

SoundEffects



An Interdisciplinary Journal of Sound and Sound Experience

Cyril de Beun

The Dichtung und Rundfunk Conference:

Medial Configurations of Speech Networks¹

Cyril de Beun,
KU Leuven (University of Leuven),
Faculty of Arts

www.soundeffects.dk



Abstract

Amid the sociopolitical turmoil of 1920s Germany, speech delivery rapidly became a popular practice among writers. Many speeches were given in (semi-)public assemblies, one striking example being the Dichtung und Rundfunk (Literature and Radio) conference. Although attended by significant writers and radio pioneers, this conference has received little scrutiny in the literature so far. This article seeks to fill this gap by investigating the communicative characteristics of the speeches that were held there. In the resulting examination, the Dichtung und Rundfunk conference is categorised as a network of interacting speeches. Its fundamental 'speech dialogues' lent a sense of communicative directness to the conference. However, this complex network required a discursive lingua franca to allow a direct confrontation between the differing, if not opposing, views that were expressed by the speakers. This common code is identified through the use of Link's interdiscourse theory, which shows the interdiscursive language to be the collective symbol of radio or, indeed, the conference theme itself. In addition, the article traces the interaction between speeches in the network back to the essence of any single writer's speech. In essence, the speech connects culture and, more specifically, literature to society. This in-between position resembles the function of interdiscourses, which reintegrate the segmented fields of societies and the specialised discourses associated with them. Thus, the Dichtung und Rundfunk conference serves as a test case for a study of the triangular relationship between the writer's speech, new media and interdiscourses. This study ultimately comes to the conclusion that the writer's speech operates as one of the most interdiscursive platforms for the exchange of opinions.

Since the late 19th century, the practice of speech² delivery had spread throughout the German-speaking world, and, in the years after 1900, it acquired a permanence in German and Austrian society. It goes without saying that such developments also affected both lesser known and highly acclaimed writers, many of whom frequently spoke in the public or semi-public sphere, addressing a vast range of topics.³ The rapid growth in popularity of public speaking went hand in hand with an increasing accessibility to the public space ('space' is to be understood in its literal as well as in its figurative sense). The public space was opened up by three factors in particular. First, Germany and Austria underwent significant sociopolitical changes leading to tensions in society. Rooted in the pre-1900 era, these changes eventually marked the *de jure* democratic transformation of the German and Austro-Hungarian empires after the First World War, which was followed by an equally turbulent period of troubled German (1918-1933) and Austrian (1918-1938) 'democracies'. Second, new media (among which the phonograph, the gramophone, radio and the printed press,⁴ to name a few examples) emerged during the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century.⁵ Third, and finally, the period in question saw the rise

of new modes of sociopolitical (cf. the first factor), economic, scientific and media-driven (cf. the second factor) thinking. Regardless of whether contemporary societies experienced this changing mentality as an undercurrent or, on the contrary, as a noticeable development, it triggered many writers to step into the limelight and represent themselves and their work in public. A recapitulation of these three main factors strikingly reveals how, over the period of a few decades, the public space radically opened up under the influence of the democratic effort combined with new communication devices that connected large parts of the country.

The increased *Vernetzung* of German society⁶ possessed both a democratic and a dictatorial potential. Whereas Riou, Böhme and Barkhoff (2004, p. 15) make the same observation when discussing the flip side of cyberspace,⁷ they do not explicate the mechanics of this potential. Penetrating society deeper and deeper, expanding networks (which, in a technical sense, originated in new media) gradually broke down or, rather, transcended the physical barriers between people. As a consequence, more and more people were able to access and control small fractions of the information flow through these networks, either by receiving or by sending bits of information. While this development democratised public debate by enabling more people to engage in regional, nation- or even worldwide communication processes, the resultant accessibility and openness (i.e. the near absence of barriers) of networks and their communicative effectiveness also meant that they became more vulnerable to being completely taken over by one person or group. Hence, the formal transparency of networks is fundamentally complemented by their indifference towards the information that they process. Hartmut Böhme (2004, p. 33) phrases the indifference as follows: 'Als bloß organisierte Struktur sind Netze gegen ihre Inhalte gleichgültig'. This danger inherent in optimised communication was illustrated by early radio and speech networks. Weimar radio stations, for example, broadcast separately, not only because of their limited transmission range of 100-150 kilometres, but also because they had been established as individual units in the first place.

The situation started to change in 1925, when the government body in charge of this decentralised structure, the Ministry of Posts and Telecommunications (*Reichspostministerium*; Naber, 2000, p. 6), set up a federal umbrella organisation called the Reich Broadcasting Corporation (*Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft*). Over the course of the 1920s, radio directors occasionally interconnected individual stations in order to transmit one programme to multiple regions. In such instances, supraregional or national coverage was temporarily achieved. Moreover, a permanent national *Deutschlandsender* went into operation in 1926, airing topical issues such as memorable speeches delivered by Germany's cultural icons. More often than not, these iconic speeches were delivered in front of a live audience. This fusion of speaking in a traditional speech setting while indirectly addressing a large group of 'absent'

radio listeners was epitomised by Thomas Mann's Nobel Prize banquet speech (1929), his memorial speech entitled *Goethe as Representative of the Bourgeois Age* (*Goethe als Repräsentant des bürgerlichen Zeitalters*, 1932) and Hauptmann's speech at the Berlin *Volksbühne* (1930; 'Schriftsteller im Rundfunk', n.d.).⁸ In the meantime, authoritarian forces also began to see the advantages and, perhaps even more important, the future potential of these networks. In the final years of the Weimar Republic, the Nazis became increasingly adept at organising media-covered mass rallies, at which multiple speeches were held. After they had risen to power, they further developed this constellation into a well-oiled propaganda system. Yet the primary point to be stressed is that, before the *Gleichschaltung* of the public sphere under Nazi rule, the *Vernetzung* certainly instigated a democratisation of expression, particularly in the decade following the First World War. Paradoxically, this opening up was further enhanced by criticism and even direct attacks targeted at the fragile German and Austrian democracies, at new media and at rhetorical activities.

This article aims to comprehend the communicative possibilities of speeches, principally the relationships between writers' speeches within speech networks. By a speech network is meant a web of speeches which are thematically and, as we shall see, discursively interconnected.⁹ Although speech networks could be identified throughout German-speaking Central Europe – and presumably in other regions as well –, this article will exclusively deal with speeches held in the Weimar Republic and, more specifically, with those held at the *Literature and Radio* conference (this is a translation of the actual title *Arbeitstagung "Dichtung und Rundfunk"*, which will henceforth primarily be referred to as *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference; *Die Sektion für Dichtkunst der Preußischen Akademie der Künste & Die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft* [SfD & RRG], 1930, pp. 3/5). Organised in Kassel on 30 September and 1 October 1929, this two-day conference brought together members of the Prussian Academy's literary section (*Sektion für Dichtkunst der Preußischen Akademie der Künste*) and the *Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft* as well as other literati, radio pioneers and even state officials. The conference organisers had invited a sizeable number of writers who were – in one way or the other – occupied with radio. Among this group were Alfred Döblin, Hermann Kasack and, representing the only woman at the conference, Ina Seidel (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 5). Even so, Seidel remained silent during the official part, which has been recorded in the proceedings (see SfD & RRG, 1930). Not only does this observation validate the claim that there were few women, if any, who took an active interest in the 'very masculine medium' (Führer, 1997, p. 733) of incipient radio, it also vouches for the low number of female speakers in the decades leading up to the Second World War. Besides, it can be presumed that it was difficult enough for women to join male-dominated organisations such as the Prussian Academy or the national radio association. The organisers' seeming lack of interest in the low female turnout is conveyed by the attendance register, which

lists Seidel among the ‘gentlemen’ (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 5). Generally, the speakers also referred to their audience in this manner, conventionally addressing them as ‘Meine Herren!’ (SfD & RRG, 1930, e.g. p. 15). A notable absentee was Bertolt Brecht, who was formulating his own radio theory¹⁰ during this period. Although he had been invited (Schoeller, 2011, p. 330), the sources available omit to elucidate why he did not accept the invitation (Mittenzwei, 2003, p. 107; Schoeller, 2011, p. 330). Even more remarkable is that both Brecht’s theoretical work about radio (i.e. the pieces that had been published until then) and his radio piece *Der Ozeanflug* (*The Flight across the Ocean*, 1929) are, in total, mentioned only twice (cf. SfD & RRG, 1930, pp. 27/76) by speakers in the conference proceedings.¹¹ In spite of the absence of Brecht and a few other writers who had started talking on the radio at an early stage (Walter Benjamin, Gottfried Benn and Thomas Mann being the most salient examples), the group gathered in Kassel represented a cross-section of the broadcasting intelligentsia in Germany. For this reason, the speeches in the proceedings are deemed of such representative value that they have been placed at the centre of this study.

In the preface to the conference proceedings, the organisers declare their aim to clarify the problems of dealing with the relationship between literature and radio (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 3). The importance of this event can therefore hardly be overlooked. Still, the literature on the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference remains marginal and, if available, limited in scope.¹² One of the two known exceptions to this statement is Hermann Naber’s (2000) essay preceding a recent reprint of the original conference proceedings.¹³ Notwithstanding Sabine Schiller-Lerg’s (2001) critical review of his account and of the edition into which it has been included, Naber’s essay gives valuable insight into the genesis and the early history of German radio, in addition to touching on individual writers’ experiences with the new medium. Schiller-Lerg, however, rightly criticises the omission of the subtitle ‘Reden und Gegenreden’¹⁴ on the reprinted proceedings. She is also right in arguing that the content of Naber’s essay mushrooms in several directions, mainly balancing between a chronological history and a collection of thematic case studies. Nevertheless, the alternative themes suggested by Schiller-Lerg are even more divergent, albeit equally interesting, and they therefore seem to intimate nothing but a call for a monograph devoted to the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference. Naber’s essay is evidently too restricted in length to take all these topics into consideration, but he at least alludes to the conference as a communicative speech network, while also studying its relation to the contemporary public sphere. The second known exception is the article on radio theory written by Gunnar Müller-Waldeck (1987, 1989). Despite positing a stereotypical dichotomy between bourgeois and socialist authors, Müller-Waldeck’s article presents an insightful and critical assessment of the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference as a media theoretical event. Having, in part at least, the same area of focus as Naber, Müller-Waldeck concentrates on the rela-

tionships between individual conference participants (especially Alfred Döblin and Arnold Zweig) and thus indirectly contributes to a theory of speech networks.

The outcome of the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference (if any) can, of course, be discussed, but this article, instead, focuses on the complex information exchange that took place *during* the gathering. In short, the article studies the communicative features of the speeches delivered by writers participating in this conference. From a media perspective, the amalgamation of these speeches' communicative features makes up their *medial configuration*, a notion that will be utilised regularly in the remaining part of this article. The chief aim here is to highlight the medial specificity of the writer's speech as a genre, particularly that of the speeches given at the conference under consideration. To this end, the article interprets the information exchange at the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference as a speech network and subsequently explores how the speeches within this network were related to each other. In doing so, it applies interdiscourse theory to the writer's speech and to the speech network. Directing attention towards the ad hoc uniform code of interdiscourses and underscoring its prevalent deployment in writers' speeches, the article shows how the three topics under scrutiny – viz. the writer's speech, new media and interdiscourses – are interlinked. Finally, the last section takes the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speeches as a test case for this thematic triangle by analysing three different deployments of a single interdiscursive element, namely radio. In view of the speakers' diverse professional backgrounds (excluding their radio activities, which literally united them), this particular speech network forms a suitable 'reference corpus' for pinning down the combined effect of the three aforementioned components. However, before these issues can be addressed, the article briefly sets out the general and the cultural or literary impact of new media in the Weimar Republic.

By the end of the 1920s, the German media landscape had drastically changed. As also noted in the introduction to this article, new (electro)mechanical devices intensified and diversified society's information exchange. Among the inventions that had altered the media landscape were the phonograph, the gramophone, radio, faster printing presses (Koszyk, 1966, pp. 268/270-271), but also, for example, the microphone. However, these mere *devices* only created an impact once they had developed into *institutions*, thus turning into proper *media*. Being or, rather, becoming institutionalised implied that the potential of these technological inventions im- or explicitly received wide recognition within a society. In the case of radio, for instance, the period of institutionalisation continued until the early 1930s. This and the next paragraph outline radio's coming of age in the German cultural world. The political, economic and social implications of and for radio are, however, not considered here. They have already been thoroughly explored by Karl Christian Führer (1997), who has looked into the organisation of Germany's broadcasting network as well as into its programming. Moreover, in his innovative attempt to tease out the

social background of German radio listeners, Führer (1997, pp. 731-742) has revealed that radio, once institutionalised, was pre-eminently an urban, middle-class medium. Radio's trajectory from a military and hobbyist novelty to an established medium can therefore be adequately described by the notion of 'double birth', as coined by André Gaudreault and Philippe Marion (2000). In their view, 'double birth' and, more specifically, 'second birth' ('rebirth' might be a suitable designation as well) refer to this institutionalisation of a 'technological procedure', viz. of a technical device and of its modes of use.¹⁵ Apart from a rapid increase in radio broadcasts, the 1920s were characterised by ongoing experiments with the technical possibilities of signal transmission, including so-called 'Bildfunk', a prototype of television (Dyck, 2006, p. 30). The 'double birth' theory and the examples given intimate how technology and society, the former being the product of the latter, mutually shaped or 'approached' each other. On that account, this article refrains from making technologically and media-deterministic claims about the speech.

Consistent with the interdependence between technology and society, new media had a major cultural impact in the Weimar Republic, with literati considering them to be both a threat and a blessing. As for radio, its gradual institutionalisation and wider reception only enhanced each other. Viewed from this angle, a rejection of the new medium still constituted a form of reception. Some authors indeed wondered how literature could be 'defended' against the expansion of mass media (radio in particular), or they simply attempted to stay aloof from such institutions. The latter (i.e. the reclusive attitude towards new media) often seemed to result from the former (i.e. the concern for literature's existence). This (near) exclusion of mass media was illustrated by the behaviour of Rudolf Borchardt, Karl Kraus and, last but not least, by that of Stefan George. Yet upholding such principles appeared to be anything but simple in practice. Hence, the majority of German-speaking authors adopted a more pragmatic stance, either contemplating how they could instrumentalise mass media for literature's own sake or proposing a new hybrid. Proponents of a new hybrid envisaged a convergence of literature and a certain mass medium. Bertolt Brecht, for example, framed a new branch of 'radio literature' between 1927 and 1932.¹⁶ In the same period, he conceived the revolutionary radio play or 'Lehrstück' *Der Ozeanflug*, also known as *Der Lindberghflug* (*Lindbergh's Flight*). Contrary to Brecht, Gottfried Benn can be counted among the large category of writers who appeared on the radio for financial reasons or in order to promote themselves and their work (which could be carried out for financial reasons as well).¹⁷

Against the backdrop of these divergent opinions, the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference provided a platform for discussions about the complex relationship between literature and radio. This complexity was partially due to the specific medial configurations of literary genres, whose transposition to radio proved to be problematic. Even though the conference organisers modestly aimed at formulating rather

than solving problems (cf. *supra*), some participants expressed strong views about this topic in their speeches. Several fierce debates took place during the two-day meeting, even to such an extent that scholars might easily get distracted by surface events and, in consequence, omit the medial configuration of the conference itself.¹⁸ In fact, the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference bore the hallmark of both Germany's revived oral culture and expanding communication networks. It might seem problematic that an oral tradition, which depended heavily on time-consuming (over)politeness and praise (or flattery), had to adopt the swiftness typical of new media networks such as radio. Yet challenging the conventions of speech delivery by speaking more directly constituted exactly one of the speaker guidelines laid down by Walter von Molo, the chair of the first session. He reminded the speakers of the ban on giving welcoming speeches during the entire conference.¹⁹ As a result of this overlap between traditional public speaking and progressive as well as pragmatic media thinking, the speeches held at the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference coalesced into a media hybrid themselves. More precisely, they were absorbed by a network of multiaxial communication.

The medial configuration of this hybrid was reflected in the conference programme. In the first place, speeches were grouped into six categories: literature and radio in general and five genres comprising novel and novella ('Epik'), essay and dialogue, drama, radio play and, finally, poetry (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 6). Each of these categories or themes was introduced by a cluster of two speeches, whose medial configuration encompassed a pattern of action and reaction, resulting in a dialogue with speeches. This strongly regulated dialogue consisted of the introductory speech (serving as an introduction to the introductory dialogue as well as to the session – covering one of the six themes – as a whole) and a so-called 'counterspeech'. This term has been inferred from the translation of the subtitle on the conference proceedings, reading 'Reden und Gegenreden' (SfD & RRG, 1930, front matter). With regard to content, however, a counterspeech did not necessarily offer opinions that were radically different from the ones voiced by the previous speaker. This article's media approach merely indicates that the counterspeech, forming one half of the static dialogue, primarily served as a *re-action* to the other half of that dialogue. As a result, this article does not use the term 'dialogue' in its strictly polemical sense, as defined by Herbert Ihering, for example.²⁰

The set of three thematic dialogues (i.e. three pairs of speeches) programmed on each day was the starting point for a discussion through improvised, more conversational speeches.²¹ These are grouped under the header 'Aussprache' in the proceedings, signifying the neutrally connoted 'exchange of ideas' as well as the more confrontational 'discussion'. The latter seems the most apposite designation in view of the prevalent disagreements emerging in the 'Aussprache' sections.²² Analogous to the introductory 'speech dialogues', the speeches in the 'Aussprache' or

discussion sections (one at the end of each day) follow the action-reaction pattern. Facilitating a dynamic interaction between multiple participants, these improvised speeches interact with each other, while simultaneously reacting to the introductory dialogues. As has been noted, the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference can be considered as a network, whose primary structure has turned out to be comprised of a discussion between two speakers. On a higher level, namely that of the set encompassing three thematic sessions, the interaction between the introductory sections on the one hand and the discussion section on the other can be compared to a discussion between two groups of participants. This leads to the assumption that the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference's basic action-reaction pattern was applicable to different levels of communication, and thus displayed a recursive interaction. Like in a matryoshka doll, the interactive pattern can, in theory, infinitely apply to ever larger and ever more complex communication networks.

In this case, the matryoshka doll was a collection of intricate speech networks. The *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speeches, as a speech network, did not function independently. Each speech held in Kassel was thematically and discursively linked to other speeches conceived by the same writer or by others. One example was the very first speech of the conference, which was delivered by Alfred Döblin as an introduction to the panel on literature and radio in general. In his speech, Döblin discussed which of the main literary genres lent itself or themselves to radio broadcasting. Decidedly arguing against the reading of novels (which he denominated 'Romane' and, more ambiguously, 'Epik') on the radio, he revived a theme from one of his earlier speeches entitled *Der Bau des epischen Werks* (1928; given that the noun 'Bau' denotes both the act of constructing and the resulting structure, this title can be translated as *The Construction of the Epic Work* and *The Structure of the Epic Work*, respectively). Döblin even recycled discursive elements such as metaphors so as to reinforce his claims. By using a spatial metaphor, for example, he stressed that the content of a novel can only be realised through the mind – that is to say, in the realm of a reader's imagination. This discursive *and* thematic element ran through both speeches, which is underlined by the following quotes: the claim 'Der eigentliche Ort des Romans ist die Phantasie' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 13) from Döblin's *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speech operated within the same thematic and discursive framework as *Der Bau*, according to which 'der Epiker [aber] als Darstellungsort die Phantasie aufsucht' (Döblin, 1929, p. 534). The spatial metaphor enabled Döblin to foreground the imaginative realm of the novel as opposed to the acoustic as well as visual dimensions of a theatre stage (in *Der Bau*) and the audio realm of radio (in the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speech). Another recurring element was the metaphor of the extensive waters, which Döblin deployed to express the wide scope of a novel. In *Der Bau*, he shared his view of a novel's 'production process' ('Produktionsprozeß') by comparing it to swimming in a sea of unknown dimensions.²³ In the *Dichtung und Rundfunk*

speech, he slightly adapted this *pictura* while referring to a novel's reception instead of its production.²⁴ In describing novel reading as a smooth yet lengthy process, Döblin played with the double meaning of 'Fluss', which is translatable as 'river' and as 'flow'. Döblin further strengthened the metaphorical ties between both speeches by inserting markers such as 'width' ('Breite'), 'extension'/'extent' ('Ausdehnung') and 'gliding' ('gleiten'). In short, these two speeches are, in more than one sense, interconnected. Other genres too could provide themes and discursive material to a particular speech, but, as this article exclusively deals with connections between writers' speeches, those networks deserve attention here.

It is, moreover, crucial to understand that the primary structure of this conference consisted in the elementary medial configuration of speech delivery *in se*. In practice, *any* single speech is more than just a piece of literature, art or even culture. One of the near unique features of a writer's speech includes its connective position between literature (and, by extension, culture) on the one hand and the rest of society on the other. In connection with the three primary factors summed up in the introduction to this article, the speech, as a 'genre' employed by writers, seems to have always been more closely related to society than other genres.²⁵ Consequently, starting in the field of literature and reaching for society seems to be an essential feature of the speech, irrespective of its practical use. In this respect, Thomas Mann's argument that only the times require a literary interference in extraliterary (i.e. societal) affairs proves to be nothing more than a rhetorical maxim, trivialising the connective potential of the speech (and presumably that of other genres as well).²⁶ Speech delivery might have been quantitatively and qualitatively tied to sociopolitical circumstances (cf. the first factor mentioned in the introduction), but writers were keen to speak about various other topics as well. Provided that they found *practical* opportunities to speak in public, they could easily provide a *cause* for their performance, as Thomas Mann did. Whether writers addressed political or, on the contrary, purely literary issues in their speeches, they all realised, at least to a certain extent, the connective potential of the speech. In this regard, the writer's speech can be compared to a railway turntable that switches between the different tracks – that is, one that 'mediates' between the various fields – of society, including those of literature.

This functional approach is consistent with Jürgen Link's (1986, 1988) theory on interdiscursivity. Referring to Michel Foucault's *L'archéologie du savoir* (*The Archaeology of Knowledge*), Link assumes that, from the 17th century onwards, a process of progressive specialisation triggered the segmentation of society's *spheres of activity* or *fields of practice* ('Arbeitsteilung' or 'Praktikenteilung'). 'Arbeit' and 'Praktiken', although difficult to translate due to their polysemy, are to be interpreted as all those activities that are institutionalised and thus categorised according to their own nature in conjunction with the specific pragmatic rituals that their 'execu-

tion' involves. Each of these fields of practice possesses its own field of *knowledge*, which Link designates as 'discourse' (Link, 1986, p. 130; Link, 1988, p. 288).²⁷ Hence, the specialisation of spheres of activity in modern societies has led to segmented fields of knowledge, and thus to an increasing number of *specialised discourses* ('Spezialdiskurse'). The explosion of specialised discourses has gradually impeded the mutually intelligible interaction between the various discourse communities. Interestingly, this modern discursive equivalent of the Tower of Babel has generated the obverse tendency to reintegrate the specialised discourses into *interdiscourses* ('Interdiskurse'). In Link's terms, an interdiscourse counts as a dynamic discourse that reconnects society's discourse communities by selecting and absorbing their (specialised) discursive material (e.g. through 'Kollektivsymbole', i.e. 'collective symbols').²⁸ In this manner, the interdiscourse's temporarily uniform code again facilitates an information exchange (such as, in this case, an exchange of opinions) via a network. As borne out by the constellation of the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference, two types of networks can be distinguished. On the one hand, tangible networks such as radio were (and are) physically present in society through electrical wiring, antennas and the like. On the other hand, abstract networks such as the discussion through speeches depended upon social and, as this article will expound, interdiscursive relationships. Ultimately, tangible networks were (and are) likewise dependent upon the rise of abstract networks, if they were (or are) to evolve into proper (i.e. institutionalised or reborn) media (cf. the section on Gaudreault and Marion's theory). Utilising Link's metaphors of commerce and warfare, one could say that the tangible network functions like a marketplace or, in the particular case of a competing opinions, like a battlefield. Nonetheless, the tangible network needs a *lingua franca* (an interdiscourse embedded in an abstract network) that allows the market dealers and soldiers to 'communicate' with each other.

What, precisely, is the relevance of interdiscourse theory to literature, and to the writer's speech in particular? Link argues that literature is an interdiscursive phenomenon *par excellence*:

Es gibt nun eine Reihe von Textsorten bzw. Genres, in denen die interdiskursive Funktion dominiert: das sind alle Textsorten der *Popularisierung*, vor allem journalistische und literarische im weitesten Sinne (1986, p. 135; 1988, p. 293; emphasis in originals).²⁹

Setting out the generative essentials of literature, Link points to so-called 'elementary literature' ('elementare Literatur') as one of the strongest interdiscursive entities. As a nearly inexhaustible source of interdiscursive material, elementary literature provides the building blocks for any literary genre.³⁰ Link summarises this functionality as follows:

Elementar-literarische Rede [Link uses 'Rede', signifying 'speech', in its Bakhtinian sense; cf. endnote ii] wäre demnach praktiken-übergreifende, praktiken-verbindende, prak-

tiken-integrierende Rede, die allerdings gleichzeitig innerhalb einer bestimmten institutionalisierten Praxis pragmatisch verankert ist (1983, pp. 26-27; emphasis in originals).

Whereas the main clause of Link's quote ties in with this article's elaboration on interdiscourses, the subordinate clause provides an insight that correlates with the earlier mentioned networks. This insight leads to the conclusion that the *institutional footing* of interdiscourses (which have been cited as elementary literature in this section) corresponds to that of socially acknowledged networks, which are, in allusion to Gaudreault and Marion, also known as *reborn* networks.

In continuation of Link's argument, this article posits that the writer's speech, quintessentially symbolised by a turntable, is the most interdiscursive of all literary genres. Hovering between various social fields (among which literary ones), the writer's speech both equals and transcends other literary genres by realising even more connective potential. This high level of connective potential was especially noticeable in discussions through speeches such as those that took place at the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference. Of course, speaking writers themselves consciously or subconsciously determined how much of this potential they actually realised. Nonetheless, the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference's directness of speaker-to-speaker communication alone converted the conference venue into a veritable platform for the exchange of opinions. Because this directness was intrinsic to the conference set-up, it was an essential component of the conference's abstract speech network. In light of its predominantly non-polemic depiction, this network seemed to have metaphorically more in common with a marketplace than with a battleground. Yet even the slightest disagreement between two speakers indicated that two specialised discourses were, in fact, 'battling' with each other. Searching for a uniform code of communication, speakers engaged with each other on equal terms by turning their specialised discourses or, in Kafka's words, their 'jargon'³¹ into interdiscourses. Interestingly, Link regards the conversation as a prototype of interdiscursive understanding:

Ich [...] möchte hier zunächst die *Konversation* als Prototyp eines interdiskursiven Sprachspiels vorstellen. Das zu Beginn zitierte Streitgespräch [...] war Ausschnitt einer Konversation: zwei Spezialdiskurse stritten – um streiten zu können, mußten sie beide zum Interdiskurs überwechseln (1986, pp. 135-136; 1988, pp. 293-294; emphasis in originals).

Even though they were probably unaware of this, some conference participants commented upon (semi-)public speaking in a way that approximated to Link's quote. Exemplifying this claim, radio director Ernst Hardt made the following remark concerning the assumed censorship of radio lecturers: 'Sie können im deutschen Rund-

funk sagen, was Sie wollen, vorausgesetzt, daß Sie nicht ganz so sprechen wie in einer Versammlung von lauter Gesinnungsgenossen' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 46).

Theoretically formulated by Link and intimated by Hardt, interdiscourses have repeatedly been proven to be the codes that reintegrate specialised discourses embedded in (social) practices. Through this reintegration, they facilitate the interaction or competition between (reintegrated) specialised discourses. On balance, it has become clear that interdiscourses tend to prevail in (elementary) literature and in the 'genre' of the writer's speech in particular. Analogous to interdiscourses, the writer's speech is figuratively positioned *between* the segmented practices of society, among which those of literature. What is more, the implicit 'in-betweenness' of the writer's speech is reflected in the explicit prefix 'inter-' that distinguishes the term 'interdiscourse' from mere 'discourse'. The 'inter-' prefix and its reference to the functional position of the speech demonstrates that interdiscourses not only connect specialised discourses and thus spheres of activity, but also medial configurations. This finding is practically underpinned by the speech network under scrutiny. In addition, the theoretical foundation of this extended analogy is strengthened by Ansgar Nünning and Jan Rupp, who state that

sich die Diskursbedingungen der Literatur unter anderem ihren spezifischen medialen Eigenschaften verdanken. Aus medienkulturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive entwickeln sich auch Diskurse nicht unabhängig von Medien (2011, p. 17).

Nünning and Rupp then go on to suggest that interdiscourse can be further developed in the direction of a 'reintegrating intermedium', which they also apply to literature. Given that media are always situated between two or more connected fields, the notion of 'intermedium' seems to be a pleonasm.

Still, Nünning and Rupp's approach helps to further explore the link between interdiscourses and speech networks. From the perspective of cultural and media studies, the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speeches can be regarded as 'media interdiscursive'. In addition to reflecting upon media, the conference speakers mainly *employed* media as a common code (i.e. as an interdiscourse). Not only the participants in the discussion section, but also those who delivered the introductory speeches were thus able to engage in discussions different from the official conference theme. Talking about literature and radio constituted the interdiscursive framework that reintegrated poetical, sociopolitical and financial issues, among other things. Without effectively linking it to an interdiscursive constellation, one of the concluding sentences in Müller-Waldeck's article hints at the embracement of radio as a collective symbol: 'So wurde er [radio] im Verständnis der Schriftsteller [in 1920s Germany] weniger als Apparat, sondern als Medium der Kunstdiskussion wichtig' (1989, p. 17). This correspondence between the speech network, media and interdiscourses can be extended to include the aspect of recursion. In keeping with the action-reac-

tion pattern of speech networks (cf. supra), a (media) interdiscourse can infinitely repeat itself. This self-repetition forms a general interdiscursive feature (Link, 1986, p. 138; Link, 1988, pp. 300-301). In this case, the collective symbol of radio forms part of an interdiscourse that simultaneously contains itself as a specialised discourse. In order to illustrate the application of radio as a collective symbol, three interdiscursive ‘engagements’ at the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference shall be briefly discussed.

The most prevalent confrontation encompassed the interdiscursive reintegration of poetical views. Arnold Zweig, for instance, did so in one of the introductory speeches that covered the theme ‘Epik’ (novel and novella). Contrary to his role as the initiator (viz. the speaker who laid the basis for the subsequent discussion), Zweig switched his role to a reactive one, when he criticised Döblin, the first conference speaker, for focusing on literature’s visual aspect too much. Although Zweig himself envisaged a revived oral tradition of storytelling on the radio, his account was, in essence, a reflection on epic literature *in toto*, communicated through the collective symbol of radio. Zweig’s discursive operation becomes apparent in the following quote:

Das Epische ist nur der Versuch, die Welt durchs Ohr, vom Munde zum Ohr, transparent zu machen an einem konkreten Erlebnis. [...] Im Rundfunk können Sie nur das klassische Erzählen gebrauchen (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 24).³²

As a second example of interdiscursive ‘engagement’, sociopolitical beliefs were reintegrated during the conference. The most striking example of this type of interdiscursive reintegration was Arnolt Bronnen’s controversial speech, which officially dealt with the ‘radio play’. According to Bronnen, radio should serve the nation and the people. While this opening statement soon provoked the other participants, Bronnen’s concluding remarks were nothing less than offensive to them. In the conclusion, his argument about radio ‘derailed’, resulting both in a plea for the nation as well as for the people and in a direct attack aimed at the contemporary state, the times and literati in particular. Bronnen spoke about

eine[r] Zeit, die verworren ist bis zur letzten Schraube, die keiner brauchen kann, [...] ein[em] Land, in dem sich eine schamlose Zunft verantwortungsloser, dem eigenen Volke entfremdeter, keiner Rasse, keiner Landschaft verhafteter Literaten breit macht (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 79).

Its fierce tone made the Bronnen scandal one of the clearest demonstrations of interdiscursive reintegration through the collective symbol of radio. Finally, the third context worth mentioning was the reintegration of financial concerns. As some writers at the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference saw it, they were not sufficiently remunerated for their radio activities. The specialised discourse on remu-

neration was clearly pervaded by anxieties over the economic downturn, which had manifested itself, in Germany at least, even before the American stock market crashed of late 1929.³³ Presumably with the threat of socioeconomic and political decline in mind, Hans Kyser noted the following:

Wer ernsthaft und verantwortlich arbeitet, muß in der heutigen äußerst schweren Lebenssituation die Möglichkeit sehen, daß seine Arbeit auch ihren Lohn findet. Hierzu sind die bestehenden Tarifverträge, die sich nicht auf Originalwerke des Rundfunks beziehen, nicht ausreichend (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 42).

These interdiscursive analyses endorse this article's view that there is a correlation between networks and interdiscourses, one that can also be teased out from Castells' (2010), Gießmann's (2006) and Böhme's (2004) elucidations of the network concept. In the strict Castellsian sense of the word, 'network society' – a designation taken from the first title in Castells' seminal study on the present-day Information Age – does hardly pertain to the Weimar Republic. Because of the fact that new communication devices such as radio had only recently seen the light of day, the then 'hardwired' technological infrastructures (e.g. radio transmission stations, telephone and telegraph lines) were too rudimentary to become collectively interlocked in a 'cumulative feedback loop' (Castells, 2010, p. 31) in which each innovation (new information, devices etc.) in its turn becomes a breeding ground for new innovations (new information, devices etc.). By contrast, as we have seen earlier, the 'softwired' abstract networks of writers' speeches soon boomed, partially in the wake of technological inventions. In order to further substantiate the ubiquity of speech networks in the Weimar Republic, this article briefly zooms out from the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* (related) network by suggesting other instances in which speeches can be approached as a network. The first example involves gatherings such as the matinee revolving around *The Responsibilities of the Writer in Our Time* (1929, *Die Aufgaben des Schriftstellers in unserer Zeit*), which featured speeches by Bertolt Brecht, Johannes R. Becher, Alfred Döblin and other authors. As this gathering was broadcast directly by the Berlin radio station and by the *Deutschlandsender*, it also epitomised the media hybrid that has been mentioned earlier ('Schriftsteller im Rundfunk', n.d.; despite the presence of well-known figures such as the ones already mentioned, there are no other sources – neither primary, nor secondary – on this topic). The second example comprises the writers' speeches on Goethe, of which the majority were held in the 1932 Goethe Year.

Contrary to Germany's hardwired networks, its abstract speech network (and the abstract network type as a whole) actually shared many of the features ascribed by Castells to the technological 'hardware' as summarised by the header 'The Information Technology Paradigm'. From these common denominators three principles of the abstract network can be deduced, namely pervasiveness, dynamism and inte-

gration. While Castells (2010, p. 70) interprets pervasiveness as the omnipresence of technologies, this article adopts the term in order to specifically emphasise the cultural and societal impact of the writer's speech in 1920s and 1930s Germany. Why did so many writers speak so often in the first place? No doubt, the speech possessed a ritualistic function that was and is intrinsic to a society's inclination towards collective experience. On top of that, the speech gave writers more freedom than other genres did, particularly when compared with the chief literary trinity of novel/novella, poetry and drama. When these genres reached the limits of their field of activity, typically in the area where their fictionality faded, the speech's connective potential had only just started to unfold. The speech therefore served not only as a simple tool for public expression, but also as a means of taking up, defending and switching stances within the public sphere. Such freedom came with the dynamism that makes up the second principle of the abstract network. As inferred from the third and fourth characteristics of the technological paradigm (Castells, 2010, pp. 70-71), dynamism incorporates the recursiveness as well as the flexibility of the networking logic. Lastly, the third principle has been derived from the progressive integration of technologies into a uniform system (Castells, 2010, pp. 71-76). Whereas the radio, the gramophone, the microphone and other devices were still far from converging into a single circuit, the (abstract) genre of the writer's speech already clearly tended to interact with speeches and other genres that were equally connective (e.g. essays and newspaper articles).

The three principles of abstract (speech) networks mirrored the operational characteristics of interdiscourses, except that the latter were realised to their best extent in (elementary) literature in general and in writers' speeches in particular. In line with the first principle, interdiscourses indeed pervaded many speeches, threading them together through the integration of discourses (cf. the third principle). That said, the most important parallel between speech networks and interdiscourses can be drawn with regard to their dynamism. Comparable to a non-digital version of *Unicode*, interdiscursive operations enabled writers to draw information (cf. supra: metaphors such as the spatial metaphor as well as the metaphor of the extensive waters and collective symbols such as that of radio) from their specialised sources (viz. fields of practice) while at the same time extending the applicability of these specialised knowledge stocks (or *Wissensbestände*) and rendering them accessible to the public sphere. The interdiscursive analyses have demonstrated that the collective symbol of radio lent itself to a series of *subscriptiones* (rather than one single *scriptio*; cf. Link, 1983, p. 50). Each *scriptio* involved the expression of a personal view, but the collective symbol as a whole – i.e. the coupling of several *subscriptiones* with one *pictura* as it occurred, for example, in the case of the radio – remained connective or *vernetzend*, which is to say open to discussion. In accordance with the action-reaction pattern extracted from the conference programme,

other speakers took up the collective symbol of radio. They coupled it with their own views, thus expanding the range of the collective symbol *and* of the speech network.

As the speakers in the 'Aussprache' sections were not bound by strict formal rules in respect of speaking time, they proceeded in the most flexible manner when negotiating their positions. This 'floating phase' was illustrated by Kyser's financial remarks. Contemplating new genres specifically intended for radio broadcasts (such as distinct radio reports and radio essays), Kyser suddenly toned down his idealistic account and switched to the more down-to-earth matter of economics: 'Aber geben wir uns keiner Täuschung hin: die Entwicklung des Radios ist an das Wirtschaftliche gebunden' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 42). Even so, it is imperative to note that interdiscourses were not dependent upon this (absence of) formal regulation. As the analyses of Döblin's and Zweig's speeches have shown, interdiscourses helped transcend the boundaries of this and similar schedules while at the same time maintaining their formal structure – in the same way that the speech network captured by the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* programme interlinked different fields of practice while preserving their systemic nature. On that score, it is interesting to observe how Bronnen neglected this negotiation between systems. By lapsing into provocations, he overstretched the interdiscursive potential of the speech network that was otherwise so flexible. This article does not examine whether Bronnen provoked his audience for the mere purpose of disrupting the conference or whether he did it because he simply wanted to express his opinion. What is important to retain, however, is that Bronnen broke the principal guideline for the interaction in speech networks. Taking Hardt's statement with regard to speaking on the radio (cf. *supra*) into account, this article concludes that Bronnen inadvertently or deliberately spoke 'wie in einer Versammlung von lauter Gesinnungsgenossen' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 46).

In sum, this article has taken the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference as a sample to study its speech network from an interdiscursive angle. The introduction to the omnipresence of public speaking in the Weimar Republic was followed by an examination of the Weimar media landscape. After having given an overview of the radio's impact on literary life, the article directed its focus onto the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference itself. By drawing on thinking about both traditional oral culture and new media, the ensuing analysis of the conference's medial configuration has revealed that the conference operated as an abstract communication network with specific interactive qualities, principally covering the direct interaction between two or more speakers. This network's fundamental pattern of action and reaction or, in other words, its quintessential speaker-to-speaker communication has been characterised as a recursive procedure. In a further step, the argument attesting to the recursive procedure was extrapolated to writers' speech networks

in general. Finally, the article has elaborated on the temporarily common code that correlates with the pivotal position of the writer's speech and with that of speech networks. The medial configuration of the writer's speech and the institutional footing of reborn media such as radio correspond to the fundamental aspects of interdiscursivity. While the medial configuration of the writer's speech is analogous to interdiscourses' ability to reintegrate specialised discourses (i.e. spheres of activity), the social acknowledgement of reborn media invites comparison with the institutional footing of interdiscourses. The resulting triangular relationship between the writer's speech, new media and interdiscursivity has been underlined by a minor interdiscursive analysis of the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference. In conclusion, this article suggests revising the idea that this conference *simply* served as a platform for discussing matters concerning literature and radio. Rather, the new medium of radio and the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speech network provided the interdiscursive and communicative framework to reintegrate (i.e. include) opinions that were only loosely related to literature or radio. Future research would benefit from extensively focusing on the interdiscursive aspects of the writer's speech. By looking into other texts and speeches other than the ones held at the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference, a possible study could further the aim of this article by scrutinising the overall impact of radio as a collective symbol. Besides, a more extensive interdiscursive analysis of the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference might shed more light on the conference's medial configuration.

References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (2002). The Problem of Speech Genres. In Emerson, C. (Ed.) & Holquist, M. (Ed.), McGee, V.W. (Trans.), *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (pp. 60-102). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Baumberger, C. (2009). "Ich bin kein 'Düchter'": Mündlichkeit und Mundart bei Friedrich Glauser. *figurationen: gender, literatur, kultur*, 10 (1-2), 159-170.
- Benn, G., Galitz, R. (Ed.), Kreiler, K. (Ed.) & Weinmann, M. (Ed.). (2004). *Das Hörwerk 1928-56: Lyrik, Prosa, Essays, Vorträge, Hörspiele, Interviews, Rundfunkdiskussionen*. Frankfurt am Main: Zweitausendeins Verlag.
- Böhme, H. (2004). Einführung: Netzwerke: Zur Theorie und Geschichte einer Konstruktion. In Barkhoff, J., Böhme, H. & Riou, J. (Eds.), *Netzwerke: Eine Kulturtechnik der Moderne* (pp. 17-36). Köln: Böhlau Verlag. (Stephan, I. & Weigel, S. (Eds.), *Literatur – Kultur – Geschlecht: Studien zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte*, 29 (Große Reihe)).
- Born, K.E. (1967). *Die deutsche Bankenkrise 1931: Finanzen und Politik*. Munich: R. Piper & Co. Verlag.
- Brecht, B. (1976). *Gesammelte Werke: Vol. 18. Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst I*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture: Vol. 1. The Rise of the Network Society* (2nd edition, with a new preface). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Die Sektion für Dichtkunst der Preußischen Akademie der Künste & Die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft (Eds.). (1930). *Dichtung und Rundfunk: Reden und Gegenreden*. Berlin: [Otto von Holten].

- Döblin, A. (1929). Der Bau des epischen Werks. *Die neue Rundschau*, 40 (1), 527-551.
- Dyck, J. (2006). *Der Zeitzeuge: Gottfried Benn 1929-1949*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag.
- Eichengreen, B. & Hatton, T.J. (1988). Interwar Unemployment in International Perspective: An Overview. In Eichengreen, B. & Hatton, T.J. (Eds.), *Interwar Unemployment in International Perspective: Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Research Workshop on Interwar Unemployment in International Perspective; Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; May 7-8, 1987* (pp. 1-59). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (NATO ASI Series: Series D: Behavioural and Social Sciences, 43)
- Führer, K.C. (1997). A Medium of Modernity? Broadcasting in Weimar Germany, 1923-1932. *The Journal of Modern History*, 69 (4), 722-753.
- Gaudreault, A. & Marion, P. (2000). Un média naît toujours deux fois. *Sociétés & Représentations*, (9), 21-36.
- Gießmann, S. (2006). *Netze und Netzwerke: Archäologie einer Kulturtechnik, 1740-1840*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.
- Gutsche, H., Gleiss, M., Musial, T., Schneider, G. & Diekmann S. (Eds.). (2000). *Archiv-Blätter: Vol. 5. Dichtung und Rundfunk – 1929: Ein Dokument der Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste*. Berlin: Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste.
- Hartel, G. (2010). Emerging Out of a Silent Void: Some Reverberations of Rudolf Arnheim's Radio Theory in Beckett's Radio Pieces. *Journal of Beckett Studies*, 19 (2), 218-227.
- Kafka, F. (2008). *Sämtliche Werke*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Kluge, U. (2006). *Die Weimarer Republik*. Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh. (UTB)
- Knopf, J. (1986). *Brecht-Handbuch: Lyrik, Prosa, Schriften: Eine Ästhetik der Widersprüche: Mit einem Anhang: Film* (unabridged special edition). Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung und Carl Ernst Poeschel Verlag.
- Koszyk, K. (1966). *Geschichte der deutschen Presse: Vol. 2. Deutsche Presse im 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Colloquium Verlag.
- Link, J. (1983). *Elementare Literatur und generative Diskursanalyse*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Link, J. (1986). Interdiskurs, System der Kollektivsymbole, Literatur: Thesen zu einer generativen Diskurs- und Literaturtheorie. In Eschbach, A. (Ed.), *Perspektiven des Verstehens* (pp. 128-146). Bochum: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer.
- Link, J. (1988). Literaturanalyse als Interdiskursanalyse: Am Beispiel des Ursprungs literarischer Symbolik in der Kollektivsymbolik. In Fohrmann, J. & Müller, H. (Eds.), *Diskurstheorien und Literaturwissenschaft* (pp. 284-307). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Mann, T. (1960). *Gesammelte Werke: Vol. 11. Reden und Aufsätze 3*. Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag.
- Mittenzwei, W. (2003). *Die Mentalität des ewigen Deutschen: Nationalkonservative Dichter 1918 bis 1947 und der Untergang einer Akademie*. Leipzig: Verlag Faber & Faber.
- Müller-Waldeck, G. (1987). "Rundfunktheorie" und Literaturkonzept. In Wruck, P. (Ed.), *Literarisches Leben in Berlin: 1871-1933* (Vol. 2, pp. 122-150). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (Studien)
- Müller-Waldeck, G. (1989). "Rundfunktheorie" und Literaturkonzept: Zum Verhältnis von Literatur und Rundfunk in der Weimarer Republik. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Rundfunks: Schriftenreihe des DDR-Rundfunks*, 23 (2-3), 5-19.
- Naber, H. (2000). "Unsere Isoliertheit ist grenzenlos": Rundfunk: Ein neues Medium in der Kontroverse. In Gutsche, H., Gleiss, M., Musial, T., Schneider, G. & Diekmann, S. (Eds.), *Archiv-Blätter: Vol. 5. Dichtung und Rundfunk – 1929: Ein Dokument der Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste* (pp. 5-29). Berlin: Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste.
- Nünning, A. & Rupp, J. (2011). Hybridisierung und Medialisierung als Katalysatoren der Gattungsentwicklung: Theoretischer Bezugsrahmen, Analysekatoren und Funktionshypthesen zur Medialisierung des Erzählens im zeitgenössischen Roman. In Nünning, A. & Rupp, J. (Eds.), *Medialisierung des Erzählens im englischsprachigen Roman der Gegenwart: Theoretischer Bezugsrahmen, Genres und Modellinterpretationen* (pp. 3-43). Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier. (Studies in

- English Literary and Cultural History / Studien zur Englischen Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaft, 50).
- Reitter, P. (2008). *The Anti-Journalist: Karl Kraus and Jewish Self-Fashioning in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Riou, J., Böhme, H. & Barkhoff, J. (2004). Vorwort. In Barkhoff, J., Böhme, H. & Riou, J. (Eds.), *Netzwerke: Eine Kulturtechnik der Moderne* (pp. 7-16). Köln: Böhlau Verlag. (Stephan, I. & Weigel, S. (Eds.), *Literatur – Kultur – Geschlecht: Studien zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte*, 29 (Große Reihe))
- Ritschl, A. & Spoerer, M. (1997). Das Bruttosozialprodukt in Deutschland nach den amtlichen Volkseinkommens- und Sozialproduktsstatistiken 1901-1995. In Fremdling, R. & Ark, B. van (Eds.), *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte: Vol. 1997/2. Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnungen im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 27-54). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Schiller-Lerg, S. (2001). [Review of the book *Dichtung und Rundfunk – 1929*, by H. Gutsche, M. Gleiss, T. Musial, G. Schneider & S. Diekmann (Eds.)]. *Rundfunk und Geschichte*, 27 (1-2), 82. Retrieved from <http://rundfunkundgeschichte.de/>
- Schoeller, W.F. (2011). *Alfred Döblin: Eine Biographie*. Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag.
- Schriftsteller im Rundfunk - Autorenauftitte im Rundfunk der Weimarer Republik 1924-1932: *Autorenregister*. (n.d.). Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv. Retrieved 17 October 2014 from <http://www.dra.de/rundfunkgeschichte/schriftsteller/autoren.php>
- Wuthenow, R.-R. (1983). Essayistik. In Glaser, H.A. & Bormann, A. von (Eds.), *Deutsche Literatur: Eine Sozialgeschichte: Vol. 9. Weimarer Republik – Drittes Reich: Avantgardismus, Parteilichkeit, Exil 1918-1945* (pp. 80-91). Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Verlag.

Notes

- 1 This article is set against the background of my PhD project which carries the working title *Schriftstellerreden in der deutschsprachigen Moderne (Writers' Speeches in German-speaking Modernism)*. This project takes stock of the speeches delivered by German-speaking writers from approximately 1900 until 1938. It should be noted that 1900 constitutes a variable *terminus a quo*, whereas 1938 constitutes a fixed *terminus ad quem* due to the German occupation of Austria and the consequent destruction of the ubiquitous German speech culture in Central Europe. This PhD project is situated within the research group MDRN ('Modern') and the Interuniversity Attraction Pole *Literature and Media Innovation*, which is funded by the Belgian Science Policy Office (BELSPO). I would like to thank Aleide Vanmol for her meticulous proof-reading of this text.
- 2 Within the framework of my PhD project in general and this article in particular, the term 'speech' denotes the projected and/or intentional act of (semi-)public speaking, including the transcript, recording etc. resulting from this act. Hence, the term will *not* appear in its Bakhtinian sense, which signifies any form of written or oral expression (Bakhtin, 2002). Although, in line with Bakhtin, (semi-)public speaking itself can be regarded as a speech genre (i.e. a collection of utterances forming a more or less standard mode of expression within a particular context (Bakhtin, 2002, p. 60)), the definition of 'speech' employed in this article comprises more than a mere theoretical construct. Rather, speech delivery is approached from a pragmatic angle, which takes into account the micro-context and the macro-context of a speech. While micro-context refers to the specific circumstances at the location where a speech is delivered (i.e. its place and occasion as well as its audience), macro-context denotes the general background against which a speech functions (i.e. the society with which that speech interacts). Although this article has no aim to elaborate on the connection between public speaking and Bakhtin, it is worth noting that the combination between the pragmatic speech definition and the theoretical notion of the utterance provides useful insights into the

- functional characteristics of the writer's speech as a medium (particularly into the connective peculiarities of a speech performance, regarding, for example, its sense of directness and the atmosphere inside an auditorium).
- 3 For my PhD project, I aim to list and collect all speeches held by 124 German-speaking authors who were active during the time frame of approximately 1900 until 1938. The authors have been selected by means of a large variety of criteria in order to provide a representative survey of the German speech culture during modernism. By way of illustration, the corpus covers the following range of authors: both (then and/or now) famous and lesser known authors, both males and females, writers expressing different poetical and sociopolitical ideas, writers from different social and national backgrounds (as long as they spoke in German) and, finally, writers employing different genres besides their activities as a public speaker. Thus far, I have listed over 1,300 speeches out of which two thirds are available in print and/or as a recording.
 - 4 It often seems that modernist print media were – erroneously – denied an innovative status equal to that of contemporary radio and film. Hans Kyser's statement in his 1929 *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speech on literature and radio is a case in point: 'Unsre Zeit hat zwei neue Ausdrucksformen der schöpferischen Phantasie geschaffen: den Film und den Funk' (Die Sektion für Dichtkunst der Preußischen Akademie der Künste & Die Reichs-Rundfunk-Gesellschaft [SfD & RRG], 1930, p. 41). Revolutionised by the advent of faster printing methods (Koszyk, 1966, pp. 268/270-271), print media such as newspapers and magazines fostered the rise of a mass press in Central Europe's primary cultural centres Berlin and Vienna (Reitter, 2008, p. 2; Wuthenow, 1983, p. 81). As a result of the rise of cultural journalism – epitomised by, for example, new forms of essayism and by the unfolding of literary/cultural critique, for example (Wuthenow, 1983, p. 81) –, the printed press came to serve as one of the dominant 'market-places' for the public exchange of opinions (Link, 1986, p. 135; Link, 1988, p. 293; Link's account of the marketplace can be aptly paraphrased in German as an 'Umschlagplatz öffentlicher Meinung').
 - 5 Many of these new media themselves originated in and contributed to sociopolitical tensions. Wars in particular can be regarded as the cradle of many new technologies, including new media such as radio. Naber, for example, points to the fact that veterans who had served with the signal troops during the First World War played a decisive role in the development of civil radio networks in post-war Germany. Among these innovators was the 'father' of public radio in Germany, Hans Bredow (Naber, 2000, p. 5).
 - 6 The term 'Vernetzung' can only be roughly described as the implementation and expansion of a communication network in German society.
 - 7 They refer to 'die andere Seite der Netzerfahrung, sein Kontroll- und Überwachungspotential'.
 - 8 The German Radio Archives remain equivocal as to the status of Mann's Nobel Prize banquet speech. The entry at stake only explicitly mentions Alfred Braun as a speaker and therefore it cannot be ruled out that Mann's banquet speech was not transmitted at all.
 - 9 Gießmann (2006, pp. 9-32) provides a concise introduction to the flourishing scholarly field of network theory, while also summing up some of its key challenges.
 - 10 Knopf (1986, p. 494) and Müller-Waldeck (1989, pp. 16-17) rightly suggest using the term 'radio theory' cautiously.
 - 11 *Vorschläge für den Intendanten des Rundfunks* (*Suggestions for the Director of Radio Broadcasting*) was one of Brecht's theoretical pieces about radio, which had been published in the *Berliner Börsen-Courier* as early as 1927. *Der Ozeanflug* was first broadcast on 29 July 1929, shortly before the conference took place (Brecht, 1976, p. 14*). In one of the scarce allusions to Brecht that was made during this conference, Hans Roeseler refers to *Der Ozeanflug* as a literary example of 'eine episch-lyrische, balladistisch-dramatische Mischform mit musikalischer Untermalung' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 27) appearing on the radio.

- 12 Baumberger (2009, pp. 165-166) specifically deals with Döblin's speech at the conference, while Hartel (2010, pp. 219-220) provides an overview of the main events that took place.
- 13 For the reprint, see Gutsche, Gleiss, Musial, Schneider & Diekmann (2000).
- 14 Cf. *infra* for its relevance to this study of speech networks.
- 15 Gaudreault and Marion's initial three-step categorisation of double birth through 'apparition', 'émergence' and 'avènement' (2000, p. 24, emphases in original) lacks the clarity appearing further on in their article. The three French terms quoted here are difficult to translate into English due to their accurate denotation. For this reason, an alternative categorisation of a medium's 'birth process', whilst in line with Gaudreault and Marion's account, is proposed here in order to shed light on this issue. In brief, this categorisation comprises the stages 'discovery', 'invention' and 'acknowledgement/institutionalisation'. A discovery of physical processes intrinsic to nature enabled and spurred the invention of devices utilising these processes. The discovery of electromagnetic waves, for example, provided one of the physical foundations for a wide range of applications in the field of signal transmission (radio, for instance). Still primitive media themselves, these applications could, under complex circumstances (which will not be traced in this article), be integrated into society, during which they would obtain an institutional status. Radio, for example, was only acknowledged by German society once public broadcasting had started (which was partially commercial and partially state-run). These three steps indicate that radio, or indeed any other primitive medium, could/can only evolve into a fully-fledged medium (one that has become widely accepted in society) through 'rebirth'.
- 16 See, for instance, his speech *Der Rundfunk als Kommunikationsapparat* (*The Radio as an Apparatus of Communication*, 1932), in which he critically evaluates the imitation of 'ordinary' literary genres by the pioneers of early radio.
- 17 In theory, Benn was dismissive of radio. In a letter to Friedrich Oelze from 8 October 1949, he states: 'diese ganze Radiosache liegt mir nicht sehr: [...]. Aber man muss es ja auch nicht zu wichtig nehmen' (Benn, Galitz, Kreiler & Weinmann, 2004, pp. 12-13). However, his voice was regularly transmitted by Weimar radio stations around 1930. Commercial grounds played a crucial role in this behaviour (Dyck, 2006, pp. 30-33). The latter statement is supported by another remark in the said letter to Friedrich Oelze. Benn announces that he will be interviewed on the radio, calling his appearance 'das übliche Interview, das ich ungern startete, aber dem ich mich nicht entziehen konnte, [...] da man auch ganz gut dafür bezahlt, sogar erstaunlich gut, Stargage!' (Benn et al., 2004, p. 12). Against this backdrop, the earlier cited metaphor of the marketplace (cf. endnote iv) can be reinterpreted as a literary market, in which 'literary' also includes writers' appearances on the radio. See, for example, Müller-Waldeck's references to the 'book market' (1989, p. 8) and to the 'practice of the art market' (1989, p. 15).
- 18 The few sources dealing with the *Dichtung und Rundfunk* conference are often confined to accounts of the controversy sparked by Arnolt Bronnen's speech (cf. Schoeller, 2011, pp. 330-331). The majority of those present – above all Döblin – were upset by Bronnen's remarks about nation and race. In the ensuing argument, Döblin reacted fiercely, hitting the table and interrupting Bronnen, a reaction that was applauded by the other participants (for Bronnen's speech, see Sfd & RRG, 1930, pp. 77-79; for the ensuing reactions and Bronnen's replies, see Sfd & RRG, 1930, pp. 90-92/95-98). These sources, Mittenzwei's (2003, pp. 106-111) and Müller-Waldeck's (1989, pp. 14-16) accounts being notable exceptions, omit to examine the scandal's background of political/apolitical or active/representative attitudes that came to the fore during the conference.
- 19 Cf. a quote taken from his brief opening remarks: 'Sie haben aus der Einladung entnommen, daß begrüßungsansprachen nicht gehalten werden sollen' (Sfd & RRG, 1930, p. 7). Other chairs conveyed similarly concise messages.

- 20 Cf. Ihering's rhetorical question in his *Dichtung und Rundfunk* speech, which restricts the dialogue to a form of polemic: 'Denn was ist der Dialog anderes als aufgeteilte Polemik?' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 36).
- 21 A majority of the participants repeatedly voted in favour of transferring the discussion section to the end of the day. By way of illustration, the proceedings report: 'Es wird beschlossen, daß mit der Aussprache erst nach Beendigung der sechs Vorträge des ersten Verhandlungstages begonnen werden soll' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 21).
- 22 In his guidelines, Molo indeed referred to the 'Aussprachen' as 'discussions': 'Die Herren Referenten wollen sich bei ihren Vorträgen bitte auf zehn Minuten beschränken. Nach den Vorträgen ist eine Diskussion vorgesehen' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 7). In the same quote, he restricts the speaking time to 10 minutes, probably with the conciseness of the monologues and a subsequent smooth running of the conference in mind (cf. supra: the ban on welcoming speeches).
- 23 'Man beginnt vielfach ein episches Werk, als wenn man ein Schwimmer ist, der sich ins Meer stürzt. Man weiß noch nicht, wie breit das Meer ist, aber man vertraut auf seine Kräfte und hat Lust am Schwimmen' (Döblin, 1929, p. 542).
- 24 'Romanen und epischen Werken ist Breite, Ausdehnung und Fluß wesentlich. Für diese Breite, diese Ausdehnung und den Fluß haben wir zur Verfügung die Augen, die über die Seiten weggleiten' (SfD & RRG, 1930, p. 13).
- 25 'Genre' has been deliberately placed in quotation marks because of the challenges faced by scholars examining the generic validity and the defining aspects of the writer's speech as a genre. Illustrative of this issue, the essay undermines the uniqueness of the writer's speech with regard to at least one aspect. In fact, essays have the same connective role as speeches, and, as Wuthenow notes, the modernist essayistic culture (similar to the speech culture) provided a pre-eminent marketplace for the exchange of opinions: 'Der Essay ist Literatur; aber er setzt diese, wie Geschichte, gleichzeitig wieder voraus, und nicht nur diese natürlich, sondern auch die Gesellschaft, die Haltung von Liberalität, Urbanität und Tendenz zur Universalität – und dann natürlich den Geist der Öffentlichkeit' (1983, p. 80). Even so, essays can be distinguished from speeches through a parameter that considers the speech's performative aspect. In comparison with speeches, essays, essentially lacking the performative aspect, are not intended to be spoken in front of an audience. Yet the vexed relationship between the speech and the essay is further clouded once its aspects are studied in relation to radio. What are the criteria for assigning a piece that is spoken on the radio the label 'radio essay', 'radio lecture/speech' or any other type of designation? Evidently, this minor reflection brings to the fore the need for a separate study on the genre of the writer's speech. Although beyond the scope of this article, this genre examination makes up an important part of my PhD project.
- 26 Pronounced in his famous *Deutsche Ansprache: Ein Appell an die Vernunft* (*German Address: An Appeal to Reason*, 1930; this address was infamously disturbed by a group of SA men, causing a scandal in which the earlier mentioned Arnolt Bronnen once again played an important part), Mann's argument merely accounted for his own, increasingly political utterances in the public sphere around that time. See the following excerpt from his address: 'Dennoch gibt es Stunden, Augenblicke des Gemeinschaftslebens, [...] wo der Künstler von innen her nicht weiterkann, weil unmittelbare Notgedanken des Lebens den Kunstgedanken zurückdrängen, krisenhafte Bedrängnis der Allgemeinheit auch ihn auf eine Weise erschüttert, daß die spielend-leidenschaftliche Vertiefung ins Ewig-Menschliche, die man Kunst nennt, wirklich das zeitliche Gepräge des Luxuriösen und Müßigen gewinnt und zur seelischen Unmöglichkeit wird' (Mann, 1960, p. 871).
- 27 Cf.: 'die Differenzierung der Diskurse setzt nicht primär bei den Klassen, sondern bei der *Praktikenteilung* an. Mit Foucault können wir also vom juristischen, medizinischen, politökonomischen Diskurs usw. sprechen: jeder arbeitsteilig ausdifferenzierten und auf der Basis eigener

- pragmatischer *Rituale* gesondert institutionalisierten Praxisart entspricht dann ein spezieller Wissensbereich, den wir *Diskurs* nennen können' (Link, 1986, p. 130; Link, 1988, p. 288; emphasis in originals).
- 28 In line with Link, this article argues that the specialisation of discourses began at the start of the modern era, which triggered the dialectical cycle (viz. the tendency and counter-tendency) of the 'differentiation and integration of discourses' ('Diskursdifferenzierung und Diskursintegration' (Link, 1988, p. 297)). However, Link claims that the specialisation of discourses commenced in the 17th century, whereas this article argues that it began as early as the late Middle Ages. As the Church's grip on the whole of society began to weaken, it gave way to new, 'unchristian' activities specialising in other fields of knowledge and subsequently creating new, specialised discourses.
- 29 Link (1988, pp. 298-299) has also drawn a heuristic outline of discourse integration, in which he has assigned literature a pivotal position. See also the following observation from Nünning and Rupp: 'Literatur ist für Link nicht das einzige, aber ein privilegiertes Forum des reintegrativen Interdiskurses, da sie hochgradig selektiv in der Auswahl von Spezialdiskursen vorgehen kann' (2011, p. 17).
- 30 Cf.: 'das erste generative Grundgesetz der Literatur heißt: Verarbeitung der kulturell bereits paratgestellten "elementaren Literatur", u.a. der Kollektivsymbolik' (Link, 1988, p. 301) and 'Das Beispiel Jean Pauls, [...], sollte meine [Link's] Grundthese verdeutlichen, der zufolge die elementare Literatur das große, wahrscheinlich größte generative Reservoir der Kunstliteratur sei' (Link, 1986, pp. 140-141; Link, 1988, p. 303). For more information on elementary literature and for a broader reflection on interdiscourse, see Link (1983, especially pp. 9-24 and pp. 25-38).
- 31 In his *Rede über die jiddische Sprache* (*Speech on the Yiddish Language*, 1912), one of his few appearances in the (semi-)public arena, Kafka laid out his ideas on the Yiddish language and its deceptive proximity to German. Closely related to and simultaneously untranslatable into the latter, Yiddish was deemed to be a jargon by Kafka (2008, pp. 1275-1278). Within the framework of this article, jargon has overlaps with specialised discourse, as both are tied to the context of a certain field of practice.
- 32 For a more elaborate analysis of Zweig's and Döblin's speeches, see Müller-Waldeck (1989, pp. 10-14).
- 33 Given that the Weimar Republic had been on the verge of insolvency since the middle of 1929 and with the German stock market starting its decline around the same time (Kluge, 2006, pp. 333-335), economic uncertainties abounded in Germany, even months before the global crisis broke out. A similar downtrend could be noticed in the real economy, which was already past its 1928 peak in terms of real GNP, real GDP and real GNP/GDP per capita (Ritschl & Spoerer, 1997, p. 51). Conversely, the unemployment rate in Germany was once again on the rise in 1929 (Eichengreen & Hatton, 1988, p. 6). Compared to 1928, this annual rise in unemployment was distinct enough to be ascribed to 1929 in its totality rather than to the 1929 crisis months exclusively (with October constituting the first crisis month). In short, these figures indeed justify Karl Erich Born's (1967, pp. 31-39) claim that the German economy was at its peak in 1927/1928 and that its positive sentiment reached a tipping point towards the end of that period.