Heinrich von Kleist and Modernity

Modernity, according to some views, poses the problem of *homo politicus*—the problem of how to act in a moral universe without a legitimating "master narrative," without a final foundation. From this angle, the oeuvre of Heinrich von Kleist—novellas, dramas, and essays—addresses problems emerging from a new philosophical universe of Kantian provenance, in many ways the same universe we inhabit today.

This volume of new essays investigates Kleist's position in our ever-changing conception of modernity, employing aesthetic, narrative, philosophical, biographical, political, economic, anthropological, psychological, and cultural approaches, and wrestling with the difficulties of historicizing Kleist's life and work. Central questions are: To what extent can the multitude of breaking points and turning points, endgames and pre-games, ruptures and departures that permeate Kleist's work and biography be conceptually bundled together and linked to the emerging paradigm of modernity? And to what extent does such an approach to Kleist not only advance understanding of this major German writer and his work, but also shed light on the nature of our present modernity?

Contributors: Seán Allan, Peter Barton, Hilda Meldrum Brown, David Chisholm, Andreas Gailus, Bernhard Greiner, Jeffrey L. High, Anette Horn, Peter Horn, Wolf Kittler, Jonathan W. Marshall, Christian Moser, Dorothea von Mücke, Nancy Nobile, David Pan, Ricarda Schmidt, Helmut J. Schneider.

Editors: BERND FISCHER is Professor of German at the Ohio State University. TIM MEHIGAN is Professor of German in the Department of Languages and Cultures at the University of Otago, New Zealand.

Cover image: Max Liebermann, *Über das Marionettentheater*, from *54 Steindrucke zu kleinen Schriften von Heinrich von Kleist* (Verlag Bruno Cassirer, Berlin 1917). Courtesy of the Kleist-Museum, Frankfurt an der Oder.

Cover design by Frank Gutbrod

CAMDEN HOUSE

668 Mt. Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731, USA
P.O. Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
www.camden-house.com
www.boydellandbrewer.com

ISBN 978-1-57113-506-3

Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture

Heinrich von Kleist and Modernity

Edited by
Bernd Fischer and Tim Mehigan

CAMDEN HOUSE
Rochester, New York

Copyright © 2011 by the Editors and Contributors

All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation, no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded, or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

First published 2011
by Camden House

Camden House is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt. Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA
www.camden-house.com
and of Boydell & Brewer Limited
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK
www.boydellandbrewer.com

ISBN-13: 978-1-57113-506-3
ISBN-10: 1-57113-506-5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Heinrich von Kleist and modernity / edited by Bernd Fischer and Tim Mehigan.
p. cm. — (Studies in German literature, linguistics, and culture)
Essays in English and German.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-1-57113-506-3 (acid-free paper)
ISBN-10: 1-57113-506-5 (acid-free paper)
1. Kleist, Heinrich von, 1777–1811 — Criticism and interpretation.
2. Kleist, Heinrich von, 1777–1811 — Appreciation. 3. Kant, Immanuel, 1724–1804 — Influence. 4. Modernism (Literature) I. Fischer, Bernd, 1953– II. Mehigan, Timothy J.
PT2379.H3445 2011
838'.609—dc23

2011025779

This publication is printed on acid-free paper.
Printed and bound in Great Britain by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction 1
Tim Mehigan and Bernd Fischer

I. The Plays

1: Zu Ende schreiben: Ultimative Strategien im Schaffen Kleists 11
Bernhard Greiner

2: "Sein Nahen ist ein Wehen aus der Ferne": Ottokar's Leap in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* 23
Nancy Nobile

3: The Fragmented Picture and Kleist's *Zerbrochner Krug* 41
Dorothea von Mücke

4: "So glaubst du jetzt, daß ich dir Wahrheit gab?" Gender, Power and the Performance of Justice in Kleist's *Der zerbrochne Krug* 55
Seán Allan

5: Recht als Krieg: Moderne Staatlichkeit und die Aporien legalistischer Herrschaft bei Heinrich von Kleist 71
Christian Moser

6: Representing the Nation in Heinrich von Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* 93
David Pan

7: Herrschaftsgenealogie und Staatsgemeinschaft: Zu Kleists Dramaturgie der Moderne im *Prinzen von Homburg* 113
Helmut J. Schneider

8: Changing Perceptions of Modernity in Nineteenth-Century German Theater from Goethe to Wagner, with Reference to Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* 131
Hilda Meldrum Brown

9: Weiblicher Sadismus, Wutwelt des Liebes-Urwalds, Geschlechtskampf, absolutes Gefühl: Die *Penthesilea*-Rezeption in der Moderne — 145
Ricarda Schmidt

10: Prosodic and Dramatic Tension in the Blank-Verse Dramas of Heinrich von Kleist — 167
David Chisholm

II. The Stories and Essays

11: Crisis, Denial, and Outrage: Kleist (Schiller, Kant) and the Path to the German Novella(s) of Modernity — 187
Jeffrey L. High

12: Das Gespenst der Armut: "Das Bettelweib von Locarno" — Zwischen traditioneller christlicher, kantisch aufgeklärter und moderner marxistischer Auffassung — 205
Peter Horn

13: The Problem of Knowledge and the Discourse of the Hysteric: Exploring a Lacanian Interpretation of "Die Marquise von O. . ." — 217
Peter Barton

14: Religion nach der Aufklärung: *Die heilige Cäcilie* — Identität, Religion und Moderne — 233
Anette Horn

15: Breaking Skulls: Kleist, Hegel, and the Force of Assertion — 243
Andreas Gailus

16: Kleist's "Übermarionette" and Schrenck-Notzing's "Traumtänzerin": Nervous Mechanics and Hypnotic Performance under Modernism — 257
Jonathan W. Marshall

17: Falling after the Fall: The Analysis of the Infinite in Kleist's Marionette Theater — 279
Wolf Kittler

Notes on the Contributors — 295

Index — 299

Acknowledgments

THE ESSAYS IN THE VOLUME were originally presented at a symposium on the works of Heinrich von Kleist in September 2010 at the University of Otago, New Zealand. The essays were subsequently revised and reworked for publication, some substantially so. The volume itself was reviewed prior to publication. We thank these expert readers. We also gratefully acknowledge the generous conference assistance provided by the Alexander-von-Humboldt Foundation. We are also grateful to the University of Otago, which contributed material support for both the conference and the conference volume. Thanks, finally, to Jim Walker at Camden House (Boydell & Brewer), who saw the volume through to completion with his customary skill and attention to detail.

B.F. and T.M.
August 2011

Introduction

Tim Mehigan and Bernd Fischer

HEINRICH VON KLEIST (1777–1811) speaks to the present age like few other writers of his time. Although he was recognized for his immense gifts as a playwright by Christoph Martin Wieland and Johann Wolfgang Goethe, two of the most important literary figures of Kleist's day, only three of his seven plays were performed during his lifetime.[1] Today Kleist's plays are among the most popular on the German stage. Despite the evident quality of these plays, Kleist was better known to his contemporaries as a short-story writer: his eight stories appeared in two separate editions in 1810 and 1811 shortly before his death. Some had been published previously. Although Ludwig Tieck issued them again in 1826 in the first edition of Kleist's collected works,[2] the stories, like the plays, receded from view after the waning of Romanticism, a literary movement with which Kleist is often associated. New editions of Kleist's works in 1885 and 1905 helped revive interest in Kleist as an author. On the occasion of the first centenary of Kleist's death in 1911, a new level of interest in Kleist as an author could already be observed: Otto Brahm's 1884 monograph on Kleist was reissued,[3] and two other major studies appeared (by Wilhelm Herzog[4] and Heinrich Meyer-Benfey[5]) to add to earlier work on Kleist by Georg Minde-Pouet[6] (1897) and Reinhold Steig (1901).[7] Although Kleist's canonization as an author of great significance in German literature cannot be said with confidence to have occurred before the postwar era, Franz Kafka's private declaration of affinity with Kleist in 1913 may be taken as a convenient date from which to mark his rising importance for the modern age.[8] A further one hundred years later, at the second centenary of his death, Kleist's reputation as one of Germany's greatest dramatists and most original and influential short-story writers is assured.

There are several reasons why Kleist is important for us today. For one thing, there is the intrinsic importance of Kleist's topics — topics such as gender, class, and ethnic wars, terrorism and sacrifice, to mention just a few. Even more striking, Kleist's poetic experiments delve more deeply than almost every other German author of the nineteenth century (with the possible exception of Georg Büchner) into the conflicts, impasses, and potential that emerged from the seismic events occurring around 1800 — from the French Revolution and the birth of constitutional nationalism, through

to the triumphs of secular science and philosophy and the arrival of the new economic order. Kleist's poetic trials do not just expose the shortcomings of political, legal, religious, and academic institutions of his day. They also set out to examine the re-conceptualizations of individual and collective identities that became conceivable at the dawn of modernity: the psychology of national belonging and total warfare, the anti-colonial struggles of ethnic, political, and familial partisanship, the power of propaganda and a press for the masses, the loss of certainty, and the crisis of inner knowledge, feeling, trust, ethics, and justice. Kleist tests the promise of an individual freedom of upward mobility and the displacement of premodern group-identities of estates, professions, and guilds by emphatic assertions[9] of individual authenticity and, with it, the politics and bureaucracies of recognition.[10] In Kleist's literature, as in much of today's literature, the demands of individual recognition are asserted with as much insistence as those of its opposite, the psychology of the insult of a recognition denied that characterizes the narrative stance and the architecture of much of Kleist's prose as well as the diction and architecture of many of his plays. Engaging with the radical twist in Fichte's philosophy of identity that Kleist's friend Adam Müller had proposed in 1804,[11] Kleist's configuration of the interdependence of action and knowledge in all his works penetrates into the very structure of perception — to an inescapable perspectivism of cognitive moments in a fluid world where objects and subjects of perception and desire are constantly moved through time and space.[12] Such a dialectics without resting points and final direction becomes the signature of Kleist's modernity.

Beyond this, Kleist's dramas are certainly of great historical significance. Kleist participated in the revival of interest in classical drama that swept through Germany in the wake of Winckelmann's two treatises on the art of antiquity in 1755 and 1764.[13] Winckelmann's treatises had brought a version of the "querelle des anciens et des modernes" into Germany several decades after the status and originality of ancient art had been passionately debated in the French academy. While the French in that quarrel seemed to have found in favor of the moderns overall, the Germans generally encountered much more difficulty in confirming a straightforward victory of modern over ancient styles of art, or indeed modern over ancient sensibility, even in the program of art propounded under the terms of Weimar Classicism by Goethe and Schiller. Both Goethe and Schiller sought in their dramas the kind of "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" that Winckelmann had exalted when contemplating the art of the ancients. For this same reason, Goethe, though he thought well enough of Kleist to stage Kleist's comedy *Der zerbrochne Krug* in Weimar in 1808, could not wholly approve of the temper of Kleist's writing, later rejecting Kleist's tragedy *Penthesilea* as both too edgy and (to his mind) diseased.[14] In aesthetic terms at least, Kleist did not ratify a practice that cast back to ancient models of art with as much alacrity as it

cast forward in pursuit of new ones. As David Chisholm shows in his article in this volume, this can be seen at the formal level of Kleist dramas. In these works Kleist cultivates a "rhythmic tension between the underlying metrical pattern and its linguistic realization" that admits no underlying harmony of form and content. Since both aesthetic and cultural expectations among German audiences in Kleist's day were geared in the opposite direction, it is perhaps not surprising that his dramas fell on deaf ears during his lifetime. Equally, it is the slow regearing of expectations over the intervening time that allows modern audiences to approach Kleist's dramas with greater understanding.

If in terms of the form of his dramas Kleist opted for the moderns, whatever the moderns would turn out to be, he seems equally in these works to have rejected the noble repose of the ancients in his choice of subject matter. This, too, is of interest to us today. The plays that have a recognizably classical backdrop, such as *Amphitryon* and *Penthesilea*, fail to work up any nostalgia for a past ideal or any ideal conflation of past and present values in the programmatic manner followed by Goethe and Schiller or, say, in the nostalgic visions of the Romantic poet Hölderlin. In *Amphitryon*, for example, the flaws of the god-king Jupiter are compounded both by the fact of his dominance over mortals, in particular the heroine Alkmene, and his failure to unmask himself to them. It is Alkmene, accordingly, who wins our sympathy and stirs our interest.[15] *Penthesilea*, for its part, is nothing short of anticlassical in its manipulation of ancient setting and characters to initiate a notably modern discussion about love — a love that, though only possible because of the social equality of the heroic lovers, ends disastrously because of this same equality. In other dramas, such as *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, Kleist delves deeply into the nature of the freedom of the individual as well as the human desire to bond with others to make community. Are human communities constructed around the capacity to make sacrifices for a broader cause, as David Pan considers in this volume in relation to the denouement of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, which is to say, initially at the level of individual sentiment and sentience and on the basis of a still-committed subjectivity, or is community ultimately generated through legal and physical power following the logic of conquest, as Christian Moser provocatively asks in chapter 5? No journeying back to ancient values will suffice to provide an answer. Instead — as so often with Kleist — we are left with a choice, a choice, when we make it, that dictates how we will go forward into modernity: the self-sacrificing individual not only sows the seeds of community but perhaps also (unwittingly) lays out the program for a future fascist collective; the skeptical individual, who recognizes the limits of autonomous individuality and the compacts with the state the individual contracts, ultimately bequeaths in Moser's reading a disputatious, agonistic version of statist community to posterity — a version of

community constrained by bloodless legality of a kind perhaps not unlike that emerging in Europe today. The pointedness of these questions, as Helmut Schneider observes, suggests, if not requires, a reconception of the body of the collective. Yet, as Schneider also argues, this is a collective no longer bound to the body of the sovereign, whose genealogy, as the play *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* clearly shows, has lost its integrity. The weakening of the dynastic line of the old order, however, has not yet brought about a new political order. Here, as so often, Kleist appears as the denizen of the in-between.

If these conclusions predispose the reader of Kleist's works toward doubt about the future, Kleist may not even allow us untroubled access to a thoroughgoing skepticism. Seán Allan, for example, argues in chapter 4 that views about Kleist's skepticism, often held to be a defining feature of his modernity, may themselves be exaggerated. The skepticism he finds warranted in Kleist's works is directed mainly at the transcendent quality of absolutes. It is the desire for "absolute transcendent knowledge" that Kleist undermines in his plays and stories, according to Allan, not the platform of all knowledge itself.

A complex view therefore emerges in this volume both of Kleist and of the modernity in whose context he is considered. This modernity might be seen to have the following attributes: first, it is not predicated on absolutes but rather on the limitations of all thinking that emerges from them. As the contributors to this volume repeatedly demonstrate, modernity in Kleist's anticipation of it is a paradigm or mind-set that is characterized by the failure of any single ethico-philosophical system to render its own legitimacy from within, that is to say, by the failure of all *metarécits*. Dorothea von Mücke provides exemplary insight into the failure of such a grand narrative in her consideration of the play *Der zerbrochne Krug*.[16] Second, this paradigm or mind-set is reliant for its claim to positivity on discursive formations, even as these appear to lack an ultimate foundation. Third, the paradigm of modernity is characterized by the problem of *homo politicus* — by, as Hannah Arendt has pointed out in many of her writings, a need to sustain action within a moral universe that must at the same time eschew any underlying, structuring "categorical imperative."[17]

If this view of modernity — admittedly informed by postmodernity — is allowed (Ricarda Schmidt challenges such a view of modernity in her article in this volume), then we read Kleist today perhaps more for the quality of the questions he asks than any answers he is seen to provide. In this context, "modernity" must be clearly distinguished from "the modern" and "modernism," like terms that define the preference for the newness of the present moment over elements conserved from the past or schooled over time by the habituation to pastness. Modernity, from this perspective, is not about the new so much as about probing the new and its value. Modernity therefore implies a level of ambivalence toward

newness that lends urgency to the question of the new, without at the same time providing the grounds on which this question can be resolved. In chapter 1 Bernhard Greiner characterizes modernity in these terms in his consideration of what he calls a literary practice of "Zu-Ende-Schreiben" of motifs, discourses, aesthetical conceptions, genres, and myths in Kleist's works.

If this view of Kleist's modernity is granted, Kleist leads us beyond the text and its rhetorical strategies, and beyond the terms of naive representation and its self-assured images of the world, onto a plane of "double thoughts"[18] where consciousness generates its own projections and simultaneously signals awareness of them. Wolfgang Kayser was the first critic who intimated the existence of this dual level of consciousness in Kleist's stories. The narrator of the stories, he observed in an important essay published in 1958,[19] does not stand above the narration but becomes a part of it. This does not just mean that we do not know the views of the author, who disappears from the text altogether; it also means that the narrator merges with any interpretation that can be gleaned from the narrated events. Put another way, the narrator stands not on the side of the writer but of the reader. From a modern perspective, this is tantamount to saying (although Kayser does not yet say it) that Kleist established the preconditions for the hermeneutic circle — the idea that no understanding of isolated parts of a text is possible without reference to the whole text, but, equally, that the understanding of the whole text drives understanding of its parts and can never be separated from it. In the skeptical, postmodern version of the hermeneutic circle, a pattern of references is engaged when textual interpretation occurs such that the reader is never able to escape the terms of her own reading. It is the presence of the hermeneutic circle at key moments in Kleist's narratives that explains the appeal of his stories for us today. It equally suggests that the narratives might have been the catalyst for the upsurge of interest in Kleist as an author, especially in the postwar period immediately predating the emergence of postmodernism.

In this context, the narratives are often considered the key to Kleist's importance as a writer. Jeffrey High, for example, sees Kleist's stories as marking a turning point in the history of the novella. With their appearance, he argues, "the German novella of modernity achieved its signature 'crisis' voice regarding thematic psychological, political-critical, and anti-metaphysical fields." As Peter Horn points out, this crisis could not fail to signal distance from the popular literature of the time. Thus while Kleist was made aware of the public taste for chivalric stories during his stay in Würzburg, he was to parody this type of literature in the story "Das Bettelweib von Locarno," deploying the device of a ghost that never properly appears. The story is accordingly moved by an unknown force that lays siege to conscious awareness: "ein gespenstisches etwas Anderes schaut

uns an, wir fühlen uns angeschaut, aber wir können es nicht sehen. . . . Wir erleben uns als einer durchaus anderen Gewalt gegenüber machtlos. Unser Blick kann dem Blick dieses Anderen nie begegnen. Dieser Effekt ist der Effekt des Gesetzes, dem wir immer schon unterworfen sind." For Anette Horn, a similar intent can be observed in "Die heilige Cäcilie oder die Gewalt der Musik," a story that fails to affirm the transcendent "power" of music alluded to in its title. As she notes in chapter 14: "Das religiöse wie das naturwissenschaftliche Erklärungsmuster bleiben unzulänglich, während die Sphinx schweigt." Andreas Gailus, probing the mystery of Kleist's narratives and how they conclude, identifies a "double ending" to the story "Der Findling." "Der Findling," he argues in chapter 15, does not just finish with a horrific ending but pushes beyond the horror — the breaking of Nicolo's skull by his foster-father Piachi — to evince a moment of "supreme satisfaction." This moment comes about, he argues, because of "the confrontation between two dimensions of speech: between the propositional *content* of a sentence, and the assertoric *force* whereby a speaker affirms and endorses this content in uttering it." Peter Barton views the kind of disjunction postulated by Gailus between "assertion" and "proposition" as a key feature of the operation of the text itself. In chapter 13 he considers how instances of textual discordance in the story "Die Marquise von O. . ." stand for and "mask" the psychic situation of the main character herself, whose need to generate knowledge of her own situation — in Lacanian terms, as the *sujet supposé savoir* — expresses itself in the desire to suppress knowledge, the desire precisely *not* to know. Barton investigates the hysterical discourse that arises from this suppression of knowledge and the desire not to know.

If, then, Kleist uncovers the erotic attachments and fetishism that stalk the desire to know, what of knowledge itself, what of the epistemological project introduced to the world by Immanuel Kant that famously resulted in a crisis for the young Kleist and, on many accounts, led to his decision to become a writer? Does the project of knowledge-through-reason associated with an era of Enlightenment culminating in the critical philosophy of Kant also fail in Kleist's eyes? Or can such a project, as Seán Allan argues, be salvaged through some other form of inquiry? Wolf Kittler is one contributor who considers an alternative to the view that the project of knowledge-through-reason, as discussed by Kleist, necessarily fails. Kittler attempts to rehabilitate this knowledge project with reference to mathematics, countering along the way the standard orthodoxy (as argued by Paul de Man) that Kleist knew no mathematics or was bad at it. Kittler shows not only that Kleist commanded knowledge of mathematics but that his discussion of the inner center of gravity of the puppet in his late essay "Über das Marionettentheater" follows mathematical theorizing of space in application to physical movement in his own day almost to the letter. Kittler suggests not only that Kleist took seriously the conceit

of the puppet that achieves grace but that grace itself, as put forward in the essay, might ultimately in Kleist's understanding be measurable and therefore materially attainable.

If this is the case, the theatrical practice arising in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which attempted to evince spiritual transcendence through physical movement, can indeed be placed alongside similar presentiments in Kleist's essay. In chapter 16 Jonathan Marshall discusses not only the dolls, robots, and puppets of puppet theaters of this time but also theories of biomechanical movement propounded by parapsychologists, which was subsequently evinced in live performance through actors under hypnosis. These theories appear consistent with the principle of what Marshall calls Kleist's "übermarionette." As he notes, "in these and other aesthetic practices, Kleist's elusive 'Schwerpunkt' or 'center of gravity' within which the harmonious spiritual body and soul might be balanced has been replaced by a rhythmic oscillation of nervous impulses, subconscious responses, and etheric perceptions."

Notwithstanding these intimations about the programming of perfect movement, the goal of transcendence, as the interpolated stories of the narcissistic ephebe and the fencing bear in the essay suggest, does remain elusive. This being so, an alternative might be found in the discursive practice of "Zu-Ende-Schreiben," as Bernhard Greiner argues. We might read Herr C.'s remarks at the end of "Über das Marionettentheater" in such a light. Not transcendence itself, then, but its narration, and not the grace of God, but how we imagine and "complete" it through a final act of writing:

> Mithin, sagte ich ein wenig zerstreut, müßten wir wieder von dem Baum der Erkenntnis essen, um in den Stand der Unschuld zurückzufallen?
>
> Allerdings, antwortete er; das ist das letzte Kapitel von der Geschichte der Welt.[20]

Notes

[1] Two, if the "distorted" première of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* in Graz in 1804, which Kleist himself did not know about, is discounted. See William Reeve, *Kleist on Stage, 1804–1987* (Kingston, ON, Canada: McGill-Queens UP, 1993), 8.

[2] *Heinrich von Kleists gesammelte Schriften*, 3 vols., ed. Ludwig Tieck (Berlin: Georg Riemer, 1826).

[3] Otto Brahm, *Das Leben Heinrichs von Kleist* (Berlin: E. Fleischel, 1911).

[4] Wilhelm Herzog, *Heinrich von Kleist, sein Leben und sein Werk* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1911).

[5] Heinrich Meyer-Benfey, *Kleists Leben und Werke* (Göttingen: Hapke, 1911).

[6] Georg Minde-Pouet, *Heinrich von Kleist: Seine Sprache und sein Stil* (Weimar: E. Felber, 1897).

[7] Reinhold Steig, *Heinrich von Kleists Berliner Kämpfe* (Berlin and Stuttgart: W. Spemann, 1901). Ricarda Schmidt provides an additional perspective on the rediscovery of Kleist in the period after 1880 in her consideration of the reception history of Kleist's play *Penthesilea* in chapter 9 of this volume.

[8] In a letter to Felice Bauer on 10 February 1913: "Gestern habe ich Dir nicht geschrieben, weil es über *Michael Kohlhaas* zu spät geworden ist (kennst Du ihn? Wenn nicht, dann lies ihn nicht! Ich werde Dir ihn verlesen!), den ich bis auf einen kleinen Teil, den ich schon vorgestern vorgelesen hatte, in einem Zug gelesen habe. Wohl schon zum zehnten Male. Das ist eine Geschichte, die ich mit wirklicher Gottesfurcht lese." Quoted in John M. Grandin: *Kafka's Prussian Advocate: A Study of the Influence of Heinrich von Kleist on Franz Kafka* (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1987), 14.

[9] The violence of assertion has repeatedly attracted interest in the scholarship of the last hundred years; see chapter 15, Andreas Gailus's contribution to this volume.

[10] See Charles Taylor: *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994).

[11] Adam Müller, *Lehre vom Gegensatz* (1804).

[12] For an impressive attempt to trace such a poetics of perspective perception and projection see Nancy Nobile's reading of *Die Familie Schroffenstein,* chapter 2 in this volume.

[13] Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (1755); Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (1764).

[14] As Hilda Brown points out, Goethe's negative assessment of Kleist proved to be tremendously damaging to him in the long run (see chapter 8 in this volume).

[15] Nancy Nobile views Kleist's capacity to engage the emotions of the viewer as a noteworthy aspect of the play *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, "for he requires that we see something other, and more beautiful, than what presents itself to our sight on the stage" (chapter 2 in this volume).

[16] As von Mücke notes in her essay: "an optimistic Enlightenment affirmation of this change as progress toward rationalization is rendered considerably more complicated through the elaborate play with both meta-historical framing devices and concrete historical references" (chapter 3).

[17] See especially Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1958); and Hannah Arendt, *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1982).

[18] This is a term borrowed from J. M. Coetzee. See his essay "Confession and Double Thoughts: Tolstoy, Rousseau, Dostoevsky (1985)," in *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*, ed. David Attwell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1992), 251–93.

[19] Wolfgang Kayser, "Kleist als Erzähler," in *Die Vortragsreise* (Berlin: Francke, 1958), 169–83.

[20] *Heinrich von Kleists gesammelte Schriften*, 2:345.

I. The Plays