz Kirch,’” in *Stormlektüren: Festschrift für Karl Ernst Laage zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Eversberg, David Jackson, and Eckart Pastor (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2000): 148.
 69. Dieter Lohmeier, “*Der Herr Etatsrat: Wirkung und Würdigung*,” in *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden* (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987), 3:776.
 70. In many instances, Storm’s characters drown in the actual sense of the word by falling into wells (e.g., *Aquis submersus*) or being swallowed by a bog, a lake, or the sea (e.g., *Auf dem Staatshof, Auf der Universität, Draußen im Heidedorf, Der Schimmelreiter*). In some cases drowning takes the more figurative form of alcoholism (e.g., *Der Herr Etatsrat*) or the character’s actual death by drowning results from his succumbing to alcoholism (*Carsten Curator*).

71. This conjoining is the function of a split in the representation of women into binaries such as “purity *and* lust” and “victim *and* destroyer.” Elisabeth Bronfen, “Femininity – Missing in Action,” in *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity, and the Aesthetic* (New York: Routledge: 1992), 212; original emphasis.
72. “Das Wasser kann sowohl als schöpferische, lebensspendende, dem Weiblich-mütterlichen verbundene Kraft erscheinen, wie auch als bedrohliche, zerstörende Wirkung,” but a death by drowning can also mean a rebirth, insofar as it attracts attention to a previously unknown individual. Elisabeth Bronfen, “Frauen kommen aus dem Wasser, Frauen gehen ins Wasser zurück: Eine Einleitung,” *Elisabeth Bronfen* (blog), June 10, 2005, <http://www.bronfen.info/index.php/archive/48-archive2005/>.
73. Klaus Theweleit, “Ströme,” in *Männerphantasien* (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Roter Stern, 1986), 1:316.
74. *Ibid*, 1:314.
75. *Ibid*, 1:320.
76. *Ibid*, 1:322.
77. Dieter Lohmeier, “*Draußen im Heidedorf*: Wirkung und Würdigung,” in *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden* (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987), 2:808.
78. Aiko Onken, “Determination—Draußen im Heidedorf,” in *Erinnerung, Erzählung, Identität: Theodor Storms mittlere Schaffensperiode (1867-1872)* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2009), 259.
79. Lohmeier, “*Draußen im Heidedorf*,” 2:809.
80. David Blackbourn, *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780-1918* (New York: Oxford UP, 1998), 188.
81. *Ibid*, 180-81.
82. Matthew Jefferies, *Imperial Culture in Germany, 1871-1918* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 89.
83. Blackbourn, *The Long Nineteenth Century*, 192.
84. Jefferies quotes cultural historian Egon Friedell’s negative assessment of the Gründerzeit: “whitewashed tin masquerades as marble, papier maché as rosewood, plaster as shimmering alabaster, glass as exquisite onyx. The exotic palm tree in the bay window is waterproofed or made of paper, the tasty arrangement of fruit in the table-centrepiece is made of wax or soap.” Egon Friedell, *Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit* (Munich: Beck, 1931), 3:357, quoted in Jefferies, *Imperial Culture in Germany*, 89.
85. Lohmeier, “*Draußen im Heidedorf*,” 2:810.
86. *Duden Familiennamen*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Fehse,” quoted in Onken, “Determination,” 267.
87. Onken, “Determination,” 267-68.
88. *Ibid*, 269.
89. With regard to Rubin’s “The Traffic in Women,” see Note 32.
90. Descriptions of Margrethe’s sexual appeal as wild and bestial are a recurring theme of the text. As a “Slovakendirne” (2:81), she is already marked as an other and a potential threat to the village community. In addition, she is described as a “Schwarzkopf” with “weißen Zähne[n]” and “wild wie ‘ne Katze” (2:82), as having a “verführerischen Kopf” (2:86), and as conveying “heiße Lebenslust aus ihren dunklen Augen” (2:90). These descriptions are consistent with those of vampiric women in the nineteenth century, and thus Margrethe’s Eastern European heritage, her dark hair and eyes, and the red lips and white teeth establish her femininity as particularly dangerous.
91. Theweleit, “Ströme,” 1:326.
92. Thomas Baltensweiler, “Die Aporie in der bürgerlichen Familie: Zur Funktion des Erwerbssinns in ‘Hans und Heinz Kirch’ und ‘Der Schimmelreiter,’” *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 51 (2002): 87.
93. *Ibid*, 88.
94. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, s.v. “Steuermannsexamen,” accessed November 29, 2012, <http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/>.
95. Peter Goldammer, “*Hans und Heinz Kirch*,” in *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden* (Berlin; Weimar: Aufbau, 1967), 3:741.
96. Theweleit, “Ströme,” 1:342-43.

Chapter Three: Regionally Defined Notions of Masculinity in Imperial Germany

Thus far, my examinations of literature published during the formative period of the German Empire have revealed that there certainly existed a dominant notion of what German masculinity should entail, but they also showed that not all writers agreed with this prevailing image and offered competing representations of German men. As I explain in chapter one, writers whose works enjoyed a large readership at the time often promoted in their writing bourgeois values such as honor, loyalty, and honesty, which incidentally overlapped with military virtues. For this reason, representations of German men, especially in texts published in the period around 1870-71, tend to adopt a militaristic tone and depict these characters as citizens going to war and taking on the roles of soldiers. They return home victorious because the combination of their bourgeois *Bildung* and the physical prowess acquired in war renders them superior to their foes. Following the end of the war, these men are seamlessly inserted into an environment that establishes a middle-class domestic idyll as the ultimate goal for any man.

By contrast, writers who were later canonized did not shy away from depicting German men as flawed characters. They suggest that militaristic forms of masculinity are out of place in communities that are not at war and present characters who fail to integrate into a postwar German society. Characters such as Fontane's Hugo Großmann show that artistic ambition often cannot be reconciled with social and financial success and that, in fact, one must sacrifice one for the other. In *Hans und Heinz Kirch*, Storm proposes that the bourgeois drive toward wealth and social recognition is not an ideal path for everyone as he depicts the complications that arise for a male character who refuses to follow that path. Last, Raabe offers an example of a male protagonist in Magister Noah Buchius who does not require marriage and family bliss in order to

become a hero in the eyes of his acquaintances and to enter a narrative of masculinity as described by Erhart.

The fact that there is such variation among these texts, all of which were published during the same relatively short time period, indicates that multiple notions of German masculinity competed against each other and that identification with one nation and one set of values was complicated by continuing loyalties toward particular regions. In the works of François, Heyse, and Werner examined above, it is noticeable that even when the settings they choose do not represent a unified Germany, they relate the idea of a German nation metonymically—a region comes to stand for Germany and its male protagonists are similar in character and attitude to those in the texts of the other writers, thus creating a sense of consistency. Even if Germany does not appear as the German Empire in these texts, the eventual unification is nevertheless regarded as a driving force that will not only bring about one single German state, but also ultimately achieve uniformity among Germans. Such treatment of German unification or uniformity is absent from the texts of Fontane, Raabe, and Storm analyzed in chapter two, and thus the protagonists they create also share relatively few common elements. For them, the fragmentation of Germany remains a circumstance that is true even after unification and is reflected in the male characters that populate the individual regions.

The observation that the German Empire was actually a fragmented state populated by citizens with allegiances to their particular localities, of course, has been made by historians and literary scholars alike. Since the 1990s, several major studies have explored the interaction between Germans' sense of local and national belonging and the transformation of regional allegiance into national identity toward the turn of the twentieth century. In her work *A Nation of Provincials* (1990), Celia Applegate establishes that nationality was closely related to the idea

of *Heimat*, which in turn has been the subject of “a long-standing ... debate in German society about the proper relation between the locality and the nation.”¹ This debate, according to Applegate, centers on the process by which a number of individual pieces combined to compose a presumably cohesive whole. Primarily, *Heimat* is, for any given individual, not necessarily defined by his or her identification with a wider national community, but instead it represents the positive feelings associated with “local communities, close family harmony, and domesticated friendly nature.”² In the nineteenth century, the term evoked a nostalgia for or familiarity with one’s hometown, but at the same time it avoided the exclusivity or the closed-off feeling that small hometowns can bring to mind. Rather, “this *Heimat* contrasted to a *Fremde* or *Ferne* of late romantic adventures in strange lands,” and thus represented a space to which one returns after a long journey and a place where one would always belong.³

If the literature of the period depicted events taking place in villages, small towns, or other “intimate” communities, it did not aim to exclude those who were not native to those communities from partaking in their experience. After all, everyone has a place that he or she considers home, and the love of one’s place of origin, regardless of region, was therefore a feeling that could translate into a universal experience potentially enjoyed by a large readership. When Auerbach chooses a Swabian village as the setting for a work or when Storm locates his characters on a Frisian island, they are nevertheless addressing an audience that at some level considers itself German and that can relate to their stories because each reader can draw on his or her personal relationship with a local *Heimat*.⁴ Their recognition of the similarity of their own relationship with their region’s beliefs, customs, and social attitudes to those of other Germans toward their home regions, Applegate claims, offered them “a way to reconcile a heritage of localized political traditions with the ideal of a single, transcendent nationality.”⁵ Thus, national

and local loyalties often existed side-by-side and rather than promoting German uniformity, proponents of the *Heimat* movement acknowledged that the source of Germany's strength was actually its cultural diversity.⁶

Alon Confino's study *The Nation as a Local Metaphor* (1997) builds upon the groundwork laid by Applegate. Echoing Applegate's observation that people with regional affiliations can find common ground and discover a sense of national belonging, Confino sees the "striking potential of nationhood to integrate diverse and frequently hostile groups"⁷ and recognizes that "the nation is a conglomeration of opposing and at times contradictory memories ... that – in spite of their confrontations – add up into something that is bigger than the sum of its parts."⁸ His chief contribution is the argument that in the final third of the nineteenth century the locality actually became a symbol for the nation and effectively became synonymous with it. Confino shows how "Heimatlers," those who actively promoted and shaped the way people perceived the local *Heimat*, "produced a visual image of the nation that represented interchangeably the locality, the region, and the nation."⁹ The essence of Confino's argument is that local, regional, and national identity eventually collapsed into one, and he applies this model even to his explanation of the role of dialect in the German Empire. Whereas Applegate views local dialect as the lively expression and "celebration of folk identity,"¹⁰ Confino sees in it once again a trend toward a unified whole, in which many local dialects come together to form one regional dialect and a number of regional dialects are in turn grouped under the German language.¹¹

He explains the process by which the nation was remade in the image of the locality as one that required of Germans a "reevaluation of old memories"¹² and their appropriation for a new national narrative in which inhabitants of former rival states needed to coexist and overlook

that they stood on opposite sides of military conflicts as recently as 1867. In his case study of Württemberg, Confino explains that education about regional history with the aim of fostering one's understanding of regional heritage was uncommon or even unheard of in that state before 1871. Not surprisingly, educators saw no reason to inform their pupils of this history until it seemed necessary to protect it after unification, "at a period when national uniformity threatened to render all Germans equal, regardless of their different pasts and traditions."¹³ Confino therefore sees the unification of Germany as responsible for giving Germans a reason to care about regional memory and the preservation of their local *Heimat* in the first place. By imagining this local *Heimat* as a symbol for their new nation and by continuously reinforcing this image in newspapers, visual media, literature, and local celebrations, Confino claims that Heimatlers succeeded in making it "an everyday mental property"¹⁴ that Germans carried with them.

In order to demonstrate how local customs contributed to Germans' sense of national belonging, Confino provides a thorough examination of Sedan Day celebrations in the state of Württemberg as an example of the process. This holiday, celebrating the decisive victory of the Franco-Prussian War at Sedan and the declaration of the German Empire on January 18, 1871, was extremely popular in the first twenty years after the unification and often appropriated days already designated for existing local celebrations for the celebration of the empire's (and the nation's) birth. What makes Sedan Day so significant is that "the meaning of the holiday was decided by German provincials, not by the emperor who refused ... to sanction the celebration officially."¹⁵ The holiday thus gave the impression of a sort of grassroots movement which was actually able to connect even small towns and villages to the rest of the nation. Perhaps more importantly, Confino claims, the refusal of official support for the holiday from the central

authority of the empire “opened a space for the bourgeoisie to shape national identity in their own image.”¹⁶ The absence of support meant that in most municipalities it was the middle classes, usually the Protestant liberal-bourgeois notables,¹⁷ who were the main financiers and organizers of the meetings in Württemberg, which in turn allowed them to construct through Sedan Day “a national identity that reflected their values and aspirations.”¹⁸ Ultimately, the holiday offered a definite meaning of what it meant to be German and “provided a symbolic representation for the shared beliefs of liberals: *Kleindeutschland*, nationalism, Protestantism, Bismarck.”¹⁹

The seeming paradox of Sedan Day thus appears to be that it was a holiday celebrated locally, drawing upon different customs in different towns, yet it achieved the stature of an unofficial national holiday and succeeded in evoking a feeling of togetherness among the many Germans celebrating it. According to Confino, this patriotic feeling was possible because the celebrations had the same cause at their core, even though they manifested differently, and thus they provided common ground for all Germans. He cites an excerpt from a speech by a *Gymnasium* principal, in which the orator credits Sedan Day with giving every German an “engere Heimat” and making it possible for each one of them to celebrate it, “feeling that [one] is everywhere at home.”²⁰ This notion of feeling “everywhere at home” illustrates perfectly Confino’s concept of the local as a national metaphor: a Württemburger, for example, could potentially find a small piece of home in Prussia as well, and that was enough to bring out feelings of national belonging.

Thus, the picture that Confino paints of nineteenth-century Germans’ understanding of local *Heimat* presents it as a gateway to conceiving of the nation as *Heimat* by transferring the properties of one’s locality onto it. In a more recent study, *Between National Fantasies and*

Regional Realities (2006), Arne Koch takes a different approach in analyzing the interaction between the locality and the nation, which is not interested in “reaching unifying conclusions about supposed shared functions” of diverse regional narratives.²¹ Koch argues that there were indeed multiple coexisting German identities—sometimes expressed through literary depictions of specific regions of Germany that highlight their unique aspects through representation of certain character types or through geographic localization—and with this claim of multiplicity he challenges directly Confino’s notion of the collapsing perception of local, regional, and national character into one point.²²

On the other hand, Koch also examines how regional belonging is constructed by means of “geographic consciousness” in the works of authors such as Auerbach and Storm, but at the same time this consciousness “encompasses a sense of national identity as well,”²³ and therefore he does not maintain that allegiance to one’s locality and acceptance of the nation as *Heimat* are mutually exclusive feelings. In fact, Koch concedes that Confino has correctly observed the disappearance of distinctions between different notions of *Heimat* over time,²⁴ but he expresses doubt about the existence of enough evidence to support Confino’s claim of converging identities because “the multiplicity and longevity of regional literature suggest that readings based upon a teleological progression from particularity to uniformity are flawed.”²⁵

Koch points out that regional literature is not merely concerned with a particular space, but also with sociohistorical time, and that it “all but requires the continuous consideration of history alongside notions of regional localities.”²⁶ One could compare this observation to Confino’s example of the increased focus on reinforcement of regional memory in Württemberg after 1871 as a factor in shaping regional loyalties in the postwar period. However, Koch does not see the exploration of local customs and history in regional fiction as a celebration of a

glorified past the objective of which was to express a desire to return to an age of particularism and of small independent German states.²⁷ Instead, he claims that the actual purpose of regional fiction in the nineteenth century consisted of asserting a regional character with the aim of preserving it within an ever more pronounced German national character. Most of all, Koch wants to show that the existence of authors with a regional focus continued to be a phenomenon even beyond the nineteenth century, which suggests that tensions between regional and national allegiance continued to be a part of German identity and did not simply disappear near the turn of the twentieth century, as Confino might argue.²⁸

The key difference between Confino's and Koch's arguments lies in the way in which they understand the interaction between Germans' perceptions of their locality and their perceptions of the nation. Confino observes an evolution in the postwar period that allowed the locality to be presented in various media as the image of the German nation and therefore to evoke feelings of the local *Heimat* with reference to the nation as a whole in a "metaphoric" fashion. Koch objects to this view as a teleological progression from local to national identity. In contrast to Confino, he claims that the multiplicity of regional identities was actually quite pronounced in Imperial German culture. Although the various regions certainly formed a larger whole in the structure of the empire, Koch argues that they nevertheless conceived of themselves as distinct entities that laid claim to their distinction and uniqueness within this conglomerate, without challenging the existence of a national character. While Confino describes an outward motion of identification in which individuals projected the image of the local *Heimat* onto the nation, Koch describes an inward motion of identification that seeks to integrate the nation (the "world outside") into an already established notion of local *Heimat*.

Although I find Koch's argument regarding a multiplicity of coexisting regional identities in nineteenth-century Germany more compelling, Confino's description of local experience lending itself as a metaphor for perceiving the nation certainly has merit as well. After all, especially some of the texts discussed in chapter one have shown that a region can symbolize a national community: the way that Saxony in *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingssöhne* evokes a unified German state or even a place as small as Kolberg in Heyse's play serves as shorthand for Germany's united resistance to foreign occupation. In spite of the popularity of such metaphorical evocations of regions in German literature of the period, however, there were also writers whose works focused on particular regions of Germany—usually their own regions of origin—and presented them in a way that emphasized their uniqueness or even their difference from other German regions. In the preceding chapters, I have shown how developing ideas of the German nation influenced depictions of German men in literary texts. In this chapter, I am particularly interested in exploring how the representations of individual German regions reflected upon literary representations of male characters and what this multiplicity of masculinities meant with respect to the notion that there is such a thing as German masculinity. For this purpose, I will once again examine works by Storm and Fontane, both of whom displayed quite openly in their writing the influence of their respective regions, albeit in different ways and to different effect.

“To Huus! To Huus, Vatter!”: Expressions of Masculinity Through Regional Character

In the previous chapter, I touched upon the common opinion even among Storm's contemporaries characterizing his writing as representative of a narrow view of society, based primarily on life in Schleswig-Holstein and heavily influenced by the experience of his native

Husum, which earned it—somewhat unfairly—labels such as “Provinzsimpelei” and “Husumerei.”²⁹ David Jackson notes, however, that Storm disagreed with criticism that dismissed his works as inaccessible to a wider audience and defended the “Heimatgefühl” found in them as “perfectly compatible with a wider national feeling – and cosmopolitanism.”³⁰ His letters to Fontane reveal that he resisted being pigeonholed as a provincialist and, in turn, judged harshly what he regarded as “Prussian provincialism,”³¹ namely its clinging to an outdated social system which it was increasingly imposing onto other German states. The democratic Storm could not abide a system “based on aristocratic privilege and caste exclusiveness” and was disappointed with a Prussian society where “even the cultured and the educated were trapped in the cult of rank and titles.”³²

Storm displays a kind of rebellion against this Prussian provincialism in a novella that has remained relatively overlooked in his œuvre, *Eine Halligfahrt*. Published in 1871, and thus coinciding with German unification, the work mirrors Storm’s personal disappointment with Schleswig-Holstein’s “subjugation” by Prussia in 1867, which cost the author his title of *Landvogt* due to a restructuring of local bureaucracy.³³ The negative experiences he had as a bureaucrat in Husum with officers of the occupying Prussian forces who treated his fellow citizens “wie einen besiegten Stamm”³⁴ disillusioned Storm with regard to the prospect of German unification if it was to be obtained on such terms, and even more than a decade after unification he railed against Prussian hegemony over the smaller and less powerful German states in the empire.³⁵ Lefebvre claims that Storm’s powerlessness in facing the Prussian state apparatus led him to adopt a certain “Kulturpessimismus,”³⁶ which only exacerbated the life crisis he underwent following his first wife’s death in 1865.³⁷ The pessimism of this period in Storm’s life is reflected in the novella by the figure of the narrator’s cousin, whose disillusion

with social and political developments drives him to adopt a life of seclusion on a *Hallig*, one of the small islands off the North Frisian coast. The plot of the novella at first seems to suggest that Storm favors regionalism or particularism, but the male characters' failure to take on a masculine role through the practice of their artistic profession or the achievement of marriage ultimately casts doubt upon the viability of an existence in isolation from a larger community.

The story is told from the point of view of a narrator remembering a day trip to a Hallig when he was a young man, most likely in the 1850s, the years following the failed March Revolution of 1848. He is visiting a cousin ("Vetter") who lives in the only house on the island and is accompanied by the wife of a Privy Councilor (*Geheimrätin*) also related to the cousin, and her young daughter Susanne. The cousin lives secluded from mainland society and feels an obvious and strong distaste for the state and its politics. He lives withdrawn from the world in the small den of the house on the island and has even given up on playing the violin, which was his passion.

Over the course of the visit, the narrator and Susanne separate from the others and explore the cousin's garden and the Wadden Sea surrounding the island. When Susanne ventures too closely to the nests of a flock of seagulls, the birds begin to scream and charge angrily at her, leading the girl to seek refuge in the embrace of the narrator. The scene is observed from a distance by the cousin and the *Geheimrätin*, who interpret the situation as a confirmation of a budding relationship between the two. On the return voyage to the mainland, however, Susanne avoids speaking to the narrator, seemingly reprimanded by the status-conscious *Geheimrätin* who would not have been pleased with a *mesalliance* between her daughter and the civil servant. Years after the trip, the cousin dies in the loneliness of his island and bequeaths his Stradivarius violin to the narrator, leaving along with it a letter containing

recollections of his own youth. The final pages of the novella consist of the contents of this letter, in which the cousin tells of his own love in his youth for an aristocratic girl named Eveline, whom he renounced out of adherence to his personal and artistic principles and his belief in politically liberal ideals.

Storm begins his narrative with an evocation of the Frisian landscape and immediately alienates the region from the rest of Germany geographically. He claims that the Frisian coast was once covered by a forest of oak trees so dense that squirrels could travel for miles without touching the ground (2:40). The oak, of course, is an old Germanic symbol of strength and especially in the nineteenth century gained popular usage as a symbol of the German nation.³⁸ It is therefore telling that Storm continues his description of the contemporary landscape as a “baumlose Ebene” (2:40) in which the forest has long since receded and the coast has been laid bare to the sea. He thus establishes this space as a region with ties to the rest of “forested” Germany, but also highlights its unique character and difference from other German areas.

However, Storm does offer an avenue into the text even to unfamiliar readers by consciously modeling the narrator after himself. The young man is a solicitor (“Advokat”; 2:57), a position that Storm himself held in Husum under the Prussian regime after 1867, and the author admits in a letter to his friend Ludwig Pietsch that he is the old man narrating the story.³⁹ Thus, although readers unfamiliar with the region might struggle to access the depicted space, Storm introduces the narrator as his proxy and provides his memory as an entrance point for outsiders. It is clear that his companions, the *Geheimrätin* and Susanne, are also strangers there and require some guidance from the narrator. Unfamiliar with the myth of the sunken island town of Rungholt, the *Geheimrätin* is puzzled when the boatman utters the name of the site as they are passing it and wonders why she cannot see it. The narrator replies that she must look in the place

where things are most securely preserved, namely in the past (2:43). Storm thus implies that knowledge of local mythology is a privilege that requires access to its history and thus remains obscured to those who are not privy to that information. Rungholt, referred to as “Heimat” in the narrator’s retelling of the myth (2:43), becomes a site that allows the boatman and the narrator to distinguish themselves from the two guests who accompany them.

Storm purposefully organizes the represented space in the novella as an opposition between the mainland and the island in order to heighten the effect of the cousin’s isolation. The cousin leads a secluded life because he tries to escape the intrusive power of the state. His assessment of the government’s influence on daily life reveals his disillusionment with life in German society. The cousin regards the state as a “verhaßte Maschine” (2:46) and those in power as “regierungslustige Mitkreaturen” (2:50). He also resents his contemporaries’ obsession with and relentless hunt for honorary titles as status symbols and finds that those who obtain them are often disreputable people in the first place (2:50).⁴⁰ Within the context of the novella’s plot, the cousin’s political and social views can be understood as the disappointment of a revolutionary reacting to the conservative turn following 1848, but given the timing of the text’s publication, one can also interpret his flight from the mainland as a subversive act that Storm employs to criticize Prussian domination of German life after the unification. Rather than joining the rest of Germany, the cousin seeks to cement his regional loyalty by actually surrounding himself with a barrier.

The cousin’s allegiance to his locality, i.e., his isolation on the island, does not represent true freedom, however. It is telling that he refers to the island as his “*Ländchen* der Freiheit” (2:46; emphasis added) because it consists of a small room in a house on a small patch of land that might as well be a cell in a prison. Lefebvre points out that one cannot achieve freedom

living in an “einsame[] Mikrogesellschaft”⁴¹ because the freedom and the comfort provided by the place one considers one’s *Heimat* always depend on the presence of a community—as much as *Heimat* is connected to a space, it is also determined by the people occupying that space and cannot be comprised by one individual alone. For that reason, the cousin surrounds himself with cultural products from the outside world, such as shelves full of books, collections of maps and copperplates, and a bust of Beethoven (2:47). However, no matter how hard he tries to recreate a semblance of *Bildungsbürgertum* in his ivory tower, he cannot establish it in a vacuum, cut off from the rest of the world.

The cousin regards his self-imposed exile from the hegemony of the Prussian state as an act of defiance. When he references in his dinner toast the local legend of Martje Flor (2:51), a girl who defied the Danish soldiers occupying her hometown by proclaiming a toast that looked forward to a better future (“Dat et uns wull ga up unse ole Dage!”; 2:52), he identifies with the history of insubordination among the local population and aligns himself with that surviving sentiment. In contrast to Martje Flor, however, the cousin does not actually defy state power, but instead he merely turns around and makes way for it, believing to be out of its reach. The narrator undermines the cousin’s claim of having escaped the system with his observation that the silver gulls native to the island have been classified long ago by scientists as *larus argentatus* (2:45) and thus already have been incorporated into a system of taxonomy. Therefore, the powers that impose order from the outside have already reached this small area, too, and the cousin’s claim of freedom is further exposed as an illusion.

The incident that led the cousin to renounce the society outside in the first place is only revealed in the letter that he leaves behind for the narrator. As a musician, he could not stand to see art vulgarized and degraded to mere decoration or a source of entertainment at social events.

His letter depicts the members of high society, for whom he performed, as shallow and unappreciative of art, exemplified by their arrangement of family portraits alongside those of luminaries such as Goethe and Mozart (2:64). The “Geplauder und Komplimente” of this group appear as mere form that lacks true appreciation for the artist and performer. The cousin’s disappointment stems from the realization that Eveline, his beloved, also belongs to the circle of those who—as Lefebvre puts it—appreciate art only as “Verzierung der Wände im Konzertsaal.”⁴² The rejection of this culture leads him to a life of isolation on an island where in his old age only the seagulls keep him company (2:61-62). Furthermore, it leads him to the abandonment of his passion, which is at the same time his profession, as he sentences his instrument to death by depositing it permanently in its “Särgchen” (2:49). Within the context of nineteenth-century gender roles, the loss of both his beloved and his profession emasculates the cousin. His personal and political beliefs have left him in solitude, and unlike Martje Flor, he does not have a better future ahead of him. Ultimately, an artist can only thrive within a community,⁴³ and by turning inward, the cousin denies his art the audience it needs as nourishment.

The narrator initially follows a path similar to that of his cousin. By adopting the symbols of the revolution, the “Heckerhut” and “Schnurrbart” (2:57), he signals his support of its ideals, but the revolutionary goals of democratic equality and unification are not shared by everyone and are pushing the narrator to the margins of society. While exploring the cousin’s workshop with Susanne, the narrator alienates her when he offers her a seat across from him in a sailboat. She hesitates and then declines because of the implicit lack of “Vertrauen zu [s]einer Steuerkunst” (2:55), thus undermining his effort to take on the masculine role suggested by the steering of a boat. The expectation brought on earlier by the name of the vessel that carried them

to the island, the *Wohlfahrt*, is thus subverted, since it turns out that it does not bode well for the narrator's voyage through life. His status as an outcast is further reinforced when the *Geheimrätin* admits that she is relieved to see the revolutionary ideas of the cousin—and implicitly the narrator—expelled to the island, where they can do no harm to the society on the mainland (2:51).

This passage indicates that those who still espouse democratic ideals and display a principled stance against the politics of the Prussian state, which threaten the sovereignty of smaller German states, are not doing enough to show their opposition if they act merely passively by running away or relying on symbolic gestures to signal their resistance. In fact, the narrator's political stance only impedes the progress of his career (2:51) and thus threatens to push him out of this society altogether. The only way to preserve the character of his region is not to close it off from the rest of the German community, which is how the cousin attempts to salvage its uniqueness and heritage, but instead one must maintain its presence within the consciousness of the nation. By contrast, the narrator's act of storytelling presents to a national audience his and his cousin's experience and offers a view of the North Frisian landscape, tradition, and culture that links the locality to the nation through the act of reading⁴⁴ and yet, in a way, counters attempts of the central power to force political and cultural uniformity.

Although the narrator is not to be understood as a direct and literal representation of Storm himself, the author's identification of the narrator as his proxy does suggest that his function as a storyteller mirrors Storm's role as a writer known for his representations of Schleswig-Holstein. Like the narrator, Storm tells his stories with the goal of preserving local memory. The violin that the cousin passes down to the narrator therefore becomes a symbol of this preservation. As a musical instrument, it is the embodiment of the cousin's artistic

production and his loyalty to his homeland. By requesting that the narrator not sell it or give it to anyone else, the cousin ensures that this instrument, an artist's tool, remains in the possession of a person who is himself an artist and can carry on his legacy. The narrator's mediation of the locality for a national readership establishes him in a position of authority and thus indirectly restores him to a masculine role, which he was initially denied by his unsuccessful wooing of Susanne.

The overall pessimistic tone of *Eine Halligfahrt* is by contrast absent from Storm's novella *Bötjer Basch*, a work published in *Deutsche Rundschau* in 1886, two years before the author's death. He conceived it as a "sister novella"⁴⁵ to *Ein Doppelgänger*, which ultimately received much more critical attention and is by comparison noticeably gloomier in its tone than *Bötjer Basch*. Whereas Daniel Basch is able to find strength and support in his small-town community that help him survive a nearly fatal fall, John Glückstadt only finds rejection and distrust that eventually lead to his death. *Bötjer Basch* thus stands out as an unusual "ray of light" that precedes the final three works of Storm's career, all of which explore dark themes and end tragically, and yet it has been almost overlooked by scholars. This text provides a counterweight to *Eine Halligfahrt*, insofar as it represents an almost utopian vision imagining a North German town that can assert its regional character in the face of globalizing and standardizing forces threatening to erase it.

The story begins when Daniel Basch, a cooper in his mid-forties, decides to marry because his sister, twenty years his elder, feels that she has become too old to continue helping with household chores and moves into the almshouse ("Altersstift"). Daniel marries Line, the youngest daughter of the harbormaster, and shortly thereafter, the couple welcomes the birth of a son. Fritz Basch is a lively and precocious boy who discovers a love of nature and language

early on. The initial years of family bliss end abruptly, however, when Line dies giving birth to a daughter who herself dies immediately thereafter. Fritz grows up without a mother and takes after his father, becoming a cooper first in Hamburg and then taking his craft to California, leaving behind a singing bullfinch to keep his father company. Daniel's business soon begins to struggle because of a new brewery in town that employs its own cooper, and he finds in Miss Therebinte a person to sublet a room in his house and thereby supplement his income.

Despite the company of the bird and the woman, however, Daniel is lonely and misses his son. News of Fritz's alleged death in California is made worse by the theft of the bullfinch, the sole reminder of his son, and leads the old man to attempt suicide by plunging into the sea from a cliff. However, he is observed by some local youths who save him from drowning. Suffering from the consequences of his suicide attempt and confined to bed in a barely conscious state, Daniel is finally revived by the sudden return of his son and the unexpected recovery of the bullfinch. Fritz takes over the family business and modernizes the workshop with machines that he has brought from America. He eventually marries Magdalene, his schoolteacher's daughter who was always fascinated by the bullfinch when she was younger, and thus completes the novella's fairy tale ending.

Storm's portrayal of the North German town in *Bötjer Basch* has a map of his native Husum at its base. One can recognize Storm's hometown in the layout of the buildings and in the names of streets and sites, such as Süderstraße and St. Jürgensfriedhof (3:459) or Krämerstraße (3:461), that have been taken directly into the story. Storm's own *Heimat* thus comes to dominate the narrative in many ways, even to the extent that he references the titles of two authentic chronicles of the town Husum by having them serve as Daniel's reading in his spare time (3:482). Furthermore, he casually inserts the historical figure of Philipp Christian

Lüders, a mayor whom Storm greatly admired,⁴⁶ as a character in this fictional hometown (3:510). Many of these references certainly would not be recognizable to any reader unfamiliar with the locality that serves as Storm's setting, but they create a very specific image of sites that were intimately familiar to the author. Thus, the specific names he uses might contribute for the "uninitiated" readers to the overall realistic evocation of place in the text, but to those who recognize them as actual markers of a particular locality they provide access to a specific experience and memory of a region as seen through the eyes of a native.

More obvious markers of the locality that Storm references, even for readers unfamiliar with the area, are tied to his use of dialect and region-specific terms that draw attention to themselves as representatives of everyday life there. Words such as "Schoner" and "Gaffel" (3:472) are easily looked up in a lexicon and can serve to transport the reader into the setting where they are used. When he wrote his masterpiece *Der Schimmelreiter* two years later and again incorporated regional terminology, Storm supplemented it with a glossary entitled "Für binnenländische Leser," which, according to Koch, "makes readers aware of the presence of regional difference and specificity"⁴⁷ because it emphasizes this difference by means of paratextual information. Even though he does not include such a glossary in the front matter of *Bötjer Basch*, Storm nevertheless employs vocabulary that deliberately alerts his readers to the existence of regional particularities. He thus reveals an ambivalent stance toward his readership, insofar as he acknowledges that it extends beyond his native region and yet he appears reluctant to admit it into the depicted space.

Storm's narrator perfectly reflects this ambivalent attitude. He begins his tale as a first-person narrative ("In ... meiner Vaterstadt"; 3:459), but these personal touches soon disappear and the narrator takes on an almost omniscient role of authority until he suddenly resurfaces as a

character in the story who visits Daniel Basch as the latter begins to fall into a depression.

According to Koch, a narrator who is presented as part of a depicted regional community often acts as a mediator for those readers who are positioned outside of that community.⁴⁸ As I argue in the preceding analysis of *Eine Halligfahrt*, the narrator of that story functions as a guide for both his companions and the reader. In *Bötjer Basch*, too, the narrator at first seems to take on this role and again appears to be modeled after a version of Storm himself. He is a *Landvogt* in the town (491), an office that Storm occupied in Husum for years, and as such an authority figure he invites readers to trust his observations about Daniel, seemingly providing them access to the depicted locality. As Louis Gerrekens explains, however, Storm actually distances himself from a narrator whom he subtly portrays as unreliable and he expects his readers to do the same.⁴⁹

The familiarity with which the *Landvogt* describes the town and the events in it is therefore deceptive; overly “trusting” readers may actually be blinded by his authoritative style.

Thus, even as the readership is supposedly allowed to enter into more intimate spheres of the town, the community is once again rendered exclusive because the narrator as guide obscures the reader’s perception of it. This exclusivity is thematized repeatedly in the text. For example, Daniel’s sister can count on the support of the almshouse only because the Basch family’s loyalty and service to their hometown have earned them social standing and rights. As “Meisterkinder” (3:460) they are granted certain rights that even citizens with less history in the town may not have, and these rights function as a support system.⁵⁰ A sense of community support also becomes evident when Daniel’s suicide attempt is averted by local youths who swim out and save him. As they carry him out of the water, the youths lay Daniel onto the “heimatliche[] Erde” (3:503), an expression highlighting the strong local bond that prevents Daniel from drowning in the threatening sea.

The embeddedness of the town's inhabitants in their local community is further reinforced by Fritz's preference for regional dialect. Koch emphasizes that the inclusion of dialect in regional literature is rarely meant simply to provide local "flavor" to the speech of the characters, but instead its juxtaposition to "standard German creates fundamental discords, such as the contrast between members of the regional community and representatives of superregional authorities."⁵¹ Moreover, he finds that a character's insistence on the use of dialect "signifies an allegiance to a certain place, tradition, and regional culture along with the willingness to demonstrate it publicly."⁵² Storm's inclusion of Low German dialect in *Bötjer Basch* serves precisely the purpose of highlighting Fritz's allegiance to his hometown.

Although Line Basch aims to raise her son to speak High German, he develops an affinity for speaking the language that he associates with his region: "am liebsten sprach er doch plattdeutsch" (3:463). Fritz's adoption of Low German does not happen merely on a whim, but he carries it through consistently in his life. In school, he rejects learning Latin, a symbol of worldliness, learnedness, and higher social spheres, because he does not recognize its relevance to his small town life and to his future profession: "die Faßbinderei geht auch auf Deutsch, am besten auf Plattdeutsch!" (3:470) His distrust of Latin reflects at the same time a distrust of his teacher, who is suspect both because he is a representative of the superregional authorities that try to introduce foreign languages to the local population and because he is so estranged from the everyday world and local life that he cannot distinguish oat and buckwheat from rapeseeds and potato seeds (3:471-72). Martin Lowsky identifies in Fritz's aversion to the Latin teacher a recognition of the incongruence that can exist between knowledge of "cultured" language and knowledge of the world.⁵³ Fritz believes that his mastering of Low German grants him intimacy with the world around him.

It is indeed Fritz's use of dialect that allows him an especially close bond to the natural world. Harro Segeberg has pointed out that a sense of the region that emerges in Storm's works does not stem from his chosen subject matter but rather from his characters' interactions with their environment, and this relationship to the nature that surrounds them gives rise to the human communities he represents.⁵⁴ Karl Ernst Laage has similarly argued elsewhere that the soul of Storm's characters is directly reflected in the landscape in which the work is set.⁵⁵ One can observe in *Bötjer Basch* as well an implicit connection between the surroundings and the language that Fritz uses to address them. As a child, Fritz turns exclusively to Low German to speak to animals, such as snails or butterflies, using rhymes that Storm did not invent but borrowed from existing folklore and that evoke the sound of magic spells one would hear in fairy tales.⁵⁶ He believes that the incantations he utters in dialect must have a visible effect on the animals that they address and in fact becomes frustrated when a butterfly refuses to land after he commands it to do so.⁵⁷ Storm strongly implies magical influence of Low German on the natural world when Fritz's chant, "Adebåre Esther, / Bring mi 'n lütje Schwester" (3:466), is followed directly in the text by Line's pregnancy. The use of regional dialect thus becomes more than a factor identifying Fritz merely with the local community—it also inherently links that community to the region, its wildlife, and its landscape.

Fritz's connection to the animal world, however, goes beyond his use of dialect. Depictions of his physical capability and his daring attitude are often accompanied by comparisons with local wildlife. When Daniel expresses concern about Fritz's unsupervised boat trips out to sea and warns his son of the danger, Fritz responds with the resoundingly confident proclamation, "wat en Seehund swemmt, dat swemm ick ock!" (3:476) His propensity to take risks is compared elsewhere to the fieldfare's ("Krammetsvogel") attraction to

rowanberries (3:475). Fritz's need to stand out by means of his physical prowess is thus represented as a natural instinct, but his bond to the animal world also takes a different form in his care for the singing bullfinch. The finch's singing of the melody of a famous folk song's opening line, "Üb immer Treu und Redlichkeit," becomes a recurring motif for the novella and acts as a reminder to Fritz that loyalty and integrity—to one's family, heritage, and *Heimat*—also define manhood.

Unlike most of Storm's male protagonists, Fritz Basch possesses qualities that identify him as a potent masculine type and that stem from his loyalty to his origins. He grows up to be "ein stämmiger Bursch mit sicheren und kühnen Augen" (3:475) and requires this physical robustness in order to practice his father's profession. While in Storm's other texts—Heinz Kirch and Hinrich Fehse, for example—are incapable or unwilling to step into their fathers' footsteps and integrate themselves into a narrative of masculinity,⁵⁸ Fritz takes up his father's profession and thus enters the genealogical line that was designated for him. Strictly speaking, barrel-making is not a regional business since it is not limited to Northern Germany and it does not depend on local materials, yet it is clearly tied to the locality in the context of the novella. The title of the work uses the Low German variant of the word *Böttcher* ("cooper") and thus incorporates the profession into the local linguistic framework. In addition, the title also identifies Daniel and Fritz directly by their inherited profession (it is not clear whether "Bötjer Basch" is a reference to the father, the son, or to both) and thereby relates it to their history and the function that their family has performed in the town for generations.

The influence of the outside world, however, affects both father's and son's perception of themselves as local artisans. When a new brewery moves into town and employs its own cooper, Fritz moves out to Hamburg and then to California to make a living. The local world that seems

initially closed off from the larger society thus opens up to a wider economic system. Koch claims that isolating the regional space or comparing it to other regions is rarely the intention of Storm's works, but rather his depiction of Northern Germany "reveals structures that permit an emphasis of one's own region-as-community within larger formations."⁵⁹ Therefore, by emigrating to California, Fritz actually transplants his skills and his profession, the markers of his masculinity and regional affiliation, to a new space where he eventually also achieves success. The American West, however, does not become a new locality but remains foreign despite Fritz's achievements. News of the son's success merely serves as a source of pride "back home" ("De Jung! De Jung! He kann wat, un dat in Amerika!"; 3:486) and affirms the family's status as capable coopers—and, thus, as capable men.

The virtue of loyalty to one's roots is further emphasized when Fritz's attempt at gold digging during the California Gold Rush nearly ends when he is stabbed in the back. As observed in *Hans und Heinz Kirch*, straying too far from home can destabilize an individual or lead to the "Zerstörung seiner Biographie."⁶⁰ When Fritz abandons his inherited profession for the prospect of greater riches acquired more quickly, he is immediately punished for it. The gold mines of California are described as a maddening place, a cacophony of languages evoking the Tower of Babel and causing diggers to lose their ability to speak in the midst of the noise (3:489). The only way in which Fritz is able to earn his fortune is by returning to his origins and taking up his father's profession again as a cooper working for a wealthy Californian winemaker, which he praises as a more honest way of life ("suur un ehrlich verdeent Geld"; 3:513). He is thus contrasted with the barkeeper's son, who also returns from California having worked as a gold digger, but is described as "nichtsutzig" (3:489) and a drunkard, and is derisively referred to by the townspeople as "der Amerikaner" (3:489). Because he has given in to the temptations

abroad and now carries out no useful profession, the barkeeper's son is marked as an emasculated foreigner in his hometown. Acknowledgment of one's loyalty to the *Heimat*, therefore, requires more than merely returning home.

When Fritz returns home, he reclaims the heritage that he almost lost, but he also brings along American-made machines, integrating the foreign into the local. Thus, the technology that restores the Baschs' business and revitalizes a local industry actually has roots abroad. Segeberg points out that even the revolutionary dyke innovations that Storm describes in *Der Schimmelreiter* and attributes to the figure of Hauke Haien were based on actual improvements made possible by Dutch engineers, financed by French capitalists, and enforced by the Danish government,⁶¹ but by merging the foreign and the local in such fashion, Storm creates a unique and powerful Frisian character. In the figure of Fritz Basch, this merging is also partially reflected in his language after he returns home. His occasional excursions into Low German are now joined by elements of English speech, such as "little Mistress" (3:507) and "little fair" (3:508). As in *Der Schimmelreiter*, the introduction of technology that is actually of foreign origin allows the protagonist to practice his profession more successfully, as evidenced by the newspaper advertisement announcing the restoration of the cooperage (3:511). In the case of Fritz Basch, the revitalized business also brings out his masculinity even further, since after his return home he is now "etwas größer als der Vater, mit einem braunen Bärtchen auf den trotzigen Lippen und ein Paar Augen, als wollten sie den Vogel aus er Luft herunterholen" (3:506-07).

Ultimately, the conclusion of the story is almost a fairy tale ending: Fritz is a strapping young man in his prime who reclaims his position in the hometown community by restoring his father's business and affirms his masculine role by marrying Magdalene. Both Lowsky and

Gerrekens acknowledge the implausibility of this ending. Whereas Lowsky claims that Storm simply ignored the economic realities of the nineteenth century because they clashed with his romantic notions of Northern German small town life,⁶² Gerrekens suggests that Storm as a realist author was quite aware of social conditions and that the unlikely happy ending is actually a function of the unreliable narrator who presents a biased view of his community.⁶³ Another possible explanation of this suspiciously conciliatory conclusion would be that Storm as a regional author was looking to preserve the character of his *Heimat*. As he does in *Eine Halligfahrt*, Storm acknowledges that regional identity can only assert itself through interaction with the world outside of the locality. By following the traditions of the trade, the Basch family business would have gone under in competition with the brewery that moved into town. The heir to the local business needs to overcome his aversion to the world outside of the provincial “enge Wände”⁶⁴ and is only able to prosper economically by bringing elements of that world into the *Heimat*. The eventual rediscovery of the bullfinch after Fritz’s return indicates that he has followed its advice of practicing “Treu und Redlichkeit” by staying true to the profession that defines his family’s heritage, performing “honest work” to earn his living in a place of temptation, and finally returning to his hometown as a stronger man to strengthen the town community.

Storm’s loyalty to his region in his writing therefore should not be regarded as “Provinzsimpelei,” i.e., a naïve attachment to his *Heimat*, but instead as an attempt to underscore the unique qualities of the region that he considered home and to protect its character from being erased at a time in history when political and economic influences exerted the pressure of standardization on small regional communities. Nevertheless, as I have shown in the analyses of *Eine Halligfahrt* and *Bötjer Basch*, Storm does not support utter seclusion and isolation from a

globalizing world as a way of preserving the local *Heimat*. In fact, the male characters who refuse to recognize that the locality is part of a larger system potentially fail to perform their masculine role, defined here by the practice of their profession and by marriage. The works examined in the previous chapter, on the other hand, offer examples of characters who lose their affiliation with their hometowns altogether. Heinz Kirch roams the seas for so long that he loses not only his family name but also himself in the endless ocean. The final sentence of *Draußen im Heidedorf* presents the metropolis as a threatening place in which individuals abandon their ties to their region of origin and become unmoored in the “Menschenflut” (2:101). By contrast, the utopian vision of Fritz Basch’s revitalization of his small family business suggests that Storm regarded the interaction with a superregional structure as a necessary step toward asserting the character of one’s local *Heimat* within a larger framework of identification. What Storm does not seem to anticipate is that even the metropolis can take on the role of a kind of local setting. In the prose fiction of Theodor Fontane, Berlin occupies a central role, and as much as Fontane accused Storm of provincialism, he is himself focused on one particular region and the particular characters who inhabit it and are shaped by its culture.

Konrad Ehlich characterizes Fontane as a decidedly Prussian author because he claims that this is how Fontane also understood himself, and he observes in the author’s prose a “geradezu programmatische Regionalität.”⁶⁵ This emphasis on a specific region is not merely limited to the explorations of local history, architecture, landscape, and population in *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*, but also extends to Fontane’s socially critical novels. Koch, however, cautions against being too hasty to assign to Fontane’s works the attribute of regional literature solely based on the locality they portray. The decisive factor that designates Fontane as an author with a local allegiance is that locality in his works “essentially

fulfills the role of a character” and “enables the connection between literary-aesthetic and sociohistorical facets.”⁶⁶ Like Storm, he is more interested in depicting a region’s relationship with the superregional structure than in presenting the superregional structure as a cohesive whole.⁶⁷ Thus, one can observe in Fontane’s Berlin novels a tendency to negotiate between various spaces in Prussia. The contrast between the city and the provinces is ever present. Whether the city dwellers organize day trips to the outskirts of Berlin, undertake longer stays at health resorts in the Harz Mountains, or accept positions in East Prussia, Fontane’s image of Prussia always remains one of a state fractured into smaller regions.

The contrast between city and province is particularly stark in the novel *Cécile*. Published in 1884/85, it is Fontane’s second work after *L’Adultera* depicting the marriage of an older man to a younger woman that ends in the wife’s unfaithfulness.⁶⁸ It is also distinguished by being the first novel thematizing Prussian military officers that Fontane actually set in the period in which it was written.⁶⁹ The plot focuses on Robert von Gordon-Leslie, a former Prussian officer of Scottish descent who left military service at some point after the Franco-Prussian War because he had accumulated debts. He turned instead to a career as a civil engineer responsible for laying telegraph lines across the globe. During a stay at Hotel Zehnpfund in Thale, Gordon meets a couple from Berlin, the retired colonel Pierre St. Arnaud and his wife, Cécile, whose weak appearance wields a certain charm over him. Intrigued by the odd match, Gordon writes to his sister and asks if she can enlighten him about their history. Gordon does not yet know that St. Arnaud was forced to retire because he was imprisoned after dueling and killing a higher-ranking officer who refused to allow him to marry Cécile, a woman who had earned a scandalous reputation by being the mistress of two princes, having been “passed down” from uncle to nephew.

The trio enjoys its stay in the Harz resort as Gordon impresses Cécile with the manner of a man of the world and acts as a guide to a region that he knows well from his childhood. Just as Gordon feels that he is falling in love with Cécile, he is called away on business and departs without a long goodbye. Several weeks later, he returns to Berlin, begins to pay ever more frequent visits to the St. Arnolds, and becomes infatuated with Cécile. Gordon eventually receives a reply from his sister that explains the circumstances of the St. Arnolds' marriage and he begins to act overly familiar toward Cécile because he knows her background. After Cécile rejects his presumptuous advances, Gordon leaves town once again and tries to suppress his feelings. Upon his renewed return to Berlin, he visits the opera and notices that in a loge across from him Cécile is attending the opera with Geheimrat Hedemeyer. Overcome with jealousy, Gordon storms into the St. Arnold residence late that night and is reprimanded by Cécile. Seeing his honor offended by this behavior, St. Arnold challenges Gordon to a duel, kills him, and escapes to the French Riviera to avoid another prison sentence. He expects Cécile to follow him, but soon receives a letter informing him of her suicide.

The origin of Fontane's choice of setting for the novel can be traced to his enjoyment of Harz vacations in the 1860s, where he himself stayed at Hotel Zehnpfund like the tourists in *Cécile*.⁷⁰ Like other similar places in Germany of the late nineteenth century, the small town of Thale, at the northern edge of the Harz Mountains, had benefited from a rail connection that made it a popular—and affordable—vacation destination for Berlin's middle classes.⁷¹ The popularity of the health resort attracted many kinds of visitors from the Prussian capital, and even though he was himself there in the same capacity, Fontane was very critical of the emerging tourist culture. In his letters, he lashed out at ostentatious nature enthusiasts, snobbish hikers who brought their own maps and refused help from guides, pretentious and elegant Berlin

socialites whose attire was hopelessly impractical for the occasion, and heavysset visitors who boasted of their upcoming hiking exploits while comfortably lounging in the shade of the hotel patio.⁷²

Fontane's observations on tourist culture lay bare the influence that Berlin begins to exert upon the Harz at that time. The large influx of visitors changes the atmosphere of the small town and transplants the city to the province, and it does so to such an extent that Rohse identifies the novel as a "Berliner Gesellschaftsroman,"⁷³ despite the fact that about half of it is set outside of Berlin. His assessment is appropriate because it is not only the themes that are similar to those in many of Fontane's other Berlin novels, but the characters that populate Fontane's version of the Harz are also those that populate Berlin. The most obvious representation of this transplantation are the two ubiquitous Berliners, whose loud and jocular speech and stereotypical holiday-hiker appearance disrupt the mountain idyll and serve as a contrast between Harz provincialism and Berlin metropolitanism.⁷⁴ Furthermore, the increasing similarities between Berlin and Thale are repeatedly highlighted by the visitors. The loud Berliners compare a factory they can see from the hotel to the smokestacks of the factories in the city (4:137-38), and the artist Rosa Hexel complains about the excessive dust in the valley and finds that the Hexentanzplatz and the Roßtrappe resemble Tempelhof and Tivoli in Berlin in the abundance of beer consumed there (4:199). In addition, most characters encountered in the novel are outsiders, and the majority of those are Berliners with some kind of Prussian affiliation.⁷⁵ Both Gordon and St. Arnaud are former Prussian officers, yet both are also familiar with the region—St. Arnaud remembers it from his days as a cadet ("Fähnrich"; 4:133) and Gordon harbors fond childhood memories of the area (4:141).

Even though Gordon was not born in the Harz region, Fontane paints it as his spiritual *Heimat* and presents him as slightly envious of Cécile's friend, the court chaplain, because of his birthplace in Halberstadt (4:230). The periods of his childhood that he spent in the mountains, but also the recent inflow of Berliners into the area, make him feel as if he has returned home. Although he is of Scottish heritage, as betrayed by his last name, he tries to distance himself from it by referring to it as "meine[] Heimat, will sagen, d[ie] schottische[] Heimat meiner Familie" (4:179), thus attempting to distinguish the place of his birth from the place where he feels he belongs. On the other hand, the landscape of the Scottish Highlands also overlaps with that of the Harz, and when St. Arnaud observes that the plaid blanket which Gordon drapes over Cécile on one of their hikes makes her appear like Lady Macbeth (4:214), he invokes not only the rocky setting of the play, but also Gordon's Scottish origins. Yet, they do not mark Gordon as alien to this environment, but instead make him appear more like a native. A similar effect is achieved in Gordon's letter to his sister with the comment that his stay in Thale offers him the same kind of recuperation from any "Verstimmung" he may have felt before (4:168) as does visiting her. Therefore, regardless of any of his other ties, Gordon feels a bond with the Harz Mountains that displaces even his family relations.

An encounter with a group of gymnasts ("Turner"), who salute Cécile and present their weapons, reminds Gordon of the qualities he missed during his long years of absence on business in foreign countries: he associates this site from his childhood with a purer form of existence, where everything seems to him "natürlicher und weniger zurechtgemacht; weniger mise en scène" (4:196). The closeness to nature that he experiences in the Harz makes it seem more genuine than other places he has visited and fills him with pride. He acknowledges that other regions of the world can offer more impressive and more overwhelming natural sights, regions

such as the Himalayas, which certainly overshadow the humble plateaus of Central Germany, but he compares the gentle features of the *Heimat* landscape to the comfort one feels upon returning home, “wenn man seiner Mutter Hand nimmt und sie küßt” (4:194). In his relationship to the natural world and its significance for his childhood, Gordon resembles Fritz Basch, whose identification with his native region is also established in his childhood by means of a link to the local landscape and wildlife.⁷⁶ This link is brought out further when St. Arnaud, after noticing several odd occurrences, such as the wind blowing rose petals onto Cécile’s feet and butterflies gathering and dancing all around her, remarks that everything bows down before her, including a dog that had followed Cécile from the hotel and Robert von Gordon-Leslie (4:188). By listing Gordon among these animals and natural phenomena, St. Arnaud assigns him to the Harz and thus underlines his intimate relationship to the region.

Gordon’s intimacy and comfort with this environment allow him to assume a dominant masculine role among the group of new acquaintances.⁷⁷ While in Thale, Gordon persistently makes Cécile the object of his gaze. During their first shared social event at the hotel, Gordon enjoys a partially hidden view from behind a vase at the *table d’hôte* and voyeuristically studies the details of Cécile’s features (4:140). While they are hiking, he constantly subjects her to the intense looks from his “scharf beobachtenden” (4:159) eyes. Cécile, however, basks in the attention and acquiesces to the leading role that Gordon seeks to establish in the group, assigning to him the part of “Führer und Pfadfinder” (4:143). The reference to Cooper’s series of *Leatherstocking Tales* once again links Gordon to a more natural state of existence—and to virile masculinity—by comparing him to Natty Bumppo, the protagonist of the series, who is also known as “the Pathfinder” and was raised by Native Americans.

Gordon repeatedly displays his abilities as a guide and thus asserts his dominant role in the group, even taking charge of the other men and undermining their authority. When the comically named independent scholar (“Privatgelehrter”) Eginhard aus dem Grunde joins the party and offers to lead them to an inn that serves excellent loach, a specialty of the Harz, Gordon trumps his decision about which path to take and, in addition, he manages to sway St. Arnaud to defer to his judgment as well (4:182). At a later point on the same hike, Gordon interrupts the scholar’s digression on the local vegetation in order to seize once again Cécile’s attention for himself (4:186). Finally, when everyone else complies with the artist Rosa’s wish to play a rhyming game with the word *Schmerle* (“loach”), Gordon deliberately removes himself from it with a half-hearted rhyme in order to provoke a “scherzhafte Fehde” (4:210) and to prove that he does not have to submit to Rosa’s will like all the other men in the group. Gordon’s confidence springs from his familiarity with the region and his recognition of it as his domain. He does not have to fear that his efforts to impress and to woo Cécile will be interrupted by St. Arnaud, whose faulty knowledge of the landscape puts him at a disadvantage.⁷⁸ Thus, Gordon succeeds in gaining Cécile’s trust and friendship, which culminates in a symbolic gesture on their final evening together, when she allows him to hold her hand and kiss it while St. Arnaud is preoccupied with a closer study of a monument by the wayside (4:214).

Outside of the environment that he perceives as his *Heimat*, however, Gordon is unable to assume the dominant masculine role to which he is accustomed. Unlike the Harz, Berlin is not a place of comfort for him but one that instead immediately identifies him as a stranger. Upon his return to the city, Gordon himself acknowledges that his prolonged absence is reason enough for him to be regarded “als ein[] Fremde[r]” (4:225). Cécile also points out that he has become “ein Fremder in seiner eigenen Heimat” (4:234), while St. Arnaud searches for Gordon’s place of

residence by consulting the newspaper section entitled “Angekommene Fremde” (4:278). His status as a stranger is also cause for a certain distrust among the established residents of the city. For example, when the topic of conversation at the St. Arnauds’ dinner party shifts to politics, St. Arnaud prefaces his speech with, “ich *hoffe* sagen zu können, wir sind unter uns” (4:243; original emphasis). He thus suggests that Gordon’s allegiance to this community is unclear. Even though they are acquainted since their mutual stay at the resort, the change of setting has also shifted the manner in which St. Arnaud perceives Gordon.

In a statement signaling a similar sentiment, General von Rossow, a particularly outspoken dinner guest, laments the declining power of Prussia, as reflected in the decline of its aristocracy in positions of power, and claims that the country needs “alte Familien und alte Namen aus den Stammprovinzen” more than anything else (4:244). The General’s insistence upon the “old family names” puts Gordon noticeably ill at ease because it excludes him from the sphere of Prussia and effectively expels him from the *Heimat*. In contrast to the role he occupies during his stay in the Harz, Gordon is relegated to the periphery of Berlin society because he has been “out of the loop” for seven years and is out of touch with a community where everyone seems to know his place. This peripheral placement is perfectly visualized by Gordon’s position at the dinner table, far away on the opposite side of Cécile, where he has no access to her.

In fact, the liberty with which Gordon was able to interact with Cécile in the Harz Mountains is reduced and even disappears in Berlin, and due to his inability to gaze at her and to command her attention, his strong masculine characteristics also disappear. When he comes to the city, Gordon immediately tries to contact Cécile, but discovers to his dismay that she has not yet returned. Thus, for over a week he is denied contact with her simply because of the physical distance between them. In addition, Gordon has lost his ability to be the observer who is

constantly in a position of control. One of his first acts after his initial arrival in Berlin is to lean out of the window of his apartment with the intention of watching the people on the street outside. Having opened the window, however, he must realize in disappointment: “alles ist so still und verkehrlos hier” (4:225). The object of his gaze is missing and with it the masculine power to which he formerly laid claim.

Instead, the roles have been reversed and Gordon is now being observed by others. As he approaches the St. Arnaud residence one evening, the doors open before him as if “er bemerkt worden wäre” (4:257). The narrator notes that it must have been somebody from the porter’s lodge, but the use of the passive voice indicates an unknown watcher and conveys a sense of uneasiness on Gordon’s part. At the dinner party, Cécile flips the aforementioned roles from the *table d’hôte* so that now she is the one who observes Gordon with a keen eye and later informs him: “mir ist nichts entgangen” (4:259). A similar role reversal occurs between Gordon and St. Arnaud, who takes on an increasingly dominant masculine persona. At dinner, the Colonel’s “Blick streifte Gordon” (4:243) at the moment he expresses his distrust of the Harz-Scotsman. Generally, Gordon feels relieved whenever St. Arnaud is absent during his visits because he need not face “seine[n] Blicke[n]” and “seine[n] spöttischen Bemerkungen” (4:238). Gordon is thus in an unaccustomed position: after having had an advantage over both Cécile and her husband when he was on his “native soil,” he believes that he can continue this same relationship with them in an alien environment that he does not recognize as such. It is clear, however, to everyone but Gordon that Berlin does not constitute *Heimat* for him in the same manner as does the Harz.

When Cécile asks him to summon the will and the power to return to an earlier, more innocent stage of their relationship, he admits to himself that he does not have the power and

questions whether he even has the will (4:264). Amidst this doubt, however, it never occurs to Gordon that he is no longer in control of his feelings and that he has lost his claim to the masculine position he once held. In fact his insistence on clinging to a position of dominance in an environment that denies him that privilege ultimately leads to his downfall. Following a renewed absence and return to Berlin, he must once again face what has developed into an obsessive fixation on Cécile. At the opera, he attempts once more to cast himself as the observer, but there is nothing casual left in his gaze, which has now transformed into an outright stare (4:268). In Berlin, Gordon has been stripped of his power and control, and he is instead plagued by a “prickelnde[s] Verlangen” and suffers “Höllqualen” at the sight of Cécile’s enjoyment of another man’s company (4:268). He is finally reduced to an almost neurasthenic state when, consumed by thoughts of Cécile together with the *Geheimrat*, he experiences a spell of dizziness (4:270). The circumstance that leads to Gordon’s death, as St. Arnaud explains in the letter challenging him to a duel, is Hedemeyer’s witnessing of his late-night intrusion into the St. Arnauds’ reception room (4:276).⁷⁹ The Colonel thus confirms Gordon’s status as an outsider who forces his way into an established community and, additionally, underlines that community’s power of surveillance over his actions. In fact, in the same letter St. Arnaud explicitly explains to Gordon that his mistake was to imagine himself “in der falschen Rolle” (4:278), and thereby he denies him the masculine role he has tried to secure.

Gordon’s undoing, therefore, stems from his violation of social distinctions—according to St. Arnaud, he “mißachtete die gesellschaftlichen Scheidungen” (4:283) that prevail in Berlin—which he is unable to recognize because the time that he has spent traveling the world has alienated him from a society he thought he knew. What remains is a childhood connection to the Harz region, which he also regards as his *Heimat*, but he ultimately fails to recognize a

distinction between the social realities of Berlin and those of the Harz. The naturalness that Gordon values and praises in the mountains does not find expression in the city. During his first few days in Berlin, he tries to pass the time by attending the theater, but he finds that he cannot enjoy it because the “Unwahrheit” of the action on stage is too distracting (4:228). Later, during his confrontation with Cécile in her loge at the opera, Gordon claims that he is hoping to leave on a longer trip once again so that he may develop himself as a person and transform into a “Naturmensch[]..., an dem nichts Falsches ist, auch nicht einmal äußerlich” (4:270). As someone who identifies so closely with a natural state of being, Gordon cannot integrate into the artifice of Berlin’s social structure. Thus, the performance of a strong masculine role is only possible for him in the space he has identified as his *Heimat* since his childhood. His attempt to usurp the role outside of that environment proves fatal.

Fontane’s depiction of Gordon as a figure whose masculine identity is manifested only within a specific space indicates that, unlike Storm, he did not recognize the possibility of regional character asserting itself within a larger, superregional structure. After all, Prussia was by no means a uniform entity, taking into account that its territorial acquisitions since the eighteenth century added to its domain not only a variety of regions that did not traditionally consider themselves German, but also large areas with Catholic populations. This expansion of Prussia, according to Ehlich, culminated in its disappearance within the German Empire, which would explain the reluctance of William I to accept the imperial crown and the ambivalence of Bismarck toward the unified empire.⁸⁰ Ehlich also sees the disappearance of Prussia reflected in the dissolution of social institutions in Fontane’s works, particularly the institutions of marriage and honor.⁸¹

As the new center of Prussian-German politics and culture in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Berlin is for Fontane, as previously observed in *Schach von Wuthenow* and in *Stine*, emblematic of this dissolution. Nevertheless, although the city was becoming increasingly cosmopolitan at this time, texts such as *Cécile* suggest that it retained a character that identified it as its own locale. Just as Gordon stands out as a stranger outside of the Harz, so does St. Arnaud when he leaves Berlin; and just like Gordon he, too, becomes unable to behave in the assertive masculine fashion that he displays in his familiar environment. Furthermore, upon encountering in the glass pavilion of Berlin's Hotel du Parc the two men who were instantly recognizable as typical Berliners on vacation in the Harz, Gordon observes that their behavior in the luxury establishment and in polite company is noticeably more subdued than before. When he asks the hotel host whether he knows the gentlemen and why they act so differently, the host replies, "richtige Berliner gibt es eigentlich nur noch draußen und auf Reisen" (4:228). His remark points out that one can only recognize them as true Berliners when they are in a foreign environment and therefore appear more conspicuous. It also indicates that the city has its own character and culture that distinguish it from other regions.

Gordon, however, fails to make this distinction; he does not recognize that he is a stranger in Berlin, and his failure to do so leads to a crisis of masculinity and ultimately to his downfall. Ironically, the world traveler feels more at home in the Harz than he does in the metropolis. While my analysis of Storm's *Bötjer Basch* has shown that Fritz is able to assert his North German masculine identity even abroad by practicing the profession of his father and to return successfully to the place with which he formed a bond as a child, Gordon's performance of a strong masculine role is dependent precisely on his presence in an environment associated with his roots. The Harz forms for Gordon a link to his childhood, he associates it with the kinds

of positive feelings that he usually experiences only when he visits his family, and the Central German landscape with its cliffs and slopes forms within the framework of the text a direct parallel to the hills of the Scottish Highlands, the ancestral home of Gordon's clan. The text thus implies that the *Heimat* feeling is not easily transferable, but instead stems from a deeper underlying relationship to a specific space, thereby complicating the notion that an individual's alliance to a region opens the door for a wider national allegiance and that gender identity is a characteristic determined on a superregional scale.

The sampling of these three texts by Storm and Fontane reveals male protagonists who depend on their association with a specific region in order to affirm their masculine roles. The difference between the two writers' understanding of this regionally determined masculine identity lies in the relationship their characters establish with the society outside of these smaller communities. Storm recognizes that the locality is part of a larger network of identification and that it requires, somewhat paradoxically, an exchange with this network in order to maintain its unique status within it. Fontane, on the other hand, depicts male characters who, like St. Arnaud, either abandon their claim to strong masculinity outside of their *Heimat* or are otherwise doomed when they try to assume the "wrong role," like Gordon. Both authors, however, suggest that there exists more than one type of German masculinity; North German men are distinct from Central German men, who are in turn different from Berliners. The works examined in this chapter thus demonstrate that the notion of a uniform German masculine ideal was challenged by a view that recognized multiple masculine types in Imperial Germany.

Notes:

1. Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 6.
2. Ibid, 9.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid, 10.
5. Ibid, 11.
6. Ibid, 80.
7. Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 4.
8. Ibid, 8.
9. Ibid, 9.
10. Applegate, 80.
11. Confino, 118.
12. Ibid, 13.
13. Ibid, 108.
14. Ibid, 10.
15. Ibid, 29.
16. Ibid, 31.
17. Ibid, 36.
18. Ibid, 28.
19. Ibid, 35.
20. Ibid, 64.
21. Arne Koch, *Between National Fantasies and Regional Realities: The Paradox of Identity in Nineteenth-Century German Literature* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 7.
22. “This multiplicity is an important principle, as it challenges Confino’s plea for a historical genesis of national identity within regional plurality that implicitly suggests the eradication of regional differences, as it ‘[...] transform[s] localness into a concept of nationhood.’” Ibid, 12.
23. Ibid, 23.
24. Ibid, 100.
25. Ibid, 26.
26. He refers to this feature of regional literature as “spatio-temporal interplay.” Ibid, 23.
27. Ibid, 133.
28. Ibid, 232.
29. See Ch. 2, n. 61-62.
30. D.A. Jackson, “Theodor Storm—The Provincial,” *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 55 (1985): 40.
31. Ibid, 46.
32. Ibid, 38.
33. Karl Ernst Laage, *Theodor Storms Halligwelt und seine Novelle “Eine Halligfahrt”* (Heide: Boyens, 2004), 29.
34. Peter Goldammer, “Halligfahrt und Mondenschein: Storms und Raabes Reaktionen auf die Gründung des deutschen Reiches,” in *Kunstautonomie und literarischer Markt: Konstellationen des Poetischen Realismus*, ed. Heinrich Detering (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2003), 142.
35. Ibid.
36. Jean Lefebvre, “Schuld und Scheitern in Theodor Storms Novelle ‘Eine Halligfahrt,’” *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 53 (2004): 63.
37. David A. Jackson, *Theodor Storm: Dichter und demokratischer Humanist; eine Biografie* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2001), 236.
38. Incidentally, the so-called double-oak (“Doppeleiche”) is a symbol of Schleswig-Holstein that gained popularity around the mid-nineteenth century. The double-oak is composed of two separate oak trunks that share the same root and thus symbolizes the motto, “They shall remain together / Forever undivided” (“Se schölln tosamen blieben / Op ewig ungedeelt”), a reference to the Treaty of Ribe (1460) which was coopted by nationalists during the Schleswig Wars to express their resistance to the political separation of Schleswig and

- Holstein. Gesellschaft für schleswig-holsteinische Geschichte, "Doppeleiche," *Geschichte in Schleswig-Holstein*, accessed July 25, 2013, <http://www.geschichte-s-h.de/vonabisz/doppeleiche.htm>.
39. Karl Ernst Laage and Dieter Lohmeier, "Eine Halligfahrt," in *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden* (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987), 2:785.
 40. Kaudelka-Hanisich offers an analysis of the rate at which honorary titles such as *Kommerzienrat* (Commercial Councillor) and *Geheimrat* (Privy Councillor) were obtained in nineteenth-century Prussia, and finds that they assumed particular importance among the business bourgeoisie in Prussia because they did not exist on the level of the German Empire and because the Prussian government required recipients to meet much stricter standards than did other German states for similar titles. She sees in the great popularity of the title of Commercial Councillor a "peculiarity of the German bourgeoisie, namely its strongly marked statism." Karin Kaudelka-Hanisich, "The Titled Businessman: The Prussian Commercial Councillors in the Rhineland and Westphalia During the Nineteenth Century," in *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*, ed. David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans (London; New York: Routledge, 1991), 107.
 41. Lefebvre, 68.
 42. Ibid, 77.
 43. Ibid, 69.
 44. Koch argues that Auerbach used the same strategy in his writing about regional settings in which he actually addressed a superregional audience, believing that "he could influence the reality of his days" through the act of reading. Koch, 46-47.
 45. Karl Ernst Laage and Dieter Lohmeier, "Bötjer Basch," in *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden* (Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987), 3:983.
 46. Laage and Lohmeier, "Bötjer Basch," 3:995n510,16.
 47. Koch, 52.
 48. Koch actually uses Berthold Auerbach's preface to the *Schwarzwälder Dorfgeschichten* to demonstrate this function of the narrator. He observes two sites of authority in the text that are at odds with each other: the authority of the regional narrative and the authority of the superregional readership "in the privileged position of receiving the regional narrative and judging it for its standpoint and appearance." In Auerbach's text and, as I argue, in the texts by Storm investigated in this chapter, "the mediating role/position of the narrator who is present on both sides brings them together." Ibid, 32-33.
 49. Gerrekens claims that the narrator intentionally obfuscates the partial blame that he and the town's citizens must bear for Daniel's suicide attempt. Readers should be cautious to take the contradictions and implausible (or implausibly misremembered) details of the Landvogt's account at face value. Louis Gerrekens, "Das seltsame Ende von 'Bötjer Basch': Wahrer Optimismus oder beschränkte Erzählperspektive?," *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 59 (2010): 15-16.
 50. According to a royal decree of 1528 by Frederick I of Denmark, only those citizens who were also tradesmen ("die hier in ihren jungen Jahren schon gewohnt, die hier durch ein Handwerk oder auf andere Weise ihre Nahrung gesucht, die der Gemeinde Steuern, Pflichten und Beschwer mit haben tragen helfen") could seek residence in their local almshouse due to misfortune or poverty in old age. M. Voß, *Chronik des Gasthauses zum Ritter St. Jürgen* (Husum, 1902), 24, quoted in Laage and Lohmeier, "Bötjer Basch," 3:984n460,33.
 51. Koch, 40.
 52. Ibid, 41.
 53. Martin Lowsky, "Fritz Basch oder Die Sensibilität für die Sprache: Über Theodor Storms Novelle 'Bötjer Basch,'" *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 48 (1999): 60.
 54. Harro Segeberg, "Kritischer Regionalismus: Zum Verhältnis von Regionalität und Modernität bei Storm," in *Theodor Storm und das 19. Jahrhundert: Vorträge und Berichte des Internationalen Storm-Symposiums aus Anlaß des 100. Todestages Theodor Storms*, ed. Brian Coghlan and Karl Ernst Laage (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1989): 125.
 55. Karl Ernst Laage, "Sylt-Spiegelungen in Raabes 'Deutscher Mondschein' und Storms 'Sylter Novelle': Beobachtungen zur Regionalität in der Dichtung des poetischen Realismus," *Jahrbuch der Raabe-Gesellschaft* (2001): 48.
 56. Lowsky, 58.
 57. Ibid, 60.
 58. See the introduction to chapter two for an explanation of Erhart's notion of masculine narratives.
 59. Koch, 53.

60. Marcel Sommer, "Lokalität, Provinzialität und das unverzichtbare Außen in Theodor Storms erzählender Prosa," *Weltengarten* 2005: 115.
61. Segeberg, 128.
62. Lowsky, 63.
63. Gerrekens, 17-18.
64. The title that Storm used for the work's original run in *Deutsche Rundschau* was "Aus engen Wänden. Eine Geschichte." Laage and Lohmeier, "Bötjer Basch," 3:979.
65. Konrad Ehlich, "Preußische Alterität—Statt einer Einleitung," in *Fontane und die Fremde, Fontane und Europa*, ed. Konrad Ehlich (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2002), 10.
66. Koch, 107.
67. Ibid, 131.
68. Edgar Groß, "Aus der Berliner Gesellschaft," in *Theodor Fontane: Sämtliche Werke* (Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1959), 379.
69. Ibid.
70. Eberhard Rohse, "Harztouristen als literarische Figuren in Werken Theodor Fontanes und Wilhelm Raabes: *Cécile – Frau Salome – Unruhige Gäste*," in *Literarische Harzreisen: Bilder und Realität einer Region zwischen Romantik und Moderne*, ed. Cord-Friedrich Berghahn, Herbert Blume, Gabriele Henkel, and Eberhard Rohse (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2008), 176.
71. Michael Ewert, "Der Harz als Geschichts- und Erinnerungsraum: Historische Raumerfahrung in Theodor Fontanes *Cécile*," in *Literarische Harzreisen: Bilder und Realität einer Region zwischen Romantik und Moderne*, ed. Cord-Friedrich Berghahn, Herbert Blume, Gabriele Henkel, and Eberhard Rohse (Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2008), 234.
72. Rohse, 178-79.
73. Ibid, 195.
74. Ibid, 197.
75. Ibid, 207-08.
76. Cornelia Blasberg has noted that *Cécile*'s premonition of Gordon's death, in which he appears soaked in the red sunlight shining through the leaves of a copper beech, also connects him to the natural realm. Cornelia Blasberg, "Das Rätsel Gordon oder: Warum eine der 'schönen Leichen' in Fontanes Erzählung 'Cécile' männlich ist," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 120 [supplement] (2001): 124.
77. My reading of Gordon's affinity to the Harz as an indication of a strong masculine role goes somewhat against the grain of the scholarship on *Cécile*. For example, Blasberg (see n. 74) regards Gordon's proximity to nature as a traditional sign that he is femininely coded. Petra Kuhnau recognizes Gordon as a sanguine man, according to the theory of humors, and characterizes him as obsessive and a hypochondriac, the male equivalent of a hysteric. The second half of the novel certainly supports these readings, but as I explain in my further analysis, Gordon *initially* appears to embody a strong masculine role and his behavior changes only after a change of the setting. Petra Kuhnau, "Symbolik der Hysterie: Zur Darstellung nervöser Männer und Frauen bei Fontane," in "*Weiber weiblich, Männer männlich*?" *Zum Geschlechterdiskurs in Theodor Fontanes Romanen*, ed. Sabina Becker and Sascha Kiefer (Tübingen: Francke, 2005), 27.
78. Although St. Arnaud claims to know the Harz from his cadet days, he mistakenly points out the *Roßtrappe* as the *Hexentanzplatz* to *Cécile*, who promptly corrects him (4:133-34). Despite being described as having a "Kartenpassion" (4:175) and often being absorbed in the studies of his maps, St. Arnaud never acts as the guide of the group, which suggests that he does not feel quite comfortable in the role.
79. Antje Harnisch suggests that Gordon's discovery of *Cécile*'s former life as a mistress places her in his mind into a similar category to that of a prostitute. Having penetrated her past in such a manner, Gordon now wishes also "in ihren Körper einzudringen," and his encroachment upon her private space is a metaphoric representation of that desire. Antje Harnisch, *Keller, Raabe, Fontane: Geschlecht, Sexualität und Familie im bürgerlichen Realismus* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1994), 134.
80. Ehlich, 11.
81. Ibid, 18.

Conclusion

The analyses in this study offer a multifaceted picture of German nationalism in the late nineteenth century and its connection to perceptions of masculinity. On the one hand, the period witnessed the publication of literary depictions of Germany that idealized the relationship between regional affiliation and national belonging, while linking notions of Germanness to the preservation of specific gender traits that tend to follow the models of a virile, cultured, yet quasi-militaristic masculinity and a domestic and natural femininity. The works by François, Heyse, and Werner that were chosen as representatives of this type of writing often do present specific regions of Germany rather than Germany as a politically unified state—this is especially true in the texts set in historical periods preceding German unification. These regions, however, usually appear as a metaphor for the whole, in accordance with Confino's model, which sees a collapse of the locality, region, and nation into one entity. Thus, François's Saxony of the Napoleonic Wars holds the seeds of future unification, while Heyse's Kolberg symbolizes the Germans' resilience against the forces that seek to drive them apart, and Werner's Bonn heeds Walther Fernow's poetic call to arms to all Germans against a common enemy. The texts in this group, furthermore, all imply that the creation and upholding of a German state is achieved only once the male protagonists subscribe to the model of masculine behavior described above and overcome the threats to it.

On the other hand, my analyses of these texts also show that the ideas of German masculinity that were popularized in the early nineteenth century by writers such as Friedrich Ehrenberg and Johann Christian Siede eventually found expression in nationalistic literature of the latter half of the century. François's Herrmann von Fels, Werner's Walther Fernow, and Heyse's young sculptor, Eduard, are all examples of male protagonists who, as both scholars and

artists, combine physical strength with the ideal of *Bildung* and are enabled by this twofold strength to defend their *Heimat*. As citizen-soldiers, however, they are figured as bourgeois and thus represent virtues that are distinct from those of the traditionally aristocratic professional army. This is an important distinction to make because the militaristic type of masculinity presented in these works should be understood as separate from the kind of Prussian militarism that is concerned mainly with discipline and obedience. Scholarship on German nationalism and masculinity often points to the Prussian-dominated German Empire and the stereotypical “warrior ideal”¹ that had “formed the background for the nationalist movements of the nineteenth century”² and treats German masculinity as a uniform construct. Such understanding of gender in Imperial Germany is narrow and incomplete. As I have demonstrated in my analyses of the works of Fontane, Raabe, and Storm, the literature of the 1870s and 1880s did not accept the prevailing ideal wholesale and in fact challenged its sustainability.

My examination reveals that for these writers both Germanness and a corresponding notion of masculinity could not be encompassed by one model. Rather, their works suggest that there is no one set pattern of masculine behavior that can be considered German. For example, the men depicted in Fontane’s novels indicate a society that pressures them to perform the type of masculinity championed by the protagonists observed in François’s, Heyse’s, and Werner’s works and that punishes them for their unwillingness to conform to expectations, as in the case of Martin Bocholt. Attempts at following the prescribed model, however, also fail either because the depicted characters are incapable of living up to expectations set by their forebears (e.g., Schach von Wuthenow) or because meeting these expectations betrays their own aspirations and interests (e.g., Hugo Großmann). Fontane thus paints a picture of German masculinity

experiencing a crisis because both adherence to and subversion of the dominant model are untenable.

Raabe presents in Noah Buchius a male character who defies most of the characteristics established in chapter one as prerequisites for the acceptable German man. Although he is a reserved man, a scholar, and a somewhat ridiculous figure, Buchius can nevertheless become an unconventional hero and in the end outlive the young, virile, and militaristic Münchhausen. Finally, like Fontane and Raabe, Storm also appears critical in his work of notions of (bourgeois) masculine behavior that leave no room for alternative models and that interpret nonconformity to expectations as a failure to be masculine.³ Both *Draußen im Heidedorf* and *Hans und Heinz Kirch* depict male characters who in one way or another do not wish to follow the path prescribed by their fathers' profession. In each case, their refusal to enter the established genealogical narrative of masculinity leads to estrangement from their ancestral community and brands them as outcasts. Inclusion in this native community is thus presented as dependent upon an individual's adherence to a hegemonic model of masculinity.

In the end, Storm's and Fontane's works validate Koch's claim that a multiplicity of German identities existed even within Imperial Germany⁴ and they further suggest that these identities were shaped by a multiplicity of German *masculinities* that were tied to local and regional allegiances. As seen in *Eine Halligfahrt*, *Bötjer Basch*, and *Cécile*, the characteristics of strong or proper masculine behavior remain consistent with those observed in chapter two, namely in the significance assigned to marriage and family, the successful practice of one's intended profession, and displays of dominance over other men. In contrast to those texts, Storm's and Fontane's works emphasize regional character and assert its uniqueness within the nation by linking gender identity to regional belonging. Thus, the narrator of *Eine Halligfahrt*

asserts his position of authority by “narrating” his locality to a national audience, Fritz Basch confirms his masculine role by assuming his father’s profession and returning to his hometown, and Robert von Gordon-Leslie fails to maintain his claim to a strong masculine position precisely because he tries to assert it outside of a space to which he is “naturally” connected. It is therefore more accurate to speak of a multiplicity of German masculinities, defined by their ties to local language and landscape, than to refer to one monolithic model of manhood in the German Empire. The literary works I have investigated in this study recognize that these various regional affiliations and gender identities were interwoven in a complex network and thus paint a picture of national identity in Imperial Germany that not only challenges the “warrior ideal” of German masculinity, but also questions the meaning of *Heimat*.

Notes:

1. Gerald N. Izenberg, "Introduction: Modernism, Masculinity, Method," *Modernism and Masculinity: Mann, Wedekind, Kandinsky Through World War I* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 9.
2. George Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 7.
3. It should be noted that all the works examined in this study offer a perspective of masculinity that is primarily influenced by bourgeois values, even when the particular work depicts a village community, such as that in *Draußen im Heidedorf*. This bias is to be expected, since the authors of these works were themselves bourgeois and furthermore enjoyed an exceptional status as artists. While their primary audience was also bourgeois, it did not exclude, however, members of other social classes. Working-class characters and living conditions, for example, are certainly underrepresented in the fiction of these authors, but as Kirsten Belgum points out, a family magazine such as the *Gartenlaube* with its liberal views and middle-class core readership also appealed to the lower classes. Kirsten Belgum, *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 19-20.
4. For Koch's explanation of this multiplicity, see n. 22 in chapter three.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Fontane, Theodor. *Sämtliche Werke*. Edited by Edgar Groß. 24 vols. Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1959.
- François, Louise von. *Frau Erdmuthens Zwillingsöhne*. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, [1912?]
- - -. "Fräulein Mutchen und ihr Hausmeier." In *Ausgewählte Novellen von Louise von François*. Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1918.
- Heyse, Paul. *Colberg*. Vol. 10 of *Gesammelte Werke von Paul Heyse*. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1891.
- - -. "Er soll dein Herr sein." In *Gesammelte Werke: Gesamtausgabe*. Reprinted from Stuttgart and Berlin editions, 1850-1914, edited by Markus Bernauer and Norbert Miller, 4:381-410. Hildesheim: Olms, 1995. <http://www.olmonline.de/purl?PPN521013364>.
- - -. "Das Glück von Rothenburg." In *Deutsche Meisternovellen*, edited by Theodore Geissendoerfer and J. W. Kurtz, 1-46. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936.
- Raabe, Wilhelm. *Sämtliche Werke: Im Auftrag der Braunschweigischen Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft*. Edited by Karl Hoppe. 20 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965.
- Storm, Theodor. *Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden*. Edited by Karl Ernst Laage and Dieter Lohmeier. 4 vols. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987.
- Werner, E. *Am Altar; Hermann*. Vol. 2 of *E. Werners gesammelte Romane und Novellen*. Illust. ed. Leipzig: Ernst Keil's Nachfolger, n.d., ca. 1893.
- - -. *Ein Held der Feder; Heimatklang*. Vol. 6 of *E. Werners gesammelte Romane und Novellen*. Illust. ed. Leipzig: Ernst Keil's Nachfolger, n.d., ca. 1895.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. and ext. ed. London; New York: Verso, 1991.
- Applegate, Celia. *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Askey, Jennifer. "The National Family: Allegory and Femininity in a *Festspiel* from 1880." *Women in German Yearbook* 24 (2008): 49-70.

- Baltensweiler, Thomas. "Die Aporie in der bürgerlichen Familie: Zur Funktion des Erwerbssinns in 'Hans und Heinz Kirch' und 'Der Schimmelreiter.'" *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 51 (2002): 87-100.
- Becker, Frank. *Bilder von Krieg und Nation: Die Einigungskriege in der bürgerlichen Öffentlichkeit Deutschlands, 1864-1913*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2001.
- Belgum, Kirsten. *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Berghahn, Volker R. *Imperial Germany, 1871-1918: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics*. New York: Berghahn, 2005.
- Blackbourn, David. *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780-1918*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Bland, Caroline. "The Triumph of Moderation? The 'Wars of Liberation' in the Writing of Louise von François." In *Women Against Napoleon: Historical and Fictional Responses to his Rise and Legacy*, edited by Waltraud Maierhofer, Gertrud M. Roesch, and Caroline Bland, 223-45. Frankfurt; New York: Campus Verlag, 2007.
- Blasberg, Cornelia. "Das Rätsel Gordon oder: Warum eine der 'schönen Leichen' in Fontanes Erzählung 'Cécile' männlich ist." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 120 [supplement] (2001): 111-27.
- Bonter, Urszula. *Der Populärroman in der Nachfolge von E. Marlitt: Wilhelmine Heimburg, Valeska Gräfin Bethusy-Huc, Eufemia von Adlersfeld-Ballestrem*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.
- - -. *Das Romanwerk von Paul Heyse*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2008.
- Brandstetter, Gabriele, and Gerhard Neumann. "'Le laid c'est le beau': Liebesdiskurs und Geschlechterrolle in Fontanes Roman *Schach von Wuthenow*." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 72.2 (June 1998): 243-67.
- Breuilly, John. "Nationalism and the First Unification." In *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, edited by Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly, 101-121. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Breuilly, John, and Ronald Speirs. "The Concept of National Unification." In *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, edited by Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly, 1-25. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Bronfen, Elisabeth. "Femininity – Missing in Action." In *Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity, and the Aesthetic*, 205-224. New York: Routledge: 1992.

- - -. "Frauen kommen aus dem Wasser, Frauen gehen ins Wasser zurück: Eine Einleitung." *Elisabeth Bronfen* (blog). June 10, 2005. <http://www.bronfen.info/index.php/archive/48-archive2005/>.
- Burns, Barbara. *The Prose Fiction of Louise von François (1817-1893)*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Confino, Alon. *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871-1918*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Di Maio, Irene S. "Nation and Gender in Wilhelm Raabe's Pre-Unification Historical Narratives." In *Wilhelm Raabe: Global Themes—International Perspectives*, edited by Dirk Götsche and Florian Krobb, 114-25. London: Legenda, 2009.
- Downing, Eric. "No Direction Home: Wilhelm Raabe's *Das Odfeld* and the Archaeology of Identity," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 82.1 (March 2008): 58-84.
- Ehlich, Konrad. "Preußische Alterität—Statt einer Einleitung." In *Fontane und die Fremde, Fontane und Europa*, edited by Konrad Ehlich, 8-22. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2002.
- Erhart, Walter. *Familienmänner: Über den literarischen Ursprung moderner Männlichkeit*. Munich: W. Fink, 2001.
- Ewert, Michael. "Der Harz als Geschichts- und Erinnerungsraum: Historische Raumerfahrung in Theodor Fontanes *Cécile*." In *Literarische Harzreisen: Bilder und Realität einer Region zwischen Romantik und Moderne*, edited by Cord-Friedrich Berghahn, Herbert Blume, Gabriele Henkel, and Eberhard Rohse, 233-56. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2008.
- Fasold, Regina. *Theodor Storm*. Stuttgart; Weimar: Metzler, 1997.
- Fitzpatrick, Matthew. "Narrating Empire: *Die Gartenlaube* and Germany's Nineteenth-Century Liberal Expansionism." *German Studies Review* 30.1 (Feb. 2007): 97-120.
- Fox, Thomas. "Louise von François Rediscovered." In *Autoren damals und heute: Literaturgeschichtliche Beispiele veränderter Wirkungshorizonte*, edited by Gerhard P. Knapp, 303-19. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1991.
- - -. "A Woman's Post: Gender and Nation in Historical Fiction by Louise von François." In *A Companion to German Realism, 1848-1900*, edited by Todd Kontje, 109-31. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002.

- Frevert, Ute. *“Mann und Weib, und Weib und Mann”*: *Geschlechter-Differenzen in der Moderne*. Munich: Beck, 1995.
- Freytag, Gustav. “Ein Roman von Louise François.” Review of *Die letzte Reckenburgerin*, by Louise von François. *Im neuen Reich* 8.2 (1872): 295-300.
- Gay, Peter. “Experiment in Denial: A Reading of the *Gartenlaube* in the Year 1890.” In *Traditions of Experiment from the Enlightenment to the Present*, edited by Nancy Kaiser and David E. Wellberry, 147-64. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Gerrekens, Louis. “Das seltsame Ende von ‘Bötjer Basch’: Wahrer Optimismus oder beschränkte Erzählperspektive?” *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 59 (2010): 5-20.
- Gesellschaft für schleswig-holsteinische Geschichte. “Doppeleiche.” *Geschichte in Schleswig-Holstein*. Accessed July 25, 2013. <http://www.geschichte-sh.de/vonabisz/doppeleiche.htm>.
- Goldammer, Peter. “Culpa patris? Theodor Storms Verhältnis zu seinem Sohn Hans und seine Spiegelung in den Novellen ‘Carsten Curator’ und ‘Hans und Heinz Kirch.’” In *Stormlektüren: Festschrift für Karl Ernst Laage zum 80. Geburtstag*, edited by Gerd Eversberg, David Jackson, and Eckart Pastor, 143-50. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2000.
- - -. “Halligfahrt und Mondenschein: Storms und Raabes Reaktionen auf die Gründung des deutschen Reiches.” In *Kunstaatonomie und literarischer Markt: Konstellationen des Poetischen Realismus*, edited by Heinrich Detering, 137-44. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2003.
- - -. “Hans und Heinz Kirch.” In *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden*, 3:738-47. Berlin; Weimar: Aufbau, 1967.
- Graf, Andreas. “‘Ich bin dagegen, daß wir Frauen uns demonstrativ von den Männern trennen’: Der Briefwechsel zwischen E. Werner (d.i. Elisabeth Bürstenbinder) und Joseph Kürschner 1881-1889.” In *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 47 (1997): 227-47.
- Gratzke, Michael. “‘Das Opfer war Gebot, war Leidenschaft’: Männlichkeit und Heldentum in Fontanes *Wanderungen durch die Mark Brandenburg*.” In *Masculinities in German Culture*, edited by Sarah Colvin and Peter Davies, 65-80. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2008.
- Grätz, Katharina. “Erbe und Sammler in Wilhelm Raabes ‘Wunnigel’: Der Zerfall einer literarhistorischen Allianz.” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 116.4 (1997): 525-44.
- Griffiths, Elystan. “A Nation of Provincials? German Identity in Gustav Freytag’s Novel Cycle *Die Ahnen*.” *Monatshefte für deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur* 96.2 (2004): 220-33.

- - -. "Provincialism, Private Life, and the Marginal Hero: Germany after Unification in the Works of Gustav Freytag, Friedrich Spielhagen, and Paul Heyse." In *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, edited by Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly, 209-23. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Groß, Edgar. "Aus der Berliner Gesellschaft." In *Theodor Fontane: Sämtliche Werke*, 4:377-83. Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1959.
- Guessard, MM.F, and E. de Certain, eds. *Le Mistère du Siège d'Orleans*. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1862.
- Hagemann, Karen. "Nation, Militär und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens: Eine Einführung." Chap. 1 in "*Männlicher Muth und Teutsche Ehre*": *Nation, Militär und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002.
- - -. "Publizistische Diskurse: Entwürfe von Nation, Krieg und Geschlecht." Chap. 5 in "*Männlicher Muth und Teutsche Ehre*": *Nation, Militär und Geschlecht zur Zeit der Antinapoleonischen Kriege Preußens*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002.
- Harnisch, Antje. *Keller, Raabe, Fontane: Geschlecht, Sexualität und Familie im bürgerlichen Realismus*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Hartmann, Regina. "Von 'Bruderkrieg,' 'Erbfeind' und der Reichsgründung in der Lyrik der *Gartenlaube* zwischen 1867 und 1871." In *Literatur und Nation: die Gründung des Deutschen Reiches 1871 in der deutschsprachigen Literatur*, edited by Klaus Amann and Karl Wagner, 93-105. Vienna: Böhlau, 1996.
- Helduser, Urte. "*pater incertus*. Zum Motiv von 'Unfruchtbarkeit' in Theodor Fontanes *Irrungen Wirrungen*." In *Krankheit und Geschlecht: Diskursive Affären zwischen Literatur und Medizin*, edited by Tanja Nusser and Elisabeth Strowick, 161-77. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2002.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. "Introduction: Inventing Traditions." In *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1-14. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. "The New Man: Theories of Masculinity around 1800," *Goethe Yearbook* 15 (2008): 187-215.
- Izenberg, Gerald N. "Introduction: Modernism, Masculinity, Method." *Modernism and Masculinity: Mann, Wedekind, Kandinsky Through World War I*, 1-19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Jackson, David A. *Theodor Storm: Dichter und demokratischer Humanist; eine Biografie*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2001.

- - -. *Theodor Storm: The Life and Works of a Democratic Humanitarian*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- - -. "Theodor Storm—The Provincial." *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 55 (1985): 22-46.
- Jefferies, Matthew. *Imperial Culture in Germany, 1871-1918*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.
- Joachimsthaler, Jürgen. "‘Wucherblumen auf Ruinen’: Nationalliterarische (Des)Integration bei Paul Heyse." In *Nationale Identität aus germanistischer Perspektive*, edited by Maria Katarzyna Lasatowicz, 217-54. Opole: Wydawn. Uniw. Opolskiego, 1998.
- John, Michael. "Between Estate and Profession: Lawyers and the Development of the Legal Profession in Nineteenth-Century Germany." In *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*, edited by David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, 162-97. London; New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Johnson, David S. "The Ironies of Degeneration: The Dilemmas of Bourgeois Masculinity in Theodor Fontane's *Frau Jenny Treibel* and *Mathilde Möhring*." *Monatshefte* 102.2 (Summer 2010): 147-61.
- Kaudelka-Hanisch, Karin. "The Titled Businessman: The Prussian Commercial Councillors in the Rhineland and Westphalia During the Nineteenth Century." In *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*, edited by David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, 87-114. London; New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Kelly, Alfred. "The Franco-Prussian War and Unification in German History Schoolbooks." In *1870/71-1989/90: German Unifications and the Change of Literary Discourse*, edited by Walter Pape, 37-60. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1993.
- Koch, Arne. *Between National Fantasies and Regional Realities: The Paradox of Identity in Nineteenth-Century German Literature*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Kopp, Kristin. "A German Dracula: Fontane's *Effi Briest* and the Anxiety of a Reverse-Diffusional Slavic Flood." Chapter 3 in *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012.
- Krause, Edith H., and Steven V. Hicks. "Illusion and Dissolution: Fontane's *Stine*." *German Studies Review* 18.2 (May 1995): 223-40.
- Kuhnau, Petra. "Symbolik der Hysterie: Zur Darstellung nervöser Männer und Frauen bei Fontane." In "Weiber weiblich, Männer männlich"? *Zum Geschlechterdiskurs in Theodor Fontanes Romanen*, edited by Sabina Becker and Sascha Kiefer, 17-61. Tübingen: Francke, 2005.

- Laage, Karl Ernst. "Sylt-Spiegelungen in Raabes 'Deutscher Mondschein' und Storms 'Sylter Novelle': Beobachtungen zur Regionalität in der Dichtung des poetischen Realismus." *Jahrbuch der Raabe-Gesellschaft* (2001): 41-49.
- - -. *Theodor Storms Halligwelt und seine Novelle "Eine Halligfahrt."* Heide: Boyens, 2004.
- Laage, Karl Ernst, and Dieter Lohmeier. "Bötjer Basch," in *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden*, 3:976-98. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987.
- - -. "Eine Halligfahrt." In *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden*, 2:785-801. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987.
- Laane, Tiiu V. "Louise von François's Critical Perspectives on Society." *European Studies Journal* 8.2 (Fall 1991): 13-41.
- Lach, Roman. "'Ein starker Hall aus Auerhorn': germanische Simulationen im historischen Roman der Gründerzeit." In *Mythos Ursprung: Modelle der Arché zwischen Antike und Moderne*, edited by Constanze Baum, 151-75. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2011.
- Lefebvre, Jean. "Schuld und Scheitern in Theodor Storms Novelle 'Eine Halligfahrt.'" *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 53 (2004): 63-80.
- Link, Jere H. "Patriotism and Theater Politics in the Second Reich: Paul Heyse's 'Colberg.'" In *Essays in European History: Selected From the Annual Meetings of the Southern Historical Association, 1988-1989 – Vol. II*, edited by June K. Burton and Carolyn W. White, 45-57. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1996.
- Lohmeier, Dieter. "Draußen im Heidedorf: Wirkung und Würdigung." In *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden*, 2:808-11. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987.
- - -. "Der Herr Etatsrat: Wirkung und Würdigung." In *Theodor Storm: Sämtliche Werke in vier Bänden*, 3:775-82. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Deutscher Klassiker, 1987.
- Lowsky, Martin. "Fritz Basch oder Die Sensibilität für die Sprache: Über Theodor Storms Novelle 'Bötjer Basch.'" *Schriften der Theodor-Storm-Gesellschaft* 48 (1999): 57-64.
- Madison, Lucy Foster. *Joan of Arc: The Warrior Maid*. Reprint of the 1919 Penn Publishing Company edition, Project Gutenberg, 2010. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/34474/34474-h/34474-h.htm>.
- Maurer, Kathrin. "Literary Crossings: The Representation of Nation in Academic Historiography and Historical Prose in Nineteenth-Century Germany." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 29.4 (Dec 2007): 359-72.

- Mosse, George. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Mullan, Boyd. "From Bavaria to Berlin: Stations in Paul Heyse's Career as a Patriotic Dramatist." *Euphorion* 95.2 (2001): 129-65.
- Nipperdey, Thomas. "Der große Umbruch." In *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. 1, 11-101. Munich: C.H. Beck: 1998.
- Nürnberger, Helmuth. "Geschichte und Politik bei Theodor Fontane." In *Theodor Fontane: Dichter der Deutschen Einheit*, edited by Bernd Heidenreich and Frank-Lothar Kroll, 9-25. Berlin: BWV, 2003.
- Onken, Aiko. "Determination—Draußen im Heidedorf." In *Erinnerung, Erzählung, Identität: Theodor Storms mittlere Schaffensperiode (1867-1872)*, 259-328. Heidelberg: Winter, 2009.
- Oppermann, Hans. "Das Odfeld." In *Wilhelm Raabe: Sämtliche Werke*, 17:399-446. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Peterson, Brent O. *History, Fiction and Germany: Writing the Nineteenth-Century Nation*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2005.
- Rohse, Eberhard. "Harztouristen als literarische Figuren in Werken Theodor Fontanes und Wilhelm Raabes: *Cécile – Frau Salome – Unruhige Gäste*." In *Literarische Harzreisen: Bilder und Realität einer Region zwischen Romantik und Moderne*, edited by Cord-Friedrich Berghahn, Herbert Blume, Gabriele Henkel, and Eberhard Rohse, 175-231. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2008.
- Sammons, Jeffrey L. *Wilhelm Raabe: The Fiction of the Alternative Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Scheidemann, Uta. "Erzählen zwischen konservativen Überlieferungen und freien Standpunkten: Über Louise von François." *Die Horen* 37.3 (1992): 61-66.
- Scherer, Friedrich. "Fontane und das Wilhelminische Deutschland." In *Theodor Fontane: Dichter der Deutschen Einheit*, edited by Bernd Heidenreich and Frank-Lothar Kroll, 79-87. Berlin: BWV, 2003.
- Schmidt, Sabine. "'fast männlich': Zu Genderdiskurs und Rollentausch in Theodor Fontanes *Mathilde Möhring*." In "*Weiber weiblich, Männer männlich*"? *Zum Geschlechterdiskurs in Theodor Fontanes Romanen*, edited by Sabina Becker and Sascha Kiefer, 227-52. Tübingen: Francke, 2005.
- Schuch, Uta. "*Die im Schatten stand*": *Studien zum Werk einer vergessenen Schriftstellerin: Louise von François*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994.

- Seaton, Beverly. *The Language of Flowers: A History*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995.
- Segeberg, Harro. "Kritischer Regionalismus: Zum Verhältnis von Regionalität und Modernität bei Storm." In *Theodor Storm und das 19. Jahrhundert: Vorträge und Berichte des Internationalen Storm-Symposiums aus Anlaß des 100. Todestages Theodor Storms*, edited by Brian Coghlan and Karl Ernst Laage, 120-32. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1989.
- Sheehan, James J. "What is German History? Reflections on the Role of the *Nation* in German History and Historiography." *Journal of Modern History* 53 (1981): 2-23.
- Sommer, Marcel. "Lokalität, Provinzialität und das unverzichtbare Außen in Theodor Storms erzählender Prosa." *Weltengarten* 2005: 113-30.
- Speirs, Ronald. "German Literature and the Foundation of the Second Empire." In *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*, edited by Ronald Speirs and John Breuilly, 185-208. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Staël, Madame de. *Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution*, edited by Aurelian Crăiuțu. Newly rev. trans. of 1818 ed. Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 2008.
- Storch, Dietmar. "Theodor Fontane und die Reichsgründung." In *Theodor Fontane: Dichter der Deutschen Einheit*, edited by Bernd Heidenreich and Frank-Lothar Kroll, 55-68. Berlin: BWV, 2003.
- Surynt, Izabela. *Das "ferne", "unheimliche" Land: Gustav Freytags Polen*. Dresden: Thelem bei w.e.b., 2004.
- Tatlock, Lynne. "The Afterlife of Nineteenth-Century Popular Fiction and the German Imaginary: The Illustrated Collected Novels of E. Marlitt, W. Heimbürg, and E. Werner." In *Publishing Culture and the "Reading Nation": German Book History in the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Lynne Tatlock, 118-52. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2010.
- - -. *German Writing, American Reading: Women and the Import of Fiction, 1866-1917*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2012.
- - -. "'In the Heart of the Heart of the Country': Regional Histories as National History in Freytag's *Die Ahnen* (1872-80)." In *A companion to German realism, 1848-1900*, edited by Todd Kontje, 85-108. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002.
- Theweleit, Klaus. "Ströme." In *Männerphantasien*, 1:314-79. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag Roter Stern, 1986.
- Thomas, Lionel. "Luise von François: 'Dichterin von Gottes Gnaden.'" *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Literary & Historical Section* 11.2 (1964): 7-27.

Wehler, Hans Ulrich. *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte: Von der „deutschen Doppelrevolution“ bis zum Beginn des Ersten Weltkriegs, 1849-1914*. Munich: Beck, 1995.

- - -. *Das deutsche Kaiserreich, 1871-1918*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

Woodford, Charlotte. “Contrasting Discourses of Nationalism in Historical Novels by Freytag and Fontane.” In *German Literature, History and the Nation: Papers from the Conference ‘The Fragile Tradition,’ Cambridge 2002*, edited by Christian Emden and David R. Midgley, 253-76. Bern; Oxford: Peter Lang, 2004.

Worley, Linda Kraus. “Louise von François (1817-1893): Scripting a Life.” *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Neueren Germanistik* 28 (1989): 161-86.