INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI®

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

The Bodies of Kleist

Aspects of Corporeality in his Dramatic Works

by

Matthew Pollard

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of German Studies
McGill University
Montreal, Canada

October, 1997

Abstract

This dissertation examines the representations of the body in the completed dramatic works of Heinrich von Kleist (1777-1811). While taking into account the psychoanalytical and philosophical approaches to Kleist, this project has Heiner Müller's words as its point of departure: that the theater represents the collision of ideas with the body. The forces of power, gender and authority leave their traces of this collision on the bodies of his characters, whose metaphorical and literal falls, wounds and recoveries speak their own gestural language.

This study is organized on the principle of Kleist's use of genre designation, the approximate chronological order of his plays, and the representation of the body. Chapter one focuses on *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Der zerbrochne Krug*, and *Amphitryon* and the notion of bodily authenticity and integrity; chapter two, on *Die Hermannsschlacht* and *Penthesilea*, looks at the spectacle of violence and its effect on the body mobilized by emotional extremity; the third chapter, on Kleist's most celebrated works, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* and *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, examines aspects of gender and vulnerability. The conclusion views his essay "Über das Marionettentheater" not as a key to understanding his works, but rather as a culmination of them, and investigates Kleist's writing on the wounded body and its connection to grace.

Résumé

Ce travail examine la représentation du corps dans l'oeuvre dramatique de Heinrich von Kleist (1777-1811). Tout en tenant compte des approches psychoanalytiques et philosophiques, ce projet prend, comme point de départ, le mot de Heiner Müller qui dit que le théatre représente une collision des idées et du corps. Les forces du pouvoir, de la sexualité et de l'authorité laissent les traces de leur confrontation dans le corps de ses personnages, dont les chutes, littérales et métaphoriques, les blessures et les rétablissements ont leur propre gestualité.

Cette étude s'organise selon le principe de désignation générique de Kleist, suivant l'ordre chronologique de ses pièces, ainsi que celui de la représentation du corps. Le premier chapitre entreprend l'analyse de la notion d'authenticité et d'integrité corporelle dans *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Der zerbrochne Krug*, et *Amphitryon*; le chapitre deux, traitant *Die Hermannsschlacht* et *Penthesilea*, examine le spectacle de la violence et ses effets sur le corps mobilisé par l'emotion extrème; le chapitre trois porte sur les oeuvres les plus célèbres de Kleist, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* et *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, et se penche sur les questions du genre et de la vulnérabilité. La conclusion présente son essai *Über das Marionnettentheater* non pas comme la clef qui permet de comprendre son oeuvre, mais plutôt comme la culmination de celle-ci, et questionne la pensée de Kleist en ce qui concerne le corps blessé et sa liaison avec la grâce.

Acknowledgements

For his support and perceptive criticism over great expanses of time and distance, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Paul Peters. Paul's acutely sensitive readings of my work helped me understand that the best criticism should embody the fire which does not consume a great work, but illuminates it.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of the following agencies: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (1994-1995) and the Quebec Ministry of International Cooperation and Cultural Affairs, which funded a 1995 travel grant to Munich. I wish to thank the Department of Germanic Studies (UVic), whose members provided me with full access to office support during the final stages of writing. I am also thankful to Frédérique Arroyas for her elegant translation of the thesis abstract into French. Finally, I could not have even begun this project without the concrete financial support as well as guidance and encouragement of the faculty, students and staff of the McGill Germanic Studies community.

Professor Klaus Kanzog (Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität, München) has shown me great generosity of spirit, by freely giving me his time and advice during and after my stay in Munich. Professor W.C. Reeve (Queen's University) introduced me to the world of Heinrich von Kleist in 1986 and has been a friend and guide to me ever since. I hope that they see my tribute to their work here in mine.

From my parents, Chris and Sunny Pollard, and my sister Lindsey, I have learned about teaching and learning. To my family, who gave me many books and believed in me when I would simply not stop reading, and helped me in more ways than I can recount, I offer my heartfelt thanks. My grandfather, Mr. R.G. Trout, and his wife Francy have financially encouraged my studies with unconditional patience and enthusiasm.

And now to acknowledge my wife Justine and our children, Jessica and Eric, who have lived so kindly with my peculiar passions and my more than occasional absences. I could not have completed this work without their keeping me in balance or without Justine making numberless sacrifices for my dream of a Ph.D. I dedicate this thesis, which represents more than anything I have ever written the "Schmutz und Glanz meiner Seele", to them with gratitude and love.

A Note on Editions and Abbreviations

Unless otherwise noted, all citations of Kleist plays and their variants are designated by bracketed verse numbers within the text and are taken from volume I of the following edition: Kleist, Heinrich von. *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*. Ed. Helmut Sembdner. 2 vols. Munich: Carl Hanser, 1994. Citations from variants are labelled as such (**Variant**) and are cited by page number. Citations of his letters and prose works are designated by page numbers in parentheses and are taken from volume II of this edition.

In addition to the standard edition of the text above, I will refer to the commentary of the following edition: Kleist, Heinrich von. *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe in vier Bänden*. Ed. Ilse-Marie Barth, Klaus Müller-Salget, Stefan Ormanns, Hinrich Seeba. Frankfurt a.M.: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1987 -. Bracketed references to the commentaries of the *Klassikerausgabe* will be designated by the abbreviation *KA* and will be followed by the volume and page number.

Quotations from Helmut Sembdner's standard reference works on Kleist's reception (*Heinrich von Kleists Nachruhm*. Ed. Helmut Sembdner. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1984) and biography (*Heinrich von Kleists Lebensspuren*. Ed. Helmut Sembdner. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1992) are abbreviated respectively as *NR* and *LS*, are bracketed within the text, and are supplemented by the item number.

The Bodies of Kleist

Aspects of Corporeality in his Dramatic Works

Table of Contents

Introduction

"Bei Kleist sind die *Dinge* groß, nicht die Worte".

Theodor Fontane (200)

As Stephen Vizinczey remarks, Heinrich von Kleist possesses one of the characteristics of a true genius: he can be deeply and painfully shocked by an idea (160). In a letter concerning his confrontation with *der Kantischen Philosophie*, he writes to his fiancée Wilhelmine von Zenge of his wound in the following words: "Ach, Wilhelmine, wenn die Spitze dieses Gedanken Dein Herz nicht trifft, so lächle nicht über einen anderen, der sich tief in seinem heiligsten Innern davon verwundet fühlt" (634). Kleist's body encounters the sharp edge of thought in an explosive moment of recognition. Although described as a pivotal moment in Kleist's psychological development as a writer, this *Kantkrise* is also remarkable for its physical effect, as a bodily reaction to a constellation of ideas. Yet Kleist was born and remained a child of the Enlightenment. Ruth Angress' article on his literary turning away from the Enlightenment notes "...daß Kleist ... die Ansichten der Aufklärung sozusagen ausprobierte, vielleicht, um durch Neuformulierung zu der allmählichen Verfertigung einer Weltanschauung zu gelangen" ("Kleists Abkehr..." 113). That Kleist quoted and parodied the literature and philosophy of the Enlightenment is evident. What is also evident is that Kleist's confrontation with ideas relocates the apparent division between the mind and the body. Kleist's career as a writer was initially grounded on the "Idee der vernünftigen Durchsetzbarkeit des Anrechts auf Glück", as expressed in his 1799 *Aufsatz, den sicheren Weg des Glückes zu finden*. However, there exists a second, but no less crucial grounding model, upon which the journey to fulfilment loses balance and momentum: "das anthropologische Modell vom mit einem ursprünglichen Schaden ... behafteten Anfang", which leaves its trace on the damaged body (Neumann, "Das Stocken der Sprache..." 13). This moral and intellectual crisis leaves the imprint of a fall or descent. This crisis, writes Hans Mayer, metaphorically implies "gleichsam ein Straucheln, Niederfallen, just an der Stelle, wo sich auch ... der Übergang von der Aufklärung zum Sturm und Drang ... die klassische Rekonstruktion vollzogen hätten" (17). As an aspect of this oscillation between Enlightenment and Romanticism, Kleist was a "Grenzgänger" in the literal and literary

sense of the word. By moving beyond established categories (of gender[1] or morality, for example) or fixed narratorial positions, Kleist's works continuously demand that the reader reassess his or her understanding of existing boundaries. A primary site of such questioning is the body. The subject's fall into consciousness, for example, transgresses and imposes upon corporal integrity, whose violation mirrors the cost of knowledge. One such boundary of knowledge is the body in Kleist's dramatic works, whose corporeality confronts the physicality of language and of other bodies.

The topos of embodiment can already be seen in one exemplary metaphor taken from his correspondence; this case presents the other's body as object: "Denn da ich Dich selbst nicht sehen und beurteilen kann, was bleibt mir übrig, als aus Deinen Briefen auf Dich zu schließen? Denn das glaube ich tun zu dürfen, indem ich Deine Worte nicht bloß für Worte, sondern für Deinen Schattenriß halte" (609). The contours of the written only partially replace the substantiality of his correspondent's absent body. As a writing subject, Kleist fantasized about tearing his heart out to present it to his reader, or of writing tears as a gesture of higher, more meaningful language. It is the shadow of the body, mediated and textualized through the written form of his dramas, whose silhouette will be traced in this study. This dissertation looks at the imaginary world of his dramas by analyzing the thematization and contexts of the body. As a significant and necessary element of all theater -- the physical manifestation of an action through live characters on stage -- the sensate body throughout literary history has also been seen as a central component of an aesthetic in its capacity for feeling and judgement. The literary and aesthetic works of Kleist, in which the body is so central to his literary and philosophical understanding of the world, constitute a shift in the relationship between the body and the development of modern subjectivity. As Gerhard Neumann states, "Das Werk Kleists spielt in der Geschichte des menschlichen Körpers, die seit der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts wesentlich auch zur problematischen Geschichte der Identität des neuzeitlichen Subjekts wird, eine zentrale Rolle" (""...Der Mensch..." 274). Neumann advances Kleist scholarship by linking his depiction of the body, as it sees and is seen, to the problem of subjectivity and of self-representation. But this subject, as the second chapter's discussion of *Penthesilea* will show, exists in a precarious state of architectural

suspension, internalized within the body by the metaphor of the arch[2]. If, as Heiner Müller states, the theater is quintessentially about the conflict between ideas and the body (Müller qtd. in Teichmann 1), it is time to look closely at the transformed, wounded, and dematerialized body of Kleist's dramas.

Because of the specificity of drama, which both visually shows the actualization of events and bodies and tells of the events or mental states indirectly depicted through teichoscopia or reports, the present study confines itself to the representation of the body in his completed dramatic works. Kleist's questioning of boundaries is seen in his theatrical and prose writing practice, by which his narrative works and the instances of narration in his dramas both possess a theatrical quality. However, although additional and occasional reference is to be made to his letters and short prose essays, a full treatment of his prose fiction, as a separate genre, belongs in either a longer or a separate monograph. On the one hand, narrative fiction poses questions of representation requiring a different set of critical tools, while on the other, considerations of scope compel me to forego a totalizing examination of all manifestations of the body in Kleist's works[3].

To examine this aspect of his work is to bring back the body into Kleist research, which has traditionally appeared as a metaphysical head without a torso, with its dominant focus on his *Kantkrise* and his radical epistemological skepticism as modes of decoding his texts. Many critics, among them John Ellis, have argued convincingly that Kleist moved beyond this change in his mental landscape, which had chronologically occurred before his attempts at writing literature. This crisis may be viewed as an unsuitable point of departure for examining a body of work which demands a differentiated, refined and constantly shifting concept of interpretation. In addition to the speculative nature of the philosophical approach -- since Kleist rarely mentioned any philosopher directly -- the influence of psychological or psychoanalytical approaches has generally obscured the physical and physiological aspects of Kleist's bodily landscape. For example, Ursula Mahlendorf's article on Penthesilea's "wounded self" as experienced through the ritually inflicted "shameful imperfection of her breast" (255) fails to mention the series of wounds inflicted on her by Achilles during the course of the drama[4].

However, recent approaches to Kleist may invoke a feminist critique of his depiction of gender, psychoanalytic approaches in terms of Lacanian analysis, and new historicist or material methodologies, which may on the one hand be a testimony to the richness of Kleist's works, but on the other an imposing and extensive body of scholarship for a writer on Kleist trying to map out new territory[5].

In view of the controversies and diverging interpretations surrounding Kleist, it is not uncommon that twentieth-century Kleist monographs begin with the delineation of opposing camps. The following offers a brief summary of these positions. Walter Müller-Seidel, for example, noted in 1961 that between the world wars the "existentielle Literaturwissenschaft" and the "völkisch-politische Richtung" took Kleist as their own (*Versehen und Erkennen* 3). Wolf Kittler, almost three decades later, distinguishes between two traditions in Kleist scholarship: those who find "ihre eigenen politischen, ja militärischen Ziele bei Kleist unvermittelt", and whose favoured text is *Die Hermannsschlacht*, and those who focus on the existential situation of Kleist's works, who in turn favour *Penthesilea* (*Geburt* 13). Hence the political agenda stands in opposition to the philosophical and aesthetic. Kittler's distinction between what appears to be pre-war and post-war Kleist reception does tend to minimize broader divisions in Kleist criticism, a critical idiom which not only embodies an old quarrel (or collusion) between art and politics, but also illustrates chronologically how the post-war existential perception of Kleist now merges and contrasts with more contemporary methods of approaching his work. Hilda Brown's monograph on *Penthesilea* describes a recent division, for example, as "a complete polarization of methods of approach" between those who place Kleist in historical context and those who "pursue forms of the "werkimmanent" approach which often create the disturbing impression that Kleist wrote his works in a complete vacuum" (11). In other words, the image of Kleist has progressed from what one may loosely label the existential Kleist to Kittler's historical reconstruction of a mobilized and nationalist Kleist.

Regardless of the method or theory through which one chooses to engage Kleist's works, the body is undeniably present in his texts and is therefore open to definition and interpretation. Instead of viewing his plays through a fixed prism of an authoritative

theory, the following chapters will allow the body to reveal itself in its different manifestations in each of the dramas; such various manifestations in each case may call forth different critical tools which seem more appropriate than others. Amphitryon's vision of self-fragmentation, for example, lends itself more to a Lacanian analysis than a materialist reading. I do not intend to let the body "speak for itself" by simply itemizing and paraphrasing its appearance as a visual sign or metaphor, although the absence of a thorough treatment of Kleist's body imagery may occasionally require me to do so. Bringing this deployment of the body into focus also implies an engagement with and a critique of the corpus of literary scholarship. This study will productively and selectively incorporate scholarship employing a variety of perspectives and methods in order to see how Kleist's dramas intersect with questions of power, gender, and authority. But a grand theory on the body of Kleist will have to remain implicitly expressed, to be derived by the reader after confronting the many bodies of Kleist in the following chapters.

While extending the body on the one hand through a series of substitutions (such as armour in *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* or the diadem in *Amphitryon*), Kleist also reintroduces and reemphasizes the presence of the body on the other, through the infliction of the wound or gestural effects. All of Kleist's completed dramas (*Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Amphitryon*, *Der zerbrochne Krug*, *Die Hermannsschlacht*, *Penthesilea*, *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*) begin with, or have as their backdrop, an act of bodily crisis. Even the ten scenes of the published fragment *Robert Guiskard*, excluded from this study due to its fragmentary nature, have as its crisis the concealment of the plague affecting the ruler; his weakening political power reflects the physical degeneration of the sovereign. In *Amphitryon*, the body doubles of Amphitryon and Sosias, Jupiter and Merkur, appropriate the name and bodily identities of their victims and bring into question male "authority". The Germanic nation of *Die Hermannsschlacht* is a body politic invaded by the Romans. The invaders initiate a cycle of aggression which turns ultimately against them in the private revenge of Thusnelda and the public liquidation of the Romans and their allies. No Kleist drama avoids mentioning or depicting war directly or indirectly, in that each play presents it through

teichoscopia or oral reports (characteristic of *Penthesilea*), or through representative individuals engaging in single combat (as seen in *Die Hermannsschlacht*). In *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, his very first published drama, war among two different branches of the same family tree is provoked by the discovery of a mutilated body.

The parallel amputations of the two fingers from the dead heir in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* instigates what Hinrich Seeba labels the "Kriminalfall", which subsequently promotes the "Sündenfall des Verdachts" in this analytical tragedy. Kleist reinvokes the theme of bodily injury and superstition in *Der zerbrochne Krug*, a drama that similarly employs the analytical method. The actual circumstances surrounding both the death of the heirs and Adam's fall occur temporally before the dramatic action and are brought to light at each play's conclusion. Achilles' and vom Strahl's initial encounters with Penthesilea and Käthchen respectively are incorporated into the expository scenes of narration, in which Achilles' wounded arm is bound and Theobald outlines vom Strahl's alleged criminal act of seduction (which caused Käthchen's leap from the window) before the opening tribunal scene. In these works mentioned above, Kleist's placement of the wound at such a temporal moment presents an interpretative challenge, since for example, Adam's highly visible injuries visually dominate the first scene and motivate the comic irony of situation. That the wounds of Homburg and vom Strahl, superficially insignificant, represent more than the insistent phrase "Nichts von Bedeutung!" (379) deployed by Hohenzollern to delimit the wound's significance, will eventually become clear.

Although Homburg's wounding (II/1) takes place at a later point in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, all these incidents have in common their banishment to a spatial dimension beyond the boundaries of the stage. While the figures of Weimar Classicism, such as Iphigenie, can be seen as bodies representing ideas, Kleist's anti-Iphigenie Penthesilea is above all a body subject to desire and violence. One could argue, with respect to Schiller's *Maria Stuart*, that extreme physical violence on stage would violate the dictates of good taste and that Maria's execution (or the liquidation of Septimus, Ventidius and Aristan of *Die Hermannsschlacht*) need not be depicted. In this respect, Kleist's dramatic practice of occasionally effacing the body seems in conformity with

convention. On the other hand, Kleist did allow a number of inappropriate bodies to grace his plays, ranging from a half-dressed Elector, Käthchen's near-nakedness under the elderberry bush, and lastly Ursula, who according to the stage directions of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* throws a child's amputated finger onto the center of the stage. Michel Chaouli's outstanding article on *Penthesilea* argues that this drama challenges the Kantian aesthetic and enacts an aesthetic of disgust. *Penthesilea* "calls into question the very categories of taste" (125) at both the gustatory and the aesthetic level. Kleist's selective strategy of bodily representation in these cases is neither inconsistent nor indiscriminate. His double strategy effaces the body momentarily from the action on the one hand, while on the other it reinserts the body in his deployment of metaphor and description. Although in most cases particular incidents of bodily wounding are relegated to the offstage, *Die Hermannsschlacht* offers an exception in the public, sacramental aspect of Hermann's wounding by Fust, while the dismemberment of Hally and Thusnelda's displaced destruction of Ventidius' body occur removed from the spectator's gaze.

With these instances of theatrical absence and presence in mind, the following section offers a brief characterization of the gaps and closures within the literature on the Kleistian body. Since an introductory general account of Kleist scholarship, in view of its sheer quantity, would be necessarily superficial and by no means complete, my project closely reads Kleist's theoretical and dramatic works and incorporates in the discussion of each play an ongoing review and critique of the relevant secondary literature. For example, John Ellis, in his groundbreaking study on *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* (1970) noted then two hundred and fifty entries on this drama alone. A continual and massive growth in Kleist scholarship over the last three decades exemplifies Kleist's durability as an object of literary study or performance. In connection to the state of research on *Der zerbrochne Krug* up to 1989, Dirk Grathoff could already speak of an almost insurmountable amount of scholarship ("Der Fall des Krugs..." 295).

As Terry Eagleton remarks, the original formulation of the term "aesthetic" brings about a discourse of the sensual, which includes not just art objects, but also "the whole region of human perception and sensation" (13). In Kleist's works there is no act of

bodily representation more spectacular than the cannibalistic consumption of Achilles by Penthesilea. Where the process of mental representation and aesthetic distance ends, there the body begins. The return of the body (*Wiederkehr des Körpers*, in the words of Kamper and Wulf) to the discourse of literary criticism reinscribes that which had already been present in the text, but had nonetheless been effaced by an "Abstraktionsprozeß des Lebens mit seiner Distanzierung, Diziplinierung, Instrumentalisierung des Körperlichen als Grundlage des historischen Fortschritts" (Kamper and Wulf, "Die Parabel..." 9). This process of abstraction has also been at work in the development of a literary criticism which seeks legitimation through a more scientific discourse.

The older literature on the body[6] in Kleist's works has neither completely ignored nor fully charted his treatment of the body in crisis. Recent isolated discussions on gender and the body, among them Nutz's discussion of *Penthesilea*'s (mis)reading the senses ("Lektüre der Sinne") and Hermand's critique of gender-based work on the same play (1995) have recently appeared. What does generally characterize the return of the body to Kleist criticism is an increased interest in *Penthesilea*: aside from the two articles above, Chaouli's essay on gustatory and literary taste in the drama (1996) contributes to the discussion of motifs that are of particular interest to feminists: Penthesilea's capacity for desire and destruction, or, in the terms of Maggie Kilgour's monograph, for communion and cannibalism. Penthesilea's role as aggressor can be juxtaposed with Barbara Kennedy's discussion of woman's body in the *Hermannsschlacht*, in which it acts as the real and imagined battleground for two male nation-states. With regard to other scholarship on Kleist's use of body motifs, Margaret Davidson's 1987 article in *Colloquia Germanica* does offer a catalogue of occurences of the hand motif in Kleist's work, but does not go further than asserting its status as a dramatic portent or as an indicator of a character's weakness. William Reeve discusses the specific image of the neck in Kleist's writings (""Mit dem Hals..."), but his mapping of this motif across all of Kleist's works restricts itself to the symbolic role of one specific part of the body.

Since it touches on a theme running through this study, Gerhard Neumann's recent article on "Das Stocken der Sprache und das Straucheln des Körpers" elucidating

three main features of Kleist's world (the lightning flash, the faltering speech and the stumbling body) is particularly useful to this study. Although the dynamic of Kleist's works often relies the conflict "...zwischen "Fall"" and "Gesetz"" (Neumann, "Einleitung..." 9), particularly, for example, in the case of Penthesilea and Amazonian law, the significance of "Fall" in its literal meaning also forms a driving force in Kleist's dramatic works: the "Fallgesetz", the law of gravity that brings his dramas to the brink or to the abyss of catastrophe. "Das Stocken der Sprache und das Straucheln des Körpers" are symptomatic of the loss the subject's center of balance and of his or her existence in a fallen world. This loss of balance occurs in several different ways: the body is "...durch die Diziplin entstellt, durch den Spiegelblick auf das Selbst aus seinem Gleichgewicht gebracht, auf der Suche nach dem Paradies der Grazie und der Freiheit" (Neumann, "Stocken der Sprache..." 25). Despite his specific echoes of Kleist's marionette essay, Neumann's understanding of the body includes the significant fall, a component in nearly all of Kleist's dramatic work. Indeed, in Ilse Graham's view, "[e]verywhere, we have come upon a resounding fall placed at the beginning of the respective drama or novella" (*Word into Flesh* 168). This study reads the sight and siting of the falling and fallen body in Kleist, rather than interpreting the philosophical or theological origins of the human fall into consciousness.

Although "[t]here can scarcely be any other writer", as noted by Hilda Brown, "whose dramatic ventures are more diverse than Kleist's" (13), this study divides Kleist's completed dramatic works into three configurations. These three chapters are structured partly according to body themes, partly on the basis of Kleist's specific deployment of genre, and finally by their approximate chronology. Kleist, consistently exact and deliberate in his use of genre terminology, described his comedies as "Lustspiele", while defining both *Käthchen* and *Homburg*, and only these works, as "Schauspiele": *Der Prinz von Homburg* has as its subtitle "ein Schauspiel", while *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* is "ein großes historisches Ritterschauspiel". Although not a complete justification in itself, Kleist's own practice of generic signposting seems intent on directing and sometimes disappointing the audience's expectations. Additionally, as argued by Klaus Kanzog ("Kommunikative Varianten..."), Kleist was meticulous in his understanding and use of

terms denoting dramatic genres and would therefore have selected his subtitles with precision and with a view to literary convention (224).

The body theme of the first chapter presents the spectacle of division. The structure of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* concerns the divided body of a family compelled to share a name, but is at war with itself. His two comedies, *Amphitryon* and *Der zerbrochne Krug*, illustrate respectively the problematic of a divided body and a divided consciousness (Jupiter and Amphitryon: two consciousnesses sharing one bodily image) and a divided consciousness in a single body (Adam: both judge and guilty party). The exercise of power, which manifests itself in the deployment of "Gewalt" against Sosias and Ruprecht, both required to present their backs to the rod of punishment, locates itself on the body. Its markings provide the conclusive proof of identity or culpability: Adam's wounds betray him, while Amphitryon, in the least physically violent of Kleist's plays, metaphorically bends his helmet plume in order to lay claim to his defeated and appropriated identity. This identity (in its literal meaning of sameness) is exactly what Adam wishes to deny. When his body is fully reconstructed by the planting of the wig, he is banished temporarily from the community. Kleist's Schroffenstein tragedy, for example, ends with the return of the absent body of evidence: the amputated finger at center stage puts the puzzle of the broken body back together again.

If we accept with Kittler the notion that *Penthesilea* embodies total and cannibalizing love, *Die Hermannsschlacht*, a staged exercise in liberation that could only take place in the theater of Kleist's mind, represents the minus of total hatred. The mobilized and militarized body, armoured for a war of gender or of liberation, finds its site of dissolution or diminishment in the field of battle. Kleist produced his own oft-cited algebraic formula regarding *Penthesilea* and *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, a lead which numerous critics have chosen to follow in their own comparative studies, be they on the aspect of love (Cullen and von Mücke) or an archetypes of femininity (Hubbs). Should one take Kleist's own point of view, itself expressed as a private pronouncement (a letter to Marie von Kleist), as a signposts for a critical, public engagement with the texts? For example, the extent to which Käthchen's capacity for "Hingebung" and Penthesilea's drive to "Handeln" (797) place Penthesilea and Käthchen at opposite poles remains

unclear. Even a cursory reading of each play demonstrates that both figures exhibit both characteristics: "Hingebung" in terms of their obsession with their respective love objects and their accompanying willingness to subject their bodies to extreme suffering, and "Handeln" in their shared capacity to follow their instincts and act according to their desires. Furthermore, the opposition between these two modes is undermined by their will to accept sacrifice and undergo physical suffering, both of which already contain within themselves the element of action. Such are the two most apparent similarities between the two title figures, who are ultimately not as entirely opposed to each other as Kleist, and the critics after him, would have us believe. This second chapter examines two dramas with similar themes and grounds its comparison between *Die Hermannsschlacht* and *Penthesilea* on the state of emergency facing Hermann and Thusnelda and Penthesilea and Achilles, as well as their representations of Thusnelda and Penthesilea.

Nowhere in Kleist does absolute hatred manifest itself to a greater degree than in these two dramas, personified by the inscription of such extreme feeling on the unarmoured male bodies of the beloved Achilles and Ventidius. Aside from textual similarities that are not apparent between *Penthesilea* and *Käthchen*, both dramas enact the collapse of the public into the private. Thusnelda's revenge, for example, nonetheless liquidates a Roman by means other than Hermann's execution of Septimus or Fust's defeat of Varus. Penthesilea is cast out of the Amazon tribe for pursuing Achilles the individual man and not the gender. While the mutual attraction between Penthesilea and Achilles is complicated by the broader context of a war, Hermann instrumentalizes Thusnelda on the home front to aid in the broader conspiracy against the Romans. When both women come to see themselves as betrayed by their suitors, the revenge wrought on the bodies of their victims simultaneously fascinates and repels. Their extreme responses -- the tearing apart of Achilles and Ventidius -- illustrate that the difference between love and hate is a matter of degree of attraction, rather than between kinds of attraction. By comparing parallel scenes and images in these dramas, this chapter will demonstrate that Thusnelda and Penthesilea, rather than Penthesilea and Käthchen, belong to the same constellation.

It would seem at first glance that the third chapter pairing *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* yokes by violence two heterogeneous elements together. However, these works -- the former an all but historical *Ritterschauspiel* and a comedy with serious aspects, the latter a national drama with comical elements (cf. Frye)-- have more ingredients in common than have been investigated by prevailing Kleist scholarship up to this point. These two dramas are paired in this chapter because they have in common their genre, the characters' vulnerability, the wound each male character suffers, and the trope of the duplicated and divided body. The difficulty with this genre classification is that some critics, among them Martini and Klüger, see *Käthchen* as Kleist's third comedy, and for different reasons. Klüger, for example, justifies this argument by noting that along with *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon*, this play "behandelt ... die erotischen Wünsche und Ängste der Männer in ihrem Mißverhältnis zur Gerechtigkeit" ("Die andere Hündin..." 115). The element of interrogation, as seen in the "Verhörsszene", is common to all three dramas, the problem being that these scenes are by no means comical. Martini comments on the "Grundierung" of the play "im Typus des Lustspiels", as a "zugleich unterhaltsames, spannendes und höchst sublimes poetisches Spiel" (428). In terms of form, Kleist did incorporate elements of comedy and tragedy in all his dramatic texts, with the exception of the consistent tone of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and *Penthesilea.* This study nonetheless places his works in a framework of his genre designations and approximate chronology, beginning with the "Trauerspiel" of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and the "Lustspiele" *Amphitryon* and *Der zerbrochne Krug,* followed by the "Drama" of *Die Hermannsschlacht* and the "Trauerspiel" of *Penthesilea*, and ending in a final chapter with his two most complex and differentiated works: the "Schauspiele" of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. After drawing out some theses on the body in the dramas, the conclusion of this study examines his dialogue "Über das Marionettentheater" as a part and product of his dramatic representation of the body.

Endnotes

1. Arnd Bohm's essay on "Die Heilige Cäcilie oder die Gewalt der Musik (eine Legende)" argues, for example, that concepts of androgyny, predicated upon the existence of fixed categories of "masculine" and "feminine" are effectively disrupted by a "crisis of gender" (200). This crisis of categories "manifests itself textually as androgynous realism" (200), the two components of the latter term nonetheless remaining unfixed and changing. The shifting and ambiguous standpoint of the narrator towards gender and power in Kleist's prose works is expressed with particular emphasis in the dramatic figures of Käthchen and Penthesilea.

2. Cf. the words of Prothoe to Penthesilea: "Sinke nicht, / Und wenn der ganze Orkus auf dich drückte! / Steh, stehe fest, wie das Gewölbe steht, / Weil seiner Blöcke jeder stürzen will!" (1347-1350).

3. John Ellis's arguments against an all-encompassing approach apply to this study: "it [is] preferable to give close attention to a moderately small number of important works rather than to try to cover Kleist's whole output -- first, because considerations of space make it impossible to discuss everything if superficiality is to be avoided; and second, because the quality of a critical discussion soon degenerates once there is a sense that everything has to be covered. If a critic begins to say things because he feels that he must say something about everything, rather than because he has something in each case that he wants to say, he will soon lose a sense of what is important and what is not and then begin to judge the usefulness of his statements by progressively lower standards" ("The Character..." 143-144).

4. The absence of the amputated breast has also led Ilse Graham, for example, to assume some deeply embedded flaw in Penthesilea's psyche (cf. chapter two). Mahlendorf misreads the scene in which Penthesilea hopes that her victory over Achilles will wash away "ein[en] Makel mir vom Busen" (1677), that her flawed and wounded sense of self, metaphorized by her missing breast, will be healed (255). The wounded self, however, has a simple and concretely location on Penthesilea's body. After combat with Achilles, as reported in the eighth scene, Prothoe describes how she fell "von dem Stoß ... / Der

ihr die Brust zerriß..." (1478-79) and is wounded literally.

5. Without attempting to propose a complete listing of recent trends, I find the following scholars recently engaging with Kleist exemplary of their approaches. Feminist scholarship includes recent work by Julie Prandi, Helene Cixous and Ruth Klüger; Chris Cullen and Dorothea von Mücke, Anthony Stephens, Helga Gallas, and Ingrid Stipa have approached Kleist by way of Lacan; Wolf Kittler, supported by the early work of Richard Samuel, has placed Kleist in his military-historical context, while W.C. Reeve's comparative approach has read Kleist's protagonists against the backdrop of Machiavellian political theory and provided analyses of themes and motifs common to numerous plays and stories. These works, fully cited in the bibliography, are fundamental to the specific discussions of the dramas.

6. The three following monographs essentially delineate the body's response to psychological states or to utterances. Johannes Bathe's *Die Bewegungen und Haltungen des menschlichen Körpers in Heinrich von Kleists Erzählungen* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1917) statistically catalogues bodily movements without distinguishing among works or contexts; Ditmar Skrotzki's *Die Gebärde des Errötens im Werk Heinrich von Kleists* (Marburg: Elwert, 1961) associates the act of blushing with a psychological state, be it shame or embarassment; Dieter Harlos' *Die Gestaltung psychischer Konflikte einiger Frauengestalten im Werk Heinrich von Kleists: Alkmene, Die Marquise von O..., Penthesilea, Käthchen von Heilbronn.* (Frankfurt a.M., Bern, New York, Nancy: Lang, 1984) examines the relationship between fainting and psychological stress. Much of this kind of scholarship causally links a mental state with a physical effect. A further dualism in Kleist scholarship manifests itself through distinctly metaphysical as opposed to body-centered approaches. To cite one example, Hans Heinz Holz's *Macht und Ohnmacht der Sprache. Untersuchungen zum Sprachverständnis und Stil Heinrich von Kleists* (Frankfurt a.M. and Bonn: Athenäum, 1962) argues that in the drama "Was geschieht, geschieht *als* Sprache" (37) and that "...die Sprache selbst das dramatische Urmotiv Kleistscher Dichtung ist" (91). For a thorough refutation of Kleist scholarhip that trades in fixed external ideas applied to the changing narrative or perceptual conditions depicted in

Kleist's fiction, see John Ellis' chapter on "The Character of Kleist Criticism" in his *Heinrich von Kleist. Studies in the Character and Meaning of his Writings* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

Chapter One

The Fallen and Divided Self:

Die Familie Schroffenstein, Der zerbrochne Krug and *Amphitryon*

GERICHTSRAT. Auf ebnem Boden straucheln, ist ein Scherz,
Ein Fehltritt stürzt vom Gipfel dich herab.

(Goethe, *Die Natürliche Tochter* (1905-06))

Following his Würzburg journey of 1800, Kleist soon undertook the first steps towards a career as an author, culminating in the composition and destruction of his dramatic manuscript *Robert Guiskard* in 1803. What is articulated in the ten-scene fragment is the crisis within the body politic as it takes place within the crumbling natural body of the infected patriarch. As Adam fails to conceal his wounds, so too would Guiskard be ultimately condemned to reveal his lack of physical health and political authority. In the background of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* lies a repressed moment of bodily crisis, the pox, which becomes the infectious illness of mistrust. That this moment is minutely inscribed as a scar on the missing finger of the dead heir, the missing piece of the puzzle which arouses suspicion, implicates the families' fascination with their clan's bodily integrity in their project of mutual extermination. The motif of the falling and fallen body, a visible presence in *Robert Guiskard* embodied by the protagonist's illness, constructs evidence of the "Kriminalfall" in Kleist's first published work, in the absent and mutilated body of Peter. *Robert Guiskard*, in the view of Gerhard Neumann, shows "...schon in seiner Konzeption den Aufbruch selbst als mit dem Kollaps infiziert ... Ist doch die 'Infektion', die 'Infizierung' als Generalmetapher Kleists schlechthin zu verstehen: als das Bild jenes Sündenfalls, dessen Erscheinungsbild die Pest ist, die pandemisch in der Sprache und im Körper wuchert" ("Das Stocken der Sprache..." 26). The first instance of doubleness and fragmentation within the family body is to be seen in "der Stämme Zwietracht" (1668) of *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, which orginates in the inheritance contract and is emblematized by the trace of plague found on the heir's mutilated body. In this sense, the corruption of the word and the body herald the downfall of the family body.

Die Familie Schroffenstein

Although relatively ignored by his contemporaries and its later critics, *Die Familie Schroffenstein* is a justifiable point of departure for these studies, for any longer account of Kleist's dramas should take into account his first works, regardless of the diverging critical understandings or aesthetic evaluations of them. Nor should one take Kleist's own words to the effect that *Die Familie Schroffenstein* is "eine elende Scharteke" (731) at face value, although past and present critics have recognized the play's strengths and weaknesses (cf. *KA* I 541 - 565)[1]. Along with *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, *Die Familie Schroffenstein* was the only play publicly performed in his lifetime (Seeba, "Der Sündenfall..." 110). This drama not only chronologically marks the beginning of Kleist's public literary activity, but also contains themes and images that would surface in various forms throughout his later works; therefore "it is an important document in the study of the author's development because of the boldness of its conception and the peculiar Kleistian vigor of its idiom" (Hubbs, "The Concept of Fate..." 339). One would have to agree with Günther Blöcker's view, that *Die Familie Schroffenstein* is "...eine Mustersammlung Kleistscher Schlüsselmotive und Lieblingsmetaphern" (qtd. in Harms 25). While some of these motifs (such as mistrust of the senses) have already been treated by other critics and will be examined in the following analysis, a second intriguing aspect of this tragedy has been relatively neglected by previous critics. This aspect, the alternating dominance of senses and sensuality, is entwined with Kleist's presentation of bodily experience.

Nowhere in his other dramatic works, with the possible exception of *Penthesilea*, does Kleist present a fictional world so engorged with the simultaneous desire for and revulsion against sensual experience, a desire for sensation at odds with what Walter Muschg called a terror of the world ("Erschreckung vor der Welt"). Such a double-bind of opposing impulses is clear from the play's outset, in which the ritual of communion, traditionally a sign of togetherness between a Christian God and His family, explodes outward into a cannibalistic hatred of another family. This instrumentalization of ritual is expressed by Rupert's command to his skeptical wife: "Würge / Sie [the enemy]

betend" (39), a contradictory combination of verbal and physical action as simultaneous and reconcilable acts. "Doch nichts mehr von Natur" (41) are Rupert's words after the (per)version of holy Communion, a metaphorical consumption of blood and body which accompanies the desire to utterly erase and incorporate the enemy: " - Sag ich dürste / Nach sein und seines Kindes Blute, hörst du? / Nach seines Kindes Blute" (93-95). The thirst for blood, blood itself a sign of familial affiliation, evokes the capacity of one side to consume the other, to render it identical and maintain its self-identity. The extinction of the other branch, in the words of Gerhard Gönner, effects the aggressor's self-definition: "Einen praktikablen Begriff vom Selbst findet eine solche Vorstellungsweise nur über eine metaphorische Instrumentalisierung der biologischen Familienbande, d.h. des Blutes" (Gönner 62).

However, such bloodlust is complicated by an opposing aesthetics of disgust: to drink the blood of an enemy -- even metaphorically -- is to restore one's sense of bodily integrity; to consume, touch or smell what in normal circumstances is socially sanctioned sustenance corrupts the body. A sense of smell pervades the opening scenes, in which Rupert fantasizes about the "Gestank" of his enemies' corpses (72), while his messenger to Sylvester claims that his enemy's castle stinks of murderers (682). As for gustatory taste, the Schroffensteiner of Warwand are obsessed with the omnipresence of poison. Agnes, for example, repeats with conviction the rumour that her brother Philipp had been poisoned (455), while Gertrude suggests that Sylvester's vomiting fit had its origin in a bottle of preserved pineapples, a gift (also in the German sense of the word "Gift") brought by the Rossitz branch (1151). When it is established that food from his own wife preceded his illness, Gertrude states: " -- Drehen freilich / Läßt alles sich" (1171-1172). Thus this turning around, this inversion, defines food as bringing not spiritual or physical nourishment, but death. Drinking, eating, breathing: all these life-sustaining biomechanical functions are seen to have turned traitor against the body. Ottokar, according to Gertrude, may proffer like a snake the poisoned apple (1111ff), an image of fallen Paradise that Hinrich Seeba characterizes as the original sin of suspicion, "der Sündenfall des Verdachts".

Of particular import in this strategy of inversion is the employment of water to

achieve differing effects. Water is initially not presented as a positive element: the heir, whose body precipitated the crisis, drowned in a river, and as part of the symbiosis between sexuality and injury, the river water into which Johann plunges mingles with his blood. However, the water at the spring retains its idyllic and idealistic flavour. The spring at which Ottokar and Agnes meet, a form of *Liebesgrotte*, had been the site of a baptism: "Da schöpfte / Ich [Ottokar] eine Hand voll Wasser aus dem Quell, / Benetzte dir die Stirn, die Brust, und sprach..." (1264-1266). Ottokar's act of naming does not prevent Agnes' eventual enclosure into the ranks of her own family. It has a hermeneutic impact for her male viewer/reader: her soul, erotically exposed to his gaze, was once "offen ... wie ein schönes Buch" (1270); now she appears before him as a "verschloßner Brief" (1281). Neumann reads this transformation as a failure to ground a language of love, which had been falsely seen as an act of "Lektüre, ... die sich zugleich als Rückkehr in die Schrift der Vaterwelt des staatlichen und religiösen Mythos zeigt" ("Hexenküche und Abendmahl..." 17). If we carry Neumann's notion of inscription further, the metaphorical transition from an open book and sealed letter become interesting in terms of their function. The eroticization of the reading experience serves as an analogy of Ottokar's penetrating male gaze, which is focussed on the publicly available artefact of the woman/book. The book has the reader as an addressee, whoever he or she may be. The letter, sealed from without, contains a specific message within with a specific correspondent in mind. That Kleist textualizes the female body is a practice of other dramas: Jupiter's inscription of his initial on the diadem, originally sealed in a case, or Hermann's instrumentalization of Hally's body as a message to be "read" are two cases in point, although it is notable that the illiterate Käthchen is apostrophized as a blooming flower. Unlike Kunigunde's deliberate manipulation of the male gaze, these cases of male signifying practice produce messages on or through women's bodies created by men for men.

The closing of the book accompanies Agnes' altered conception of water. The symbolic exchange of names and words, as well as baptismal water, moves to a material level of exchange. Brought to her by Ottokar against her nausea, Agnes sees the proffered water as a potential poison: "Er bringe mir Wasser, bringe / Mir Gift,

gleichviel, ich trinke es aus, er soll / Das Ungeheuerste an mir vollenden" (1298-1300). Such perverted transsubstantiation of water into poison, evoked by the wine of the communion becoming the blood of the child in the opening scene, implies in Neumann's view "die Rückverwandlung des natürlichen Quellwassers in das Gift des Sozialvertrags, des organischen Lebensprinzips in gesellschaftliche Gewalt" ("Hexenküche und Abendmahl..." 17). While the water of baptism had once clarified Ottokar's understanding of Agnes, such transparency converts into a form of reflective opaqueness in a parallel scene. Rupert, accompanied by his kinsman Santing, also suffers from a form of nausea:

SANTING. Fühlst du nicht wohl dich?

RUPERT. Nein.

Mich dürstet.

SANTING. Komm an diesen Quell.

RUPERT. Löscht er

Den Durst?

SANTING. Das Wasser mindestens ist klar,

Daß du darin spiegeln könntest. Komm!

RUPERT **steht auf, geht zum Quell, neigt sich über ihn, und plötzlich mit der Bewegung des Abscheus wendet er sich.**

SANTING. Was fehlt dir?

RUPERT. Eines Teufels Antlitz sah

Mich aus der Quelle an.

SANTING **lachend.** Es war dein eignes.

RUPERT. Skorpion von einem Menschen.

(2226-2231)

Rupert's thirst for blood, already expressed on his charge to the messenger Aldöbern, returns with a vengeance. The clarity of the water allows Rupert to see himself in every sense of the word. This transparent medium reflects Rupert the viewer back onto himself and denies him sustenance, a sustenance gained only by the murder of Agnes. However, by killing whom he thought to be Agnes, Rupert actually kills "himself", his own

biological reflection and extension Ottokar. The animal metaphor of Johann, with the wisdom of the mad, emphasizes such a juxtaposition: "Ah! Der Skorpion! / 's ist Ottokar!" (2649-2650), a label Rupert had already applied to himself; he even cries "Ich selbst! Ich selbst!" (2678) after the murder. In a dramatic instance typical in its Kleistian circularity, the motif of thirst enunciated by the wine and host of the Holy Eucharist at the beginning of the drama surfaces again. Rupert reinvokes the communion scene with his allusion to "Deines Kindes Blut" (2715) to Sylvester, while Johann's demands "Bringt Wein her!" (2717) reestablishes the culinary nature of the plays' use of ritual in the "Abendmahl" and "Hexenküche"[2]. As with the miracle of transsubstantiation, water does indeed turn into wine.

This obsession with the raw materiality of sensation foregrounds another unusual aspect of *Die Familie Schroffenstein*. Unlike any other drama of Kleist's, *Die Familie Schroffenstein* overwhelmingly emphasizes the primacy of speaking and hearing over the act of writing and seeing. *Penthesilea* does not present messengers bearing texts, although the heralds relay messages; the teichoscopic techniques require a listener and a speaker who sees. The act of writing, arguably one of the more important symbolic and plot functions in his dramatic works[3], is effectively invisible in this first drama, which in many ways represents a panorama of the senses. Siegfried Streller locates the original sin by way of Rousseau in the corruption of nature through formalized social relationships ("Jean-Jacques Rousseau..." 642-643). In a family constellation corrupted by the original sin of the (presumably written) inheritance contract, it is not surprising that neither the Warwand nor the Rossitz families avail themselves of writing. The mistrust between all the characters that pervades the drama finds its parallel and root in the generalized distrust of the written word. The messengers and intermediaries, for example, take and deliver their messages orally, while the confusion on each side is deepened by the media of rumours and the value attached to inaccurate or incomplete information. In the double sense of "Verhören" (analogous to the problem of "Versehen" in *Penthesilea* (Kaußen-Mandelartz 94), the results of the inquisition are heard, but misinterpreted: the tortured man from Warwand utters the name Sylvester and, in the view of the Rossitzer, thereby confesses to the murder of Peter. It is as if this world has

turned away from the written word and become a post-literate society, unable to read the signs of a fallen language or a fallen nature; the Schroffensteiner's failure in understanding originates in their inability to read properly the evidence of their senses.

Despite -- or because of -- the presumably written form of the inheritance contract, an overcompensating belief in the power of orality underlies the drama. "Das eine Wort", for example, is noted by the commentator of the *Klassikerausgabe* as a recurring formulation: "Daß der Wahrheitserweis nur auf ein einziges, aus seinem Zusammenhang gerissenes und in vorgegebene Verdachtsstruktur übertragenes Wort gegründet wird, ist eine immer wiederkehrende Denkfigur, in der Kleist sowohl die Verbindlichkeit der Sprache als auch die Fehlbarkeit der Sprachdeutung ausdrückt" (*KA* I 609-610). The parallel communion and "Hexenküche" scenes respectively evoke the characters' belief in the healing power of incantation. While the Rossitzer formalize their desire for revenge by swearing an oath, Barnabe's recitation of wishes, among other things, hopes for a remission of her mother's cancer. This power of spoken language, in that it brings about a physical response, is articulated in the messenger's ability to bring Sylvester down with the strength of his words, a power made manifest in Rupert's demand: "...Schweige still, dein Wort / Ist schneidend wie ein Messer" (2707-8). The heard exerts a powerful effect; what is seen -- or what seems to be seen -- has fatal consequences.

Rupert and Sylvester's failure to recognize their own disguised children points towards a sense of sight debilitated by their psychological blindness. In his well-known portentious formulation, Sylvester expresses the defect in the organs, which is in fact a defect in the interpretation of sensory information[4]: "Das Mißtrauen ist die schwarze Sucht der Seele, / Und alles, auch das Schuldlos-Reine, zieht / Fürs kranke Aug die Tracht der Hölle an" (515-517). While other characters are plagued by their misreadings of the world and the speech around them, two characters in particular not only demonstrate a developed sense of interpretation but also read and write with the signs of the body.

Sylvius' blindness allows him to see. Lacking the "kranke Aug", Sylvius relies on his sense of touch and hearing to understand the emotional state of his interlocutor:

"Fühl mir einmal die Wange an" (392) Agnes asks of him, so that Sylvius may feel her tears. Following Ottokar's murder and in the company of Johann, he **"betastet die Leiche"** and is the first to recognize that the body before him does not belong to Agnes (2646-2648). For it is the mad Johann and the blind Sylvius, supposedly marginalized by their incapacities in this world of the senses, who are the bearers of certain truths. It is therefore no coincidence that Kleist places them together in V/1: Johann leads Sylvius "ins Elend" (2626) to the bodies, and Sylvius cries: "Im Wald die Blindheit, und ihr Hüter / der Wahnsinn!" (2628-2629) These "truths" are recognized materially, and written on or with the body.

When embodied writing does occur, it becomes present in two forms of bodily inscription radically opposed in their intent. For example, Johann makes the following remark regarding his rivalry with Ottokar for the loyalty of Agnes; he literalizes his wounded sense of trust by threatening to stigmatize himself, thereby etching on his own body the sign of Ottokar's alleged act of betrayal:

> Denn in die Brust schneid ich mir eine Wunde,
> Die reiz ich stets mit Nadeln, halte stets
> Sie offen, daß es mir recht sinnlich bleibe.
> (812-814)

The wound, which produces and continues to produce pain, demonstrates Johann's vulnerability, since it inscribes a memory not by means of a pen, but with the blade of a knife. But it is a memory to be felt, something "sinnlich" rather than a mental impression[5]. In another context, memory becomes embodied for Sylvius through an imprint, a "Hand-druck":

> SYLVIUS. Agnes, wo ist Philipp?
> AGNES. Du lieber Gott, ich sags dir alle Tage,
> Und schriebs dir auf ein Blatt, wärst du nicht blind.
> Komm her, ich schreibs dir in die Hand.
> SYLVIUS. Hilft das?
> AGNES. Es hilft, glaub mirs.
> SYLVIUS. Ach, es hilft nicht.

AGNES. Ich meine,

Vor dem Vergessen.

SYLVIUS. Ich, vor dem Erinnern.

(385-390)

Sylvius cannot see, but can nonetheless comprehend the immediacy of his other sense impressions. However, what causes Johann to remember and should cause Sylvius to remember does not bring the relief intended by Agnes, who assumes that Sylvius desires memory, when he in fact wants a cure for it. Instead of healing, the inscription of a memory in both cases wounds each recipient. Such psychological extremity coexists with the drama's sheer brutality, which exacts a tremendous cost on the body: Peter's death by drowning and the amputation of his fingers, the summary execution of one Warwand man, the torture of the other, Johann's fall, the stoning of the Rossitz messenger, Sylvester's faint, Johann's wounding, Jeronimus' lynching, Agnes' bleeding, Barnabe's cooking of human flesh, Johann's madness, and the murder of Agnes and Ottokar. In contrast to the comparative male freedom to endure and inflict bodily harm, Agnes' bodily experience is radically controlled, represented by the curtailment of her sense of touch. After Johann attempts to offer her the dagger with which she is to put him out of his misery ("Nimm diesen Dolch" (1051)), she collapses "**besinnungslos**" without being touched. Jeronimus comes upon the scene and inflicts a wound which renders him unconscious, literally striking him dumb. Agnes' sensory and tactile parameters are limited by her and her mother's fear of male violence. Her freedom must be circumscribed: she rejects the dagger offered by Johann, because she is afraid of him, while her mother forbids her to touch it because she is afraid for her: it may, like the apple proffered by the snake (1111 ff), be poisonous. Agnes, for example, receives this admonition from her mother Gertrud:

Du sollst mit deinen Händen nichts ergreifen,
Nichts fassen, nichts berühren, das ich nicht
Mit eignen Händen selbst vorher geprüft.

(1238-1240)

Such control of woman's sensual and spatial parameters does not save Agnes from the

dagger of her father, nor does it bring her closer to the truth. This demand echoes the truth-finding forensics of Ruprecht from *Der zerbrochne Krug*, whose simple tactility also leaves him in the dark: "Was ich mit Händen greife, glaub ich gern" (1176). At the conclusion of a plot, which shares with *Amphitryon* and *Der zerbrochne Krug* the link between truth and violence, it is not surprising that Sylvius the blind seer asks: "Sind wir denn / In einem Beinhaus?" (2663-2664). The implied answer: the grotesque return of Peter's finger, a synecdoche that stands for the murdered Ottokar and Agnes and points back to the scene of the crime.

Since the missing finger of Peter begins and concludes the drama, this element that ties the knot and solves the puzzle warrants detailed attention. In Seeba's account of the "Sündenfall des Verdachts", he makes the case for a "Kriminalfall": the mysterious deaths of the two young heirs to the respective family names. When two armed men from Warwand are found with the body of Peter of Rossitz, one is summarily executed, while the other is tortured to death in order to punish him for the murder and to extract a confession (210-217). In Warwand, the rumour has been spread that Philipp, heir and son of Gertrude, had been poisoned by the enemy of Rossitz (450-456). However, only Ottokar (legitimate son and heir of Rupert of Rossitz) notices that the body is missing each of the little fingers, but only after the crisis had already been set in motion: "...Immer ists / Mir aufgefallen, daß an beiden Händen / Der Bruderleiche just derselbe Finger, / Der kleine Finger fehlte" (1479-1483). The "rätselhafte Faktum" of the child's finger "wird ... zum Motiv im wörtlichsten Sinn: es setzt in Gang, bewegt, und treibt voran" (Müller-Seidel, *Versehen und Erkennen* 90). This puzzling fact, this missing part of the body, "ist nur der Anlaß, um einen inneren Vorgang in seiner Rätselhaftigkeit zu motivieren" (Müller-Seidel, *Versehen und Erkennen* 93). However, Ottokar acknowledges this peculiar fact in the third act, long after the machinery of catastrophe has been set in motion. Although the "Chor der Mädchen" sings of "blutige Händlein" (19), the motivating factor is the apparent murder of the heir, not the condition of his body. One would have to agree with Seeba's assessment that the drama should not be rejected out of hand due to a momentary lapse in aesthetic judgement; the amputated fingers suggest the motif of castration, since the death of the heirs (and the subsequent murders of Agnes

and Ottokar) effectively cut off the hope for a legitimate perpetuation of the family line. The original "Ort / Der Tat" (1485-86) is located not on the river bank, but in the prehistory of the violent events that are encapsulated in the drama, that is the "Gewalt" (in the sense of power) of the "Erbvertrag", the original sin: according to the Kirchenvogt, "der Erbvertrag gehört zur Sache. / Denn das ist just als sagtest du, der Apfel / gehöre nicht zum Sündenfall" (184-186). The Rossitzian fingers point to the writing instruments that write and sign the original document; they also relate to the branches of the two family trees that tear each other down ("Die Stämme sind zu nah gepflanzet, sie / Zerschlagen sich die Äste" (1971-1972)). Finally, **"Sylvester reicht ihm [Rupert] mit abgewandtem Gesicht die Hand"**, a gesture that concludes the deployment of the dominant hand motif, which links or re-members the drama's beginning and end. When Ursula, in an Aristotelean scene of bodily recognition (*KA* I 627), throws the child's finger onto centre stage, she ushers in the return of the repressed family history[6].

The actual use of the fingers by Ursula and the men of Warwand also exemplifies Kleist's ironic reversal of conventional meanings. In view of local suspicions, the placement of the amputated finger under the threshold of the door provides its user security against the forces of evil: Ursula states that: "Ich wollte ihn [the finger] unter meine Schwelle legen, / Er wehrt dem Teufel" (2697-2698). The child's finger under the door's threshold, when coupled with a figure passing over it, implies a transgression, transition, and the crossing of a line. When Ottokar enters Ursula and Barnabe's kitchen, he crosses the threshold into the knowledge that could prevent the tragedy. However, he is prevented from spreading the truth by the spatial confinement of a cell, on Rupert's orders. He crosses the window threshold in order to escape, only to emerge from the cave's entrance and be murdered by his own father. When asked as to the finger's purpose, Barnabe replies that "...der [the finger] tut nach dem Tod mehr Gutes noch, / Als eines Auferwachsnen ganze Hand / In seinem Leben" (2192-2194). Thus the negation of finger's intended purpose brings about not good, but rather evil executed by the instrumentalized and unknowing "Arm der Rache" (83).

While already a symbolical component of the male-centred events in the drama, the fingers are significant in the following scene with respect to Agnes:

AGNES. So setz dich nieder, daß ich sehe,
Wie dir der Kranz steht. Ist er hübsch?
OTTOKAR. Recht hübsch.
AGNES. Wahrhaftig? Sieh einmal die Finger an.
OTTOKAR. Sie bluten. -
AGNES. Das bekam ich, als ich aus den Dornen
Die Blumen pflückte.
(714-718)

"Der Kranz", continues Agnes,"ist ein vollendet Weib" (724). Margaret Davidson reads this occurence, which is also echoed by the fifteenth scene of *Penthesilea*, in the following way: "In both *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and *Penthesilea* mistrust, misunderstanding, and false pride lead to tragic deaths foreshadowed by bleeding fingers" (235). The suggestion that their bleeding fingers should necessarily foreshadow a violent death relies on an assumed convergence between symbolic cause and dramatic effect. Such bleeding in young women may on the one hand indicate a displaced physiological allegorization of the growth into womanhood (particularly in Agne's case, who is fifteen and seen by her grandfather Sylvius as ready for the altar (419)), or perhaps on the other a physical sign of sanction for transgressive behaviour, in these two cases the participation in a symbolic exchange that violates the respective standards of the Amazon and family communities. That Agnes participates in this exchange by offering the wreath as a woman, with its sexual connotations, foreshadows the exchange of clothing in the cave scene.

The clothing exchange in the cave, which may be seen as the mutual performance of the family identity rendered whole, is an exchange in Jeronimus' view which could end the feud by way of a marriage. In its placement of the representatives of each side of the Schroffenstein family in the same location, it is also the circumstantial root of the tragic irony, but not of the tragedy. According to Ingeborg Harms' interpretation: "In der Höhlenszene, die auch eine Umkleide- und Verwandlungsszene ist, wird die Schuld der Welt abgestreift mitsamt den Attributen ihrer Eitelkeit. Die Kinder entdecken unter

den Verkleidungen den paradiesischen Stand. Mit dem Kleidungsumtausch tragen sie zivilatorische Schichten ab, die über die Erscheinung eine gesellschaftliche Ansicht legten" (77). It is interesting to note that in the presence of Rupert's illegitimate son Johann, the bathing Agnes dresses, but allows the legitimate heir Ottokar to undress her (*KA* I 611). Without overreading the cave scene as an instance of culturally subversive challenge to gender categories, one should note that their language of love verges on parody: "this 'idyll'", writes Sean Allan, "is little more than a romantic tableau of their own making", and their language an "attempt to imitate the rhetoric of adult coquetterie" (70). The discovery of paradisal innocence is hampered by their exchange, and not by their removal, of their clothing. They actually do not become completely undressed -- and Kleist deliberately interweaves Ottokar's speech with his gradual removal and replacement of Agnes' clothes -- because they simultaneously reassert and nonetheless invert their respective gendered social positions. The emancipatory potential of their exchange of identities is cancelled out by the desire of each father to kill the other's child. Changing the clothes does not change the identity of the wearers, but rather the identity of their murderers.

With her understanding of the utopian element in this scene, Harms reminds this reader of a particularly Kleistian model of attaining Paradise through the back door: the biographical notes of Wilhelm Schütz (*LS* 66) report how Kleist "[f]ing mit der Umkleidungs-Scene vom Ende an, dichtet darüber das Stück". This circularity is particularly apparent at the drama's conclusion. The missing finger returns after the alleged murders (the mutually suspicious deaths of the sons and heirs Peter and Philipp) are brutally realized in the murders of the children Ottokar and Agnes. The disrupted wedding ritual of Ottokar and Agnes, a normative heterosexual ritual with the eventual aim of continuing the family line, is replaced by the bonding of the childless fathers. Johann, who did not participate in the communion oath, now demands wine. This concluding tableau asks the audience to imagine a future beyond the boundaries of the play, in which the heirless family is eventually extinguished. It also asks the audience, through the presence of the child's finger, to move backwards to the pre-action past.

This past, a pre-history of this drama, takes place between apparent acts against

nature: the composition of the inheritance contract and the death of the heirs. When Ursula enters the final scene and "**wirft einen Kindesfinger in die Mitte der Bühne und verschwindet**" (2680), it is recognized by Eustache as belonging to Peter because of the "Blatternarbe, / der einzigen auf seinem ganzen Leib" (2688-89). The detached and freefloating finger, whose lack of owner points to the chaos of evidence interpretation, bears traces of an earlier natural trauma: the illness of smallpox. The allusive link between hatred and infectious dis-ease becomes apparent: "A plague on both your houses!" curses Mercutio in III/1 of *Romeo and Juliet*, a play from which Kleist may have appropriated the theme of love and perhaps the "schwarze Sucht" (515; cf. "cankered hate" in I/1 of *Romeo and Juliet*) of mistrust between two rival houses. Gerrekens suggests a further allusion to the pox: the apparent phonetic similarity between the original title of the drama (*Die Familie Ghonorez*) and the medical term gonorrhea (365-366). Although Kleist's initial intent to relate original sin and sexual license remains a matter for speculation, perhaps Kleist was also attempting to allude to the corrupting nature of suspicion. However, such fear of suspicion, which infects the sick eye, is eventually replaced at the tragic conclusion by a fear of madness as contagion. Rupert asks that all distance themselves from Johann, a marginalized outsider to his own family members: "Ist er in Fesseln gleich geschlagen, kann / Er euch den Speichel noch ins Antlitz spein, / Der seine Pest euch einimpft" (2669-2671). In the selection of his final title, Kleist decided to shift the emphasis from illness, which remains a theme in the finished work, to Adam's "leidige[m] Stein zum Anstoß" (6), which exists both within and without the characters. Perhaps Sean Allan's play on names -- an evident poetic practice of Kleist's (cf. Reeve, *Heritage* 107-122) -- could be expanded. In his view, hunting "encapsulates the Rossitzer's relationship to the world" (66), and Johann significantly "loses his seat ('Sitz') on his horse ('Roß')" (66). Secondly, "schroff" not only means abrupt, but also "steep" and "precipitous", and "die schroffen Steine" of the first version of Johann's fall may have brought "die Schroffensteiner" down the slippery slope to their collective downfall, under the Vor-wand (Warwand) of a murder that never took place.

However, there is yet another "Fall" in the drama which is not a "Kriminalfall", which is narrated by Johann to his half-brother Ottokar. The character Johann, originally omitted from Kleist's first scheme of *Die Familie Thierrez* (Wolff 135), accounts for his unusual encounter with Agnes in this passage:

> Mein Pferd, ...
> Von Hörnerklang, und Peitschenschall, und Hund -
> Geklaff verwildert, eilt ein eilendes
> Vorüber nach dem andern, streckt das Haupt
> Vor deines Vaters Roß schon an der Spitze -
> Gewältig drück ich in die Zügel; doch,
> . . . . . .
> ..., eh ich, was ich sehe, wahr
> Kann nehmen, stürz ich, Roß und Reiter, schon
> Hinab in einen Strom. -
> (267-280)

This passage suggests a "Vor-fall" to what Seeba names the "Sündenfall", since Johann's accident occurred five weeks before he speaks of it to Ottokar (265) and therefore some time before the discovery of Peter's body. The unbridled suspicion of the rival families toward one another, coupled with their rush to judgment (the impossibility of "Wahrnehmung" expressed above), provides the impetus for the fall of both families. Johann's fall during the hunt, caused presumably by his frightened horse, shares a parallel with Homburg's involuntary dismounting of his horse on the way to battle. While Homburg's fall neither has serious physical consequences, nor bears any impact on his future actions at Fehrbellin, Johann's fall in the river brings about his first contact with Agnes and subsequent rivalry with Ottokar. If we agree with Reeve's interpretation of the plunging stag diving into the water from *Käthchen* and *Die Hermannsschlacht* as a sexual symbol (*Pursuit of Power* 105), with the accompanying assumption that water represents the female principle, then Johann's accidental plunge leads one to two main aspects of sexually charged imagery. In a moment of apotheosis, Agnes, bathing naked in the river, appears before the half-conscious "Hingesunknen" (298) as a veiled "Engel"

(295). She flees, dresses, and then returns, after which she removes the veil and quells "[d]as Blut, das strömende" (300). That he "...rührte nicht ein Glied, / Wie eine Taub in Kindeshand" (303-304) emphasizes his passivity or impotence before this sexually charged vision[7]. This image also evokes a sense of the sacred, for the veil which she leaves becomes a fetish. Similar in its function as a physical proof to Natalie's glove in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, the veil acts as a token of their encounter and physical trace of the experience.

The unspecified wound he sustains, which gushes blood, belongs to the metaphorical constellation of the physiological and psychological act of ejaculation, expressed by Johann's bleeding and loss of consciousness. It remains a matter of speculation as to why Kleist brought Johann's fall from his horse into the symbolic configuration of Homburg's fall from his horse, rather than leaving his altered account as it was in his early version, *Die Familie Ghonorez*, in which Juan/Johann describes his first encounter with Ignez/Agnes:

> Als ich, im Jagdgefolge deines Vaters
> Ein Windspiel mißte, und, es suchend, selbst
> Mich im Gebirge von dem Troß verlor.
> Wie ich, schon hastig, nur dem Jagdhorn folgend,
> In grader Linie fort durch Strauch und Moor
> Und moosigem Gestein mich winde, gleitet
> Mein Fuß, mein Haupt zerschlägt sich an dem Felsen --
>
> (**Variant**, 827)

In Kleist's first version of this scene, Juan slips and injures his head, while upon regaining consciousness "ein strahlenreines Wesen", "ein Engel" removes her veil and quells the flowing blood of his head injury. A religious interpretation of this scene brings out a parallel with the more obvious baptismal imagery associated with Ottokar and Agnes; while Ottokar sprinkled water on her forehead and breast, Johann wounds his head, and following Ottokar's alleged betrayal, also metaphorizes his wounded feelings with an imagined self-inflicted wound on his chest. Both Sembdner's edition and Edel and Kanzog's critical edition illustrate clearly the alteration of Juan's narration of his

misstep to Rodrigo, by providing the text of the "Im Manuskript gestrichene Vorstufen der "Familie Ghonorez" (Sembdner 826-832). Kleist chose in this case to insert the Christian yet erotic imagery of the "Strom" (suggesting baptism, rebirth (Kluge, "der Wandel..." 58) and cooling of desire) and to work with the concealing/revealing dialectic of Agnes' removal of her veil. Gerreken's assertion, that Kleist rewrote this version of the fall to incorporate elements of Christian myth, is justified (362). The use of "Hingefallene", which implies a loss of control and fall into sin, becomes the more evocative "Hingesunkene", while the blood imagery of the first becomes commingled with the river water of the final version[8]. In Kluge's view, this field of associations also coheres more effectively with the water and baptismal imagery of the third act ("Der Wandel..." 58). This earlier passage, stricken from the *Schroffenstein* drama, evokes in theme and image the punning opening of *Der zerbrochene Krug*:

> Ja, seht. Zum Straucheln braucht's doch nichts, als Füße.
> Auf diesem glatten Boden, ist ein Strauch hier?
> Gestrauchelt bin ich hier; denn jeder trägt
> Den leidigen Stein zum Anstoß in sich selbst.
>
> (3-6)

The two passages have two image clusters in common: the stone and the "Strauch". As we can see through their juxtaposition, the notion of a misstep is central to Kleist's compehension of human fallibility; even the play's opening line of the chorus in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* characterizes the murder of the heir in this way: "Nieder trat ihn ein frecher Fuß" (6). This footfall embodies a truly fateful step (so to speak) in the progress of the tragedy, while "der Herrgott" yanks Adam's foot and causes his comic fall (21). In *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, for example, Kleist carries this notion to absurd lengths, when he has Natalie describe Homburg as "dieser Fehltritt, blond mit blauen Augen" (1095). The misstep, coupled with a fall, is also fundamental to the comic dimensions of Kleist's work and initiates the events of *Der zerbrochne Krug*.

Der zerbrochne Krug

Kleist's first original attempt at comedy shares with *Die Familie Schroffenstein*

the existence of a criminal case, a "Kriminalfall", which must be explicated by analytical method. Indeed, Kaußen-Mandelartz points out that unlike Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, which according to Kleist's own words has some affiliations with *Der zerbrochne Krug*, *Die Familie Schroffenstein* features a father who unknowingly kills his own son (91). There is also one further associative link between these dramas. While Johann's misstep was rewritten as a fall from an incontrollable horse, Adam's "fall" from the window is re-visioned as an entirely innocent, though fabricated, fall from his own bed. Hinrich Seeba's argument is therefore strengthened by these associations, in that he sees these two dramas as having several themes in common: "Tatsächlich bestehen zwischen der grotesken Komödie vom adamitischen Sündenfall und der grotesken Tragödie vom "Sündenfall" (186) der Schroffensteiner nicht nur genetische, sondern auch thematische, die auch auf jene belachte Ur-szene des letzten Akts ein neues Licht werfen... ("Sündenfall..." 113)[9]. *Der zerbrochne Krug*, whose plot is driven forward by a transgressive meeting and an attempted union between a man and a woman in less-than-paradisal conditions, begins where *Die Familie Schroffenstein* ends: the disruption of social roles, defined by family models or moral proscription, exacts a price. Additionally, both works share the motif of the Fall, in the form of the inheritance contract (metaphorized as the apple of original sin) and Adam's fall. Both the contract (the word) and the pitcher (the picture) are man-made constructs that are violently broken (Grathoff, "Der Fall des Kruges..." 294).

Before embarking on an examination of *Der zerbrochne Krug*, the circumstances of yet another intertextual fall occurring chronologically between Johann's and Adam's fall ought to be examined. This "Zwischenfall", which takes place in Goethe's *Die Natürliche Tochter*, may shed light on the fallen body of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and *Penthesilea* by a comparison suggested by the quotation that heads this chapter.

Josef Kunz, commentator and editor of the Hamburger volume containing Goethe's political tragedy, had already seen how Goethe brought together political uncertainty and an individual's instability in the play's "Metapher des Sturzes" (488). Walter Müller-Seidel points out that the loss of Paradise in *Die Natürliche Tochter* is

related to tragic guilt, by citing Eugenie's line: "Jenes Apfels / Leichtsinnig augenblicklicher Genuß / Hat aller Welt unendlich Weh verschuldet" (9121-1923) (*Versehen und Erkennen* 209). Aside from this imagery of original sin, which occurs textually fifteen lines after the magistrate's distinction between "Fehltritt" and "Straucheln", Eugenie had suffered a physical fall. Eugenie's accident on horseback implicates the heroine's downfall with the threatened collapse of an established order of political legitimacy. In Katharina Mommsen's view, this drama shares with *Penthesilea* a fascination with the motif of collapse. Mommsen takes this common aspect one step further: "Es gibt in der *Penthesilea* unmittelbare Anspielungen auf eine Dichtung Goethes ... nämlich auf das Trauerspiel *Die Natürliche Tochter*" (45). Among those direct similarities are Eugenie's and Penthesilea's skill at riding, their fall from above ("Felsenwände" in each drama) in pursuit of prey (a stag and Achilles respectively, whom Penthesilea describes as a "Hirsch" (2645)), the common phrase "Roß und Reiterin" (45), and the description of each protagonist as a "Centaurin" (46). What is for *Die Natürliche Tochter* a realistic hunting background is for *Penthesilea* an underlying metaphoric force. There are some interesting parallels between *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and *Die Natürliche Tochter*, in addition to the similarities between the former and *Penthesilea* (cf. Kaußen-Mandelartz). Although Sean Allan, for example, has already taken note of the circumstantial similarity between Johann's and Eugenie's falls (66), the following will examine further this textual similarity in greater detail.

When Mommsen compares the descriptive passages concerning Eugenie's riding practices before her fall with Kleist's teichoscopic description of Penthesilea's superhuman pursuit of Achilles, it becomes clear that Kleist made use of certain passages as models for descriptive scenes of *Penthesilea*. However, it is also possible to suggest that this intertextual dialogue had already begun with the anonymous publication of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* in the beginning of 1803, to which Goethe's drama (composed and performed in 1803, published as a pocketbook in 1804) may have been a rejoinder. The first documented contact between Goethe and Kleist came through the efforts of Adam Müller in 1807 with his sending of *Der zerbrochne Krug* to the former; I do not imply

that Goethe would have been able to attribute *Die Familie Schroffenstein* to Kleist, for the play was published anonymously and remains apparently unmentioned by Goethe in the standard documentary sources[10]. Despite this apparent lack of bio-bibliographical evidence, a textual comparison brings the following results.

Johann, identified in the *dramatis personae* as "Ruperts *natürlicher Sohn*" (my emphasis) not only participates in a chaotic hunt, but also falls on horseback into a river: "ehe ich, was ich sehe, wahr / Kann nehmen, stürz ich, Roß und Reiter, schon / Hinab in einen Strom" (280-283). Likewise, the Herzog of Goethe's tragedy reports how "...die Amazonentochter, / Die in den Fluß dem Hirsch sich zuerst / Auf raschem Pferde flüchtig nachgestürzt" (127-129). Despite these apparent similarities between Kleist's first published drama and Goethe's *Trauerspiel*, one could suggest that both authors were referring to the myth of Tanais, who drowned himself in a river, rather than succumb to his desire for his mother; Wolf Kittler, for example, outlines the mythical associations of the plunging stag in such works as *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Penthesilea* (*Geburt* 187-189).

Even if the possibility of Goethe's borrowing from *Die Familie Schroffenstein* must remain a matter of speculation, Mommsen's research is nonetheless convincing with regard to Kleist's engagement with *Die Natürliche Tochter*. An as yet unconfirmed encounter between Kleist's first work and Goethe's tragedy is not entirely out of the question. What is possible is that Kleist's response to *Die Natürliche Tochter* did not culminate exclusively in specific scenes in *Penthesilea*, but that *Der zerbrochne Krug* answers to a particular challenge laid out in Goethe's political tragedy. The Goethe quotation heading this chapter resembles not only a challenge but also a generic prescription, in that a comical and horizontal stumble on the floor contrasts with a misstep resulting in a tragical vertical fall. Kleist's reply to the words of the judge (both to Goethe as author and to his character the "Gerichtsrat") may be found in judge Adam's first words:

> Ja, seht. Zum Straucheln brauchts doch nichts, als Füße.
> Auf diesem glatten Boden, ist ein Strauch hier?

Gestrauchelt bin ich hier ...

(3-5)

The language of the misstep -- the "Fehltritt"[11] and the verb "Straucheln" -- as well as the terms "glatten" or "ebne[n] Boden" leads one to suspect that Kleist possibly had the apparent genre prescriptions of Goethe's "Gerichtsrat" in mind[12]. The magistrate's remark bears repeating, in view of its juxtaposition with the words of Adam:

GERICHTSRAT. Auf ebnem Boden straucheln, ist ein Scherz,
Ein Fehltritt stürzt vom Gipfel dich herab.

If the biblical Adam's fall is of tragically mythic proportions, then judge Adam's fall, be it the invented one against the oven (originally ornamented with a sword-bearing cherub) or his injurious fall from Eve's window, is the stuff of comedy. Homburg's physical fall (although "leichthin zur Seite niedergleitend" (381)) is the "Vor-fall" to his collapse in the "Todesfurchtszene", while the physical and psychological dimensions of Penthesilea's violent and recurring falls culminate in her tragic descent.

This implicit dialogue between Kleist and Goethe, which takes place behind the scenes of Johann's, Eugenie's and Adam's falls, leads to the most spectacular and best documented literary confrontation between Goethe and Kleist: the failed staging of *Der zerbrochne Krug* at the Weimar court theater in 1808. In Kleist's first comedy, Diethelm Brüggemann sees more than an intertextual dialogue taking place, but a frontal attack on Goethe as representative of a particular theory of drama and as a practitioner of a particular kind of theater. Of interest here is Kleist's manipulation and disruption of genre categories, for this play's theological allusions and manifestations of bodiliness playfully mingle the mythical with the creaturely, the tragic with the trivial. The external circumstances surrounding the composition of *Der zerbrochne Krug* have been thoroughly documented[13], and despite the Le Veau engraving's initial relevance for the poets' competition of 1802 between Zschokke and Ludwig Wieland, Kleist worked on the manuscript up to 1811 and used an array of literary, religious and iconographic sources[14]. In the reception of Kleist, however, the dialogue between dramatic convention and innovation has in turn produced interpretive conventions. Hans Joachim Schrimpf, in 1964, could speak of this play's strange neglect (342), and further explains

that its outsider status in relation to Kleist's works originates in the critics' view of him as a "geborene[r] Tragiker[...]" (Schrimpf 342). Despite Goethe's recognizing the play's "außerordentliche Verdienste" (*LS* 185), some critical voices have tended to dismiss Kleist's only original comedy as a "Werk meisterlicher Mache" or "technisches Zwangsprodukt" (Gundolf cited in Schneider 166), often simply because something so circumstantial as a poetic contest, rather than an existential crisis or psychological compulsion, provided Kleist with the initial impetus to write the play (Schlossbauer 526). *Der zerbrochne Krug* has gradually become one of German literature's most performed (cf. Reeve, *Kleist on Stage* 52) and critically examined comedies. By 1981, Dirk Grathoff could hardly speak of neglect, but rather of "die bereits ans Unüberschaubare grenzende Fülle der Literatur" ("Der Fall des Kruges..." 295), a tendency that has become even more prominent in the last fifteen years.

That Kleist was precise in his practice of labelling his dramas by genre has already been established (cf. Kanzog, "Kommunikative Varianten..."), for Kleist's description of *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon* as "Lustspiele" assumes on the one hand a certain horizon of expectations on the audience's part and an author's knowledge of theatrical tradition and contemporary practice on the other. What cannot be established, as the ongoing debates demonstrate, is the specific extent to which Kleist mixed tragic and comic elements in practically all his completed dramas. Despite our assurance that his plays present us with both comic and tragic elements, there remains the audience's discomfort with the thoroughly unamusing moral dilemma faced by Eve and Alkmene, to name only two oft-cited examples of Kleist's alleged penchant for psychological cruelty. Yet his *Krug*, for example, is playing on both sides of a game between tragedy and comedy from the very beginning with the audience, as it directs our gaze from the boot to the buskin, from the tragic to the comic. As with the coffin of *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, the play's opening tableau draws the audience's attention to the body of a protagonist, who **"sitzt und verbindet sich ein Bein"**. Adam, because of his bandaged leg, cannot get his boots on: "Pest! Mein geschundner Fuß! Ich krieg die Stiefeln -- " (204). Bootless Adam, reduced to limping through the trial in his socks,

cannot play a tragic role even in accordance with dramatic costuming convention.

Licht's forensic gaze, replicated by the audience, moves from Adam's leg to his face. Adam's first inventive story concerning his facial injuries also alludes on many levels to the tragic, only to parody this genre. His morning collision with the "Bocksgesicht" has numerous implications. Firstly, the face of the horned goat with its extended nose points out Adam's sexual desire and goatishness, in its satyr-like and satirical representation of Adam's horniness and his misshapen foot; secondly, in the battle of the phallic noses between Ruprecht and Adam, Adam comes up short: "Die Nas' hat auch gelitten" (43). Finally, however, the potential etymological roots of the Greek term tragedy are seen by some reference works as referring to the "Bocksgesang"[15], the goat-song, an allusion of which Kleist may have been aware when he transmogrified the ornamental cherub armed with a sword (representing Adam being smitten with an angel's sword and driven from Paradise) into the burlesque goat with an extended nose. This banishment from Paradise is translated onto the actions of Ruprecht, an avenging angel, who flies into Eve's chamber and beats Adam with a door latch (Harms 149). The horns of the goat are precisely those horns of the cuckold which Adam attempts to plant on Ruprecht's head (who in turn wishes to discover if "dir [Ruprecht] von fern hornartig etwas keimt" (944)). These horns also represent the twin wounds inflicted on Adam's head, more or less the horns of the devil or the satyr. Kenneth Calhoon's view adds the notion of sacrifice to the tragic symbolism of the goat, when he suggests that "the role of sacrifice [is] possibly the most important point of tangency between the biblical and the classical traditions" (231): If Adam and Oedipus are the *pharmakoi*, or surrogate victims (231), then the telling term "Sündenböcke" describes their function in the German vernacular. At the image of the goat this tangency between biblical and classical traditions intersects in another way: Adam, horned and hoofed and leaving a sulfrous odor, is also the devil. Yet this relationship between the tragedy and the satyr play is complicated by Kleist's combination of two unlikely sources for comic material: the Fall of Adam and Eve and the myth of Oedipus.

That Kleist already provides a clue to the understanding of this comedy can be seen in his unpublished "Vorrede". Here he alludes to the "historische Faktum" of the

Oedipus legend, which his story superficially approximates in terms of character attributes, plot structure, and language. In his brief article of 1960 on Kleist's "Metamorphose" (849) of the Greek tragedy, Wolfgang Schadewalt notes how Adam and Oedipus are both judges and have deformed feet, and how both are eventually exposed, as a component of the analytical method of each drama, as the investigator of his own crime; Kreon, like Licht, becomes his superior's successor (844); the scars on Oedipus' feet parallel the role of Adam's absent wig, which cannot cover his scars (847); Ruprecht and Oedipus are connected through their blindness (848). Adam's schizophrenic "Angsttraum", for example, is analogous to the function of Teiresias the oracle (Schrimpf 347). Furthermore, as Hörisch points out, Oedipus kills Laius, who emerges like Walter from a "Hohlweg" (176); Ingeborg Harms further points out that Walter's wagon is "im Hohlweg umgeworfen", while Oedipus throws Laius fatally from his wagon (159-160). Both dramas share the "unbewußte Doppelsinn in der Rede der Hauptfiguren" as a mode of expressing tragic irony in the one play and a way of promoting comic (mis)understanding in the other (Zenke 95). However, Frank Schlossbauer argues against assigning too much weight to such analogical stretches, by which Kleist critics seem to ennoble the low form of the comedy by placing it in the distinguished company of the classical tragedy (527). These comparisons, in Schlossbauer's view, are of limited value to understanding Kleist's comedy (527), especially since the play's scale and scope also captures the minutiae of everyday life.

This scholarly emphasis resting on Kleist's "Anreicherung seines Dramas" (Zenke 93) through tragic and mythical themes notes the distinction that Oedipus pays the ultimate price for finding the truth, while Adam, though socially and physically stigmatized by his lies, retains some standing in the community. The succession of the leader in the Sophoclean and biblical myth has a common sexual prohibition: Oedipus is cursed for his parricide and incest, while Adam is exiled after his eating of the tree brings his awareness of Eve's nakedness (Milfull 8). These dramas do intersect, however, in their vivid treatment of bodily deformation and violence. My use of Nutz's term "body drama" (in his article on *Penthesilea* as "Körperdrama") attempts to capture my belief that no other work of Kleist (with the possible exception of *Penthesilea*'s

blood, sweat and tears) focuses to the same degree on the body's sensation and gratification, desire and punishment, excretion and consumption. In addition to the shared elements of plot and character outlined above, Kleist equipped Adam with the significant "Klumpfuß" (26) that links not only the "Schwellfuß" Oedipus to judge Adam, but also the Christian to the ancient myth, in order to establish an "ironische Ausdehnung des Assoziationsfeldes" (Zenke 93). The hoof of Satan's foot, even though invoked with regard to Adam, acts as a "ganz unmetaphysiches Komödienrequisit" (Zenke 94), as does Adam's sulphorous "Denkmal". Adam is not the devil, but merely devilish; he is not the inverted mirror figure of Oedipus, but perhaps, in his sublimated desire to see Walter dead, he is Oedipal.

In addition to the echoes of the fallen body of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, there exists the Judeo-Christian mythical background to *Der zerbrochne Krug*: Adam and Eve's multiply coded fall from innocence. John Milfull notes that "Kleist's works abound in images of the 'Fall', which are characterized by perplexing moral ambiguity" (10). Judge Adam's attempt at a sexual exchange (the first fall being an ascent into carnal knowledge) is linked explicitly to the second fall, the "fortunate fall" into the use and manipulation of language, with the object not to enlighten, but to conceal. Adam's barrier of language, in place of his wig and in the absence of Eve's testimony, temporarily conceals the significant traces of his literal fall. Thus the play's representation of language, in its oral and written form, is the site of conflict between different expressive modes: "Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit der Sprache", in the view of Ernst Ribbat, "werden ... kontrastiert" (145).

Symptomatic of alternating power relations expressed by the uses of different kinds of linguistic expression, the exchange of bodies is linked with the stature accorded the written and the spoken. For example, Adam expects Eve's body is to be fraudulently exchanged for his facility with the written word (the draft notice and the medical certificate), sealed with his authority. Should Adam obtain access to Eve's body, she would receive in return the false medical certificate, and she shall have Ruprecht's body, physically intact and free from the fever and combat depleting the ranks of the colonial troops. Adam's capacity to read and write (and thereby render absent the body of

Ruprecht) gives him power over the illiterate Eve, who must accept the truth value of Ruprecht's draft notice and the fake affidavit. However, Kleist reverses the biblical myth and collapses the roles Adam and Satan together; in biblical tradition, the serpent tempted Eve to eat from the tree of knowledge, who then in turn tempted Adam.

But it is judge Adam who already possesses the knowledge of language, a facility not entirely in control of its medium. While on the one hand he draws attention to the importance of his faked documentation for Eve, he consistently confuses on the other his creature comforts and accessories with the written artefacts of the law: files are used to wrap food and his wigs are stored in the bookshelf (Hettche 88-89). Indeed, Adam shows no interest in any written legal document, and in his discussions with Walter insists on the primacy of unwritten statutes (Hettche 89). But, as Hettche argues, precisely this brokenness of Adam's false language, associated with the "Knackern" of the attestation in "Fraktur", foreshadows the discovery of Adam's "Ver-brechen" (95).

Milfull also points out the notion that Adam's sin -- as a result of a doubling process confirmed by the presence of the tree of knowledge and the tree of life -- can be seen as "division", the rending of one into two. Each tree has the same root, but Adam has chosen to eat only of one (8). Eckehard Catholy notes that the "Aktenstöße" are piled up like the Tower of Babel, an allusion to "die prinzipielle Sprachverwirrung und Vielzüngigkeit der menschlichen Rede", a result of "menschlicher Sündhaftigkeit, eines zweiten Adamfalls" (179). Ernst Ribbat sees the mixture of discourses leading to "Babylon in Huisum", most apparent in the confusing exchanges between Adam and his maidservants, or between Licht, Adam and Walter's servants. When the news of Walter's accident is brought to Adam and Licht by Walter's servant, the following confused exchange ensues:

LICHT **zum Bedienten**:

Es ist dem Herrn Gerichtsrat, will ich hoffen,
Nichts Böses auf der Reise zugestoßen?

DER BEDIENTE: Je, nun! Wir sind im Hohlweg umgeworfen.

ADAM: Pest! Mein geschundner Fuß! Ich krieg die Stiefeln-

LICHT: Ei, du mein Himmel! Umgeworfen, sagt Ihr?

Doch keinen Schaden weiter -?

DER BEDIENTE: Nichts von Bedeutung.

Der Herr verstauchte sich die Hand ein wenig.

Die Deichsel brach.

ADAM: Daß er den Hals gebrochen!

LICHT:

Die Hand verstaucht? Ei, Herr Gott! Kam der Schmidt schon?

DER BEDIENTE:

Ja für die Deichsel.

LICHT: Was?

ADAM: Ihr meint, der Doktor.

LICHT: Was?

DER BEDIENTE: Für die Deichsel?

ADAM: Ach, was! Für die Hand.

DER BEDIENTE:

Adies, ihr Herren. - Ich glaub, die Kerls sind toll. **Ab**

(201 - 218)

The confusion springs from two damaged objects -- Walter's sprained hand and the broken shaft -- and the method of repairing them; Licht's remark cited above lacks parallel structure, in that he inquires about the sprained hand and then the blacksmith, when in fact he is referring to the repair of the broken part. Adam conflates the broken shaft with the wish for Walter's broken neck. Zenke cites this dialogue as demonstrating an "Interferenz der Reihen" (102), while Martini sees the "höchst komische Sprachwirkung" in the speed of exchange and effect of confusion ("Bauformen des Lustspiels..." 417). As a symptom of this chaotic language game in which hand and shaft, doctor and blacksmith become confused, Schrimpf maintains that the "Menschlich-Organische[-] und Mechanische[-] wachsen ineinander", and that "Zufall und Tücke der Objekte richten sich gegen ihn [Adam]" (365) -- and also against Walter[16]. Furthermore, as Ribbat notes, the importance of the play's play with language lies in its fallen state,

in that Huisum begins in many ways to represent the tower of Babel. After his arrival, Walter locates this doubleness in language in the figure of Adam, admonishing him twice; in the first instance he is not to use a "zweideutige Sprache" with the complainants (542), and in the second he is not to instruct the parties through "zweideutge Lehren" (805).

As a mediator between Adam's excessive orality, suggested by his attempts to talk, eat and drink his way out his predicament, and Marthe's visuality, the "Schreiber" Licht present us with the most "disembodied" sign system of the written word. Seen by Eckehard Catholy as "die einzige 'unsympathische' Figur des Stücks" (175), Licht in recent years has been viewed infrequently as an unambiguously positive figure and more as the ambitious penpusher specializing in "clandestine domination" (Reeve, "Ein Dunkles Licht..." 63); it is difficult to decide whether or not Adam or Licht is writing the script for the unfolding events, as the secret-ary "adroitly stag[es] the public exposé" of Adam (Reeve, "Ein Dunkles Licht..." 62). Hettche goes so far as to describe Licht as Adam's "detektive Gegenspieler" (85). While Licht's protocol provides a written record of Adam's conduct during the trial, Licht's placing the wig on Adam's head produces the ultimate body of evidence and represents, coupled with his holding the mirror before Adam, his only significant non-verbal gesture. As Borchardt points out, Adam's confrontation with his own image -- aided by Licht -- occurs at the beginning and at the end of the comedy: at first to view the evidence of his wounds, and in the end to view the wig, the final piece of evidence (120-121).

Compared to Licht's process of abstraction through the written word, Marthe's literal use of and response to language, while seen by Graham as naively comical, displays not simply a lack of understanding, but a different modality of understanding. Marthe's narrative is to "lend force and apparent meaning to the non-verbal sign" (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 70). The difference between Adam and Marthe lies in their "polare Verfahrensweisen" (Hoverland, "Adam und Frau Marthe..." 59); Marthe, far from being a bumpkin, is a worthy "Gegenspielerin" (Hoverland, "Adam und Frau Marthe..." 63) to Adam. By Roland Reuss' account, Marthe's grasp of language is ironically nominalist in her apparent belief in the Adamite link between a name and a

thing ("Notizen zur Sprache..." 8-9). When the once intact jug is broken, there are only fragments of meaning ("Scherben") and an absence ("das Loch"). Marthe fills the absence with her tale of the jug's imagery and its circumstantial history. But the non-verbal triumphs with the planting of Adam's wig on his head, when an inorganic imitation of a bodily sign (the wig which replaces the hair) is coupled with his physically battered head. This reunion initiates the confirmation of his guilt. The brokenness of the jug is irreparable, but the piecing together of perpetrator, to compose an image or profile, remains a possibility. Thus the separation between the word and the object it represents, the identity/sameness of judge and perpetrator which Adam tried to keep apart, is no longer tenable. As in Adam's prophetic dream, he was once split in two, but is now one: "Drauf wurden wir beide zu eins, und flohen..." (275).

Adam and Eve interact through silence or voice: Adam speaks and writes lies, and Eve breaks her silence to speak the truth. In Kleist's re-vision of the myth, it is Adam the tempter (who comes up from Marthe's garden) and Eve the tempted[17], for she was apparently willing to participate in the ruse to keep Rupert out of the army, thus compounding Adam's lie (concerning conscription) with another (regarding Ruprecht's unfitness for service). While Adam has the ability to read and write the words on the page, Eve possesses the skill of reading the symbolism of coinage. Before she recognizes the symbolic worth of money, Eve triumphs through her oral testimony over Adam's written and spoken lies: "Eves Mund verwahrt ein 'Geheimnis', das die Männer begehren und reden heißt; Eves Mund allein entscheidet über die Semantik der Zeichen, die Adams Leib eingeschrieben sind" (Hörisch 177). Despite Licht's apparent complicity in Adam's downfall, Eve's breaking her silence, in the same way the "mouth" of the jug speaks of its shattering, ascribes to his wounds their ultimate meaning and origin.

Compared with Marthe's comical-naive reading of the scene formerly depicted on the jug, Eve's understanding of the gold's representative value displays her not so innocent grasp of iconography[18]. She is declared innocent of any carnal knowledge, but such declarations have little use in view of her other trial of innocence. As Anthony Stephens points out, when Eve says in the variant: "Was hilfts, daß ich jetzt mich schuldlos erzähle?" (1946) she is on the one hand reinvoking the possibility of Rupert's

conscription; on the other hand, she is also expressing her awareness that she is "verloren" (1950), and has participated in a ritual exchange of power through narration (Stephens, "Die berechtigte Frage..." 33). Free of guilt in the shattering of the jug, and exonerated of sexual misconduct, she is nonetheless complicitous in the economy of the *Schein*: the written attestation and the world of seeming, both of which embody the fictionality of symbolic meaning. The shine of Walter's money, with its "leuchtend Antlitz" (**Variant**, 2374), which both attracts and repulses her, finally brings about her cooperation[19]. Here the moment of awareness is seconded by her use of the specific term "Erkennen", in its double sense of recognition and knowledge that resides in the variant's treatment of the "antagonism between truth and language" (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 65).

According to Gerhard Neumann, *Der zerbrochne Krug* realizes dramatically the doubling of original sin, as it is marked on his stumbling body and by his stuttering words (qtd. in Hettche 85). The stumbling body falls, not only in a physical sense, but also in terms of the traces it bears when it collides with the truth: "Kleists Umschrift des Paradiesesgeschehens läßt den Mann den Sündenfall begehen, indem sie die Frau zum Subjekt/Objekt des Begehrens erklärt, das den männlichen Leib mit Signifikanten schlägt" (Hörisch 177). This doubling of language and body, in addition to the doubleness of meaning found in Adam's language games, also draws lines of intersection between him and other characters. The play is dominated by alternating forms of togetherness and fragmentation. After all, Adam informs Walter: "Ich fiel" (1459), with the revealingly truthful qualification, "...[d]ie Wahrheit zu sagen, über mich" (1463). Adam's disunited body, in effect, also multiplies and shadows the bodies of Walter and Ruprecht.

For example, Walter and Adam both suffer parallel accidents and injuries. In the comic dialogue already cited above, three things are reportedly damaged: Adam's foot, which cannot fit into the boot, the carriage shaft, and Walter's sprained hand. Walter's sprained hand, significantly described as "Nichts von Bedeutung", also relativizes critics' attempts to overestimate the fixity of *nomen est omen*[20]. Both are explicitly associated with the vulnerability of the neck, which represents in Reeve's view a persistent

anatomical symbol for Kleist (""Mit dem Hals..." 23). Another judge in Holla, suspended by Walter, is found "aufgehangen" (111) and although revived, has lost all status "als wär er eine Leiche schon" (117). Walter, unlike Laius, suffers only a sprained hand, but Adam merely rhetorically wishes for his superior's injury ("Daß er den Hals gebrochen!" (208)); afterwards, however, he recounts to Licht the nature of his "schizophrenic dream" (Reeve, ""Mit dem Hals..." 241), in which Adam has already doubled himself and "...judiziert den Hals ins Eisen mir" (273). Having already attempted to supplant Ruprecht, Adam threatens to throw Ruprecht by the neck in irons (a projection and displacement of his nightmare scenario (Reeve, ""Mit dem Hals..." 241)) and does give this order using the same words at the end of the proceedings. Adam's neck comes to represent everybody's fleshly vulnerability.

Aside from their physical affiliations, Adam and Ruprecht are competitors, who duplicate and share the role of Eve's husband (Allan 82). In addition to this social aspect, the relationship between the bodies of Adam and Ruprecht is seen in their interchangeable eyes. What was for the Oedipus myth a self-inflicted punishment of blinding, became for Adam's eye a sign of punishment, especially in view of Licht's oath: "Ei, hier liegt / Querfeld ein Schlag, blutrünstig, straf mich Gott, / Als hätt ein Großknecht wütend ihn geführt" (44-46). Despite his insistent denials, Adam's eye, along with Ruprecht's, is injured, as the latter is blinded by the interloper's throwing of sand in his eyes (1003-1007, also: "Der Satan warf sie [his eyes] mir voll Sand" (1553)).

Supplementary to their association by way of the neck and the eyes, Marthe's hope that Ruprecht's back will receive the punishing blows of the officer's staff (474-475) is fulfilled by proxy on Adam's back, when the judge, reenacting his fall from Eve's window, leaps from his judge's seat and allows the spectators to view from their window "[w]ie die Perücke ihm den Rücken peitscht" (1959). Calhoon finds another parallel to Adam's traumatized and misshapen form in Ruprecht's curse: "Daß mir der Fuß erlahmte" (2253), a spoken assumption of Adam's dominant physical characteristic. Similar to the officer's staff, which functions symbolically as a sign of authority and practically as a implement of punishment, Adam's wig is an emblem of authority which eventually punishes him for his transgressions, in this case a self-inflicted disciplining of

the body. Such displacement is also projected onto the judge's robe, which Ruprecht beats in the absence of the judge's body, "in Ermangelung des Buckels" (1904).

With the Edenic and Babylonic falls in mind, it is notable that Adam also refers to "zwei Fälle" during the trial, which could include his own literal fall from the window, and the fall of the "Alte[n] Adam" (605): "...Zwei Fälle gibt's. / Mein Seel, nicht mehr, und wenn's nicht, so bricht's" (554-555), although such punning renders the fixed meaning and intent of these words unreadable. It is unclear how Adam, as judge and reader (i.e. interpreter of the evidence) is successful in his attempt to limit the possibility of the meaning of the fall to two, and only two, possibilities. These "zwei Fälle" may include Adam's fall (an undeniable fact) and his imagined fall out of bed (invented), the perpetrator's fall from Eve's window (unexplained), Walter's wagon crash, or of course the jug's final shattering. Any one of these literal falls may be linked to the "Fall"/case before the judge. Adam, as arch-fabulator, simultaneously widens the horizons of the event's meaning while delimiting the possibilities of explanations that point to his guilt. However, Adam's sin is more than doubling, for the foregoing has shown that he unceasingly multiplies the case's ("der Fall") possibility for meanings and associations. However, in this process of multiplication and replication, the mirroring relationship between the pitcher and Adam, both of whom are the central protagonists of this comedy, has remained relatively unexamined.

Before examining the relationship between the broken jug and the broken judge, we should examine in some detail Adam's postlapsarian physical condition. What are the nature of Adam's wounds, as we learn of them in the opening dialogue with Licht? He suffers from a sprained left foot (21-22) and facial injuries to his cheek (35-37), eye and nose (44-45). Licht and Adam both describe his face (35) and his foot (204) as "geschunden", a term ("flayed") usually denoting an extreme form of punishment. Adam's foot binds two strains of mythic culpability together: the biblical, in that the "Pferdehuf" represents Satan, and the Oedipal, in its misshapen state; the foot, as a physical deformity, serves as a "ganz unmetaphysiches Komödienrequisit" (Zenke 94). Even Adam's curse (or one should say oath) "Um alle Wunden" (521), expresses an implicit association between his fallen state and the stigmata of Christ. It is clear that

Adam's wounds represent a "body of evidence", as part of Kleist's "erkenntniskritische Rehabilitierung des Leibes" (Hörisch 175). The body becomes a sign and "indiziert Wahrheit gemäß dem Gesetz", for "[a]n des Dorfrichters Leib erscheint, was seine Rede nicht ans Licht und schon gar nicht in Lichts Protokoll kommen lassen möchte: die Male seines enttäuschten Begehrens" (Hörisch 175). However, both Adam's body and the jug are the only victims of a shattering experience. As Mark Ward sees it, the jug's destruction represents an escape from domination: "If the pitcher is taken as representing restriction, imposed authority and indeed a tyrannical power structure, then its breaking becomes a very positive occurrence, and a concentrated articulation of the comic "Gestalt" of the work" (64). In the same way, the jug's shattering portends Adam's eventually broken authority. If "Jedwedes Übel ist ein Zwilling" (1484), as Adam remarks when Walter notices his missing wig, then the twinning of judge and jug warrants more detailed investigation.

Ilse Graham suggests in her groundbreaking article of 1955 that the true protagonist of *Der zerbrochne Krug* (as indicated in any case by the title of the play) is in fact the broken jug itself, whose fall is narrated four times. Here I would like to point out a parallel between the fate of Adam and the life story of the jug, whose narration takes up several lines in the seventh scene. Although Graham does argue convincingly for the reinsertion of the jug as a central symbol of the comedy, I would go one step further and illustrate how Adam's fall reproduces the story of the jug's history. In other words, there is a fall in addition to Walter's and Adam's -- overlooked to a large extent by most critics -- which precedes Adam's. In this instance, Marthe describes Zachäus' throwing the jug from his window in order to save it:

> Der [Zachäus] warf, als die Franzosen plünderten,
> Den Krug, samt allem Hausrat, aus dem Fenster,
> Sprang selbst, und brach den Hals, der Ungeschickte,
> Und dieser irdne Krug, der Krug von Ton,
> Aufs Bein kam er zu stehen, und blieb ganz.
>
> (699-704)

While the jug survives with its leg intact, Zachäus ironically breaks his neck, only to

incongruously live to tell his tale to Marthe's late husband. In the second instance, the obvious motivation for the stage trial, Adam survives his fall from the window with face and leg injuries, but the jug is shattered, perhaps in Marthe's view as a sign of Eve's fractured, irreparable innocence ("Dein guter Name lag in diesem Topfe," (490)). The trajectory of the jug is explicitly linked to the act of telling and retelling; whoever possesses the jug, however temporarily, becomes a repositor of the vessel's history. Thus Zachäus, even with a broken neck, and Adam, who is trying to save his own neck, are required to tell the tale of the jug's adventure, regarding or disregarding the truth. The hole in the jug brings about Marthe's quest for the truth and need for an ending to the jug's (hi)story.

Adam, though instigator and investigator of the crime, represents as a human allegory the fall of the jug, only this time he injures his leg, while the jug lands intact "aufs Bein", until its second shattering fall. Kleist explicitly associates the jug and the "leg" in a single metaphor complex, in that both Adam and the jug land, so to speak, on their feet with differing results. Hansgerd Delbrück notes another judge/jug parallel in the material required: As God created Adam out of sand, so too is the "irdner" pitcher (*Kleists Weg* 53). Adam himself makes this connection clear, when he compares his foot ("Klumpffuß" (26)) to a lump: "Ein Fuß ist, wie der andere, ein Klumpen" (27). "Fußklumpen und Kopfklumpen", according to Harms, "...verweisen auf den Tonteig, aus dem jener Krug entstanden ist" (211). The foot and leg surfaces again in Ruprecht's oath: "Ich aber setze noch den Fuß darauf" (442), meaning that he will be cursed should he take Eva as his wife. Finally, the jug, "der kein Bein zum Stehen hat" (429), cannot be replaced. This metaphor is sustained and extended in a further passage: Frau Marthe insists that the "Herr Korporal" (469) (literally: the body), "der würd'ge Holzgebein" (470), would be a more suitable mate. As a form of compensation within the framework of a social economy, Marthe desires a one-legged man for her daughter to reassemble the lost integrity of the now legless jug. In the fallen and shattered world, in which the "Ausnahmezustand" of conscription portends bodily damage, fragmentation becomes the norm. The "dignified" amputee uses his sign of rank, "den Stock", to impose his authority on the conscripts; this same stick, a functionalized and ceremonial phallus, will

mark its authority in the back of Ruprecht, "...der dem Stock / Jetzt seinen Rücken bieten wird" (474-75). Thus the prosthesis, applied to the man with one leg, replaces Eve's lost honour embodied by the legless pitcher. The corporal, in possession of a second prosthesis in the form of his staff, will exact Marthe's revenge on Ruprecht. Adam is protected from physical sanction, for Walter threatens Ruprecht with confinement when he beats not the judge himself, but his robes.

Secondly, Adam's fall against the "Ofenkante" is his own invention, because it was Ruprecht's blow with the doorhandle that caused his wound. The latter, as embodying point of transgression (the door to Eve's room) is symbolically compatible with the windowsill (to the window of Eve's room). The variant scene, in which Eve explains the circumstances of Adam's visit, renders the link between Adam's head and the pitcher explicit. Upon entering her room, Adam "...nimmt sich die Perücke förmlich ab, / Und hängt, [...] / Sie auf den Krug dort..." (2209-2211). One can accept the erotic associations between the wig (metonymically Adam, as part of him) and the jug (synecdochically standing in for Eve and her innocence), if one assumes that the pitcher solely and allegorically represents Eve. However, Adam and the jug mutually fulfil a substitute function, in that the one stands in for the other: "Adam removes his wig, ... establishing a contiguity between himself and the icon of the old order" (Calhoon 246) by virtue of its placement. Hence the simultaneous fall of Adam, accompanied by the wig-wearing pitcher.

Numerous critics have noticed the link between Adam and the pitcher, by virtue of their parallel damage and association with authority. Calhoon, in a political reading, views the jug as a "symbol of the feudal structure" and a "surrogate for Adam" (231). The jug, like Adam's head, is punctured. Hoverland notes that the holes in Adam's head and in the body of the pitcher come from the same fall (*Prinzip* 38) and quotes Adam's remark: "Denn auf der Flucht zerschlagen sich die Krüge" (1350), even though there is only one jug. But the jug, like Adam, has a mouth and a neck, as well as legs; and according to *Grimms Wörterbuch*, an archaic term for a drinking vessel is a "Kopf" (11:1768), a congruence which may explain Adam's sudden mention of not one jug, but two. Ingeborg Harms notes that the broken jug is indeed the broken judge: "Auch der

Krug hat, wie Adam, nach seinem Fall zwei Löcher, das frische Loch, von dem in Marthes Zeugenbericht so vehement die Rede ist, und die Gußöffnung, die der Krug ohnehin besaß. In Adams Fall substituiert die Ofenkante das Gesims. Und Adams Schädel übersetzt sich in den Krug" (183); both the jug and Adam have "mouths", the latter's mouth issuing a stream of words, while Marthe speaks through and for the broken jug.

As with the emptiness of the hole where the scene had been depicted (649), Adam's "evil" wound is noticed by Walter as a hole: "Das ist ein böses Loch, fürwahr, im Kopf, das!" (1455). The hole in the jug has a hymenic association, which Marthe defines as Eve's "Ehre" residing in the jug. Ruprecht locates the source of Marthe's anger not in the shattered jug, but in the cancelled wedding between him and Eva: "Die Hochzeit ist es, die ein Loch bekommen" (440).

However, the real absence or hole in the story is the hole in Adam's head, that is the "truth" hidden for over two thousand lines of text. The narrative and interrogative language of the trial, during which all but Eve give testimony, temporarily suspends the testimony of Adam's body. His fictions also supress the true history of the wig, which would have covered the wounds Adam's head, until its fit finally confirms the judge as the accused. The essential material mediator of the wig conclusively implicates the battered Adam with the shattered jug.

I would also like to expand on Graham's formulations and assert the jug additionally plays a partially allegorical function in the drama, based in part on a reading of Frau Marthe's narration of the jug's history. Her story is not simply an absurd digression which characterizes her naive mode of perception (Graham, "The Broken Pitcher..." 103), but a deliberate literary **mise en abîme**, by which the reflected images of external events are inscribed on the nothingness of the hole, or in Frau Marthe's words, "auf dem Loch, wo jetzto nichts..." (649). What are now shattered fragments were images, in this case a representation of Kaiser Karl the Fifth, "von dem seht ihr nur noch die Beine stehen" (653) -- a possible allusion to the "legs" of the jug **and** of Adam. As in the incident between Adam, Ruprecht, and Eva, Marthe mentions at the close of her history a spectator:

Hier guckt noch ein Neugier'ger aus dem Fenster
Doch was er jetzo sieht, das weiß ich nicht.
(673-674)

A forgotten witness, or the audience[21]? Before the destruction of the jug, it would seem obvious that the curious onlooker was viewing the spectacle outlined by Frau Marthe. He sees "jetzt" -- through a collapsing of temporal and spatial boundaries on her part, since the images on the jug were as fixed and as static as those on Keats's Grecian urn -- and (re)constructs the mystery of the event. Karl Schneider clarifies Marthe's narrative style, which parodies Homer's description of Achilles' shield (176), and introduces useful terms, derived from Lessing, to describe how Marthe effectively intertwines being and becoming, depicting "das Koexistierende als ein Konsekutives" and translating "Beschreibung" into "Handlung" (176). To extend this descriptive modality to apply to the play itself is to recognize the importance of the "stationäre[...] Prozeßform" mentioned by Goethe (*LS* 185), by which the narration of the events is not separate from, but integral to the action. The importance of the pitcher lies also in its representative value as an art object to the drama as a whole. Where Martini sees in the to-and-fro of dialogue the effect of simultaneity, I see this illusion embedded in the temporal framework of the play. While the reconstruction of the pitcher/picture remains an impossible task, so too is the reconstruction of the events leading up to its destruction from the "fragments" of Marthe, Eve and Ruprecht's perspectives a difficult undertaking. The act of viewing the spectacle, for example, requires the spectator to move backwards and forwards through time through the narration, while viewing the narration as action. For example, Adam's act of dressing and undressing spans the entire sphere of action, from the removal of his wig at Eve's, the attempts to put on his vest and boots, to the conclusive wig replacement and the removal of his robes. Thus Marthe's apparently naive misrecognition of time constraints reveals and reflects the elastic function of textual time.

The "Krug" is the *Krug* in another way. I would argue that the pitcher, once whole and now shattered, embodies the play's aesthetic. In Reuss' opinion, "[d]er Name *Der zerbrochne Krug* ... ist *auch* ein Versuch Kleists, zu benennen, was sein Stück für sich selbst *ist*" ("Notizen zur Sprache..." 4). The intact surface of the jug, presented only

through Marthe's narration, illustrates in miniature a historical scene. Mark Ward notes that while Gessner's idyll and Zschokke's narrative explicitly depicted their pitchers ornamented with scenes of seduction and sexual conquest (60), Kleist chose a historical moment. The "zerscherbte Paktum" is not only a broken pitcher, but a broken picture; for surely it is no coincidence that the jug is "durchlöchert" precisely on its surface where the scene had been depicted. Hugo Aust draws out the importance of the *Bild*: the play "...verdankt seine Enstehung einem Bilde, bewegt sich konzentrisch um ein Bild (Krug-Gemälde), findet in einem Bild (Münzprägung) die Lösung und erhält aus dem Umkreis der bildenden Kunst (Teniers vs. Raphael) die einzige Selbstdeutung seines Autors" (68). The critic must put together the pieces, to attempt to reassemble the whole and to do the play/pitcher justice (in Marthe's words, "Soll hier dem Kruge nicht sein Recht geschehen?" (1971)). Ernst Ribbat rightly sees the play as "ein schwieriges Stück" (137) composed, of course, out of many plays, stories and pieces. The reconstruction of the pitcher is impossible, but not the reconstruction of the events leading to its final demise -- or is it? Whether the jug's status is a dramatic lapse on Kleist's part or a deliberate relativization of Marthe's reliability, the pitcher either has a hole ("Ein Loch"), or is shattered in many pieces ("In jeder Ecke ein Scherben"), or merely broken in two ("entzwei geschlagen"), or even be doubled, as Adam refers to the "Krüge" (1350). Indeed, for Oskar Seidlin, the pitcher may not be broken at all, "but literally riddled through in the most outlandish way", in what he describes as "an orgy of in-two-ness" ("For Whom..." 88); the play refers repeatedly to "entzwei", describing Walter's wagon (182), the pitcher (647), and finally Eve's happiness (should Adam destroy the forged documents) (2229). Likewise the jug (648), Adam's head (1458) and the wedding (441) have a "Loch". Ribbat explains that the broken jug is not just the object of the quarrel, but a poetological moment: "die heroische Tragödie umfassender Geltung hat keine Basis mehr, das Private, Fragmentarische, Partielle des Lustspiels ist allein zurückgeblieben" (137). The play's surface is part and parcel of the play of surfaces; the hole in the pitcher is to be filled with an explanatory meaning, the hole to be repaired by wholeness.

This loss of wholeness is confirmed by the presence of the fallen body and

extended by a series of associations: Adam's wound and the shattered jug, Walter's hand and the broken axle, the amputee corporal and the potentially flogged Ruprecht, and the "krummbeinig[e]" Lebrecht (1229). These injured characters populate a world in which humans not only possess their bodies but **are** their bodies (Hörisch 170). Adam's loss of his wig, the final piece of evidence in the puzzle of his guilt, cannot be seen in this context as a simplistic plot device. After all, in the Judeo-Christian tradition, the fig leaf worn by Adam is according to Richard Kearney the "his first cultural artefact" (42) and the price of shamed knowledge; Oskar Seidlin identifies the wig as a "kümmerliches Feigenblatt" (47), a leaf or a sheet of paper ("ein Blatt") behind which Adam can conceal his exposed body. Adam knows only too well that the return of the wig, as with the absurd return of Peter's finger in *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, will herald the end of the spectacle. Walter states: "Und grad auch heut / Noch die Perücke seltsam einzubüßen! / Die hätt Euch Eure Wunden noch bedeckt" (1456-58). His head wounds, suggestive of a sexual transgression (the head being a traditional phallic symbol) would have been sufficiently covered by his missing wig, suggestively impaled in the shrubbery surrounding Eve's window.

His departure from his bed and bench "bis in alle Welt" (1725) partially reflects on the exile of Adam and Eva from Paradise, and instead of the fixed tableau at the climax of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* or *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, Adam flees from an audience within an audience, his coat -- the mantle/"Mantel" (so to speak) of authority -- metonymically beaten by Ruprecht in its bearer's absence. What is interesting in this scene is how Adam's absent body leaves the stage, but he cannot escape his own stumbling physicality: "Verflucht mein Unterleib" (1774) is his curse. The body of Adam can escape, but Adam cannot escape his body. In the end he flees, his own back whipped in a masochistic manner by his returned wig (1659). Calhoon points out the role of scapegoating ritual, for Kleist, if one accepts Diethelm Brüggemann's argument, Adam's temporary banishment may act out the unseating of the only judge, in the words of Adam Müller to Goethe, whose opinion mattered: "die Billigung des einzigen Richters, den der abwesende Verfasser im Auge gehabt haben kann" (*LS* 183).

Der zerbrochne Krug is also about power, not only that of a judge and

perpetrator, but also that of "author"-ity in the form of the false letter of conscription. The power to absent the body of the rival, to remove it from its village frame of spatial reference to the distant theater of war embodies the impact of the verbal on the corporal. Ruprecht's body remains an object of the material instruments of power: either his back should be flogged by military discipline, or his neck clapped in irons by judicial punishment. The state, by issuing a piece of paper, can send him to the other side of the world. Wood, paper, iron -- and gold. Ruprecht does get more than he bargained for. The "Schaupfennig" offered to Eve as a token of their monogamous future is replaced by the gold of Walter which buys his freedom. Adam's "gewaltsames Verfahren" (609) is itself based on unique and unwritten statutes (629-630), while his letter outlining Ruprecht's conscription, though false, is accepted as authentic on Adam's authority. Walter even suggests that the necessarily literate member of the court, the scribe Licht, take over the proceedings. Hence the scriptural -- meaning both the written and the authoritative voice of the Bible -- is temporarily privileged in various ways over the corporal. Eventually, Adams's body becomes the body of evidence, a catalogue of physiognomic and bodily signs of guilt, whose fallen state leaves its imprint in the snow in the form of his trail of crooked footprints. Thus Adam's writing practice betrays him: his clubfoot leaves his imprint in his crooked steps, his wigless head is inscribed with his fall.

Amphitryon

Kleist's two comedies *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon* are linked by the notion of the primal scene of alternating doubling and fragmentation, of two-ness together and broken in-two-ness. These scenes of breaking are played out on the once-united body of the Schroffenstein family, whose fathers appear as "Hälften einer zerbrochenen Einheit" (Kluge, "Der Wandel..." 65), on the split nature of Adam and the shattered jug, and on the doubling of Amphitryon and Sosias. The doubling effect of the written word (as a sign of a referent) in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* is embodied by the divisive inheritance contract, while Adam's faked notice of conscription and false attestation bear witness to his deception by means of the written word. It is not surprising that Kleist's first tragic drama and his comedy *Der zerbrochne Krug* are driven by the metaphor of

original sin (*KA* I 608-609), coupled with a transgressive fall. The fall of Johann's and Adam's body marks these characters with the physical traces of their transgression. In the first two plays, the body literalizes the characters' trauma, while the process of doubling is part of social signification (in the construction of a divided family) or a dominant trope of *Der zerbrochne Krug*. Two branches of the same family tree are at war with each other over feudal rights, representing the one divided into two. Yet the opposing patriarchs (and their spouses) complement and mirror each other, particularly in the reciprocity of their aggressive actions. The possibility of a marriage between the lovers Ottokar and Agnes, who significantly meet at a reflecting pool, could reunite the family, but they are killed in a mirror fashion by their own fathers, after which the fathers unite in grief. In *Der zerbrochne Krug*, for example, Adam doubles and is doubled by Ruprecht and Walter, while simultaneously playing the role of father and suitor to Eve. Adam is most notably both judge and jug, the latter's final shattering acting as an emblem of its destroyer's fragmentation.

In *Amphitryon*, the body doubling is literalized by the appearance of Jupiter and Merkur in the respective guises of Amphitryon and Sosias. With the exception of Sosias's beaten back, instead of the physicality of the body of the *Krug* and *Schroffenstein* plays, characters express their deepest anxieties through fantasies of bodily fragmentation or exterior signs of embodied transformation, such as the diadem reinscribed with Jupiter's initial or Amphitryon's bent plumage. *Amphitryon*'s violence is largely psychological (cf. II/5), is internalized (through imaginary projection), or metaphorized (through language and visual signs). The woman Alkmene, like the servant Sosias, is forced to bear the physical traces of her encounter with the god by bearing his son Hercules.

If *Der zerbrochne Krug* explores the comic dilemma of a divided moral and corporeal self, as Adam "will von ungespaltenem Leib sein" (1232), avoiding a horizontal cut of the body between lower and higher senses, *Amphitryon* radicalizes self-division to the extent that Mercury and Jupiter respectively literally re-place and re-produce Sosias and Amphitryon's selves. Yet while the identity (in both senses of sameness and naming) of the body and its parts, that is the reconnection of the missing

finger to Peter and the explicit link between Adam and the wig, reconstructs and re-members these damaged bodies, *Amphitryon*'s framework is the out-of-body experience. The body divided becomes the body double.

Sharing a period of composition with *Der zerbrochne Krug*, as well as being his second comedy, *Amphitryon* nonetheless stands apart from Kleist's other plays as a conscious adaptation of its immmediate literary predecessor by Molière. Kleist makes this connection clear in the subtitle, *Ein Lustspiel nach Molière* ("according to" and temporally "after" Molière), while making changes and innovations, most notably the insertion of Jupiter's interrogation of Alkmene in the fifth act of the second scene. This addition "...places religious questions squarely in the play's central focus, with the consequent danger that a reading which finds their presentation ultimately incoherent runs the risk of seeming to condemn the whole play" (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 75). It is not surprising that this original scene, with its theological and religious implications, has produced the most commentary and debate[22] among critics who divine or refute coherence in Jupiter's "doctrine" or question or accept his total mastery of the situation. It is also not surprising (and hopefully not disappointing to the reader) that the present study's focus on the body will require the following examination to bypass these interpretive debates and look only at particular moments of bodily or self-representation.

In both dramas, the characters of Sosias and Adam are linked in various ways, as are those of Ruprecht and Amphitryon. Lilian Hoverland, for example, sees Adam acting as his own "Spielleiter"[23], while Sosias acts as a "Schauspieler" (*Prinzip* 34). In addition to their obsession with food and drink or their "Körperlichkeit" (Zeyringer 559), their common transgression is their capacity (especially in dramas featuring ritualized forms of interrogation) for telling stories, to (re)present a narrative. Sosias' solo theatrical performance at the play's beginning, in which he plays and rehearses for an audience of himself, already foreshadows his self-division, as he has already objectified himself as subject and object of his speech: "Dieser Sosias wird ... zudem eindeutig als *Theaterfigur* eingeführt..." and as "Theaterautor, Regisseur, Inspizient ... und als Schauspieler im Schauspiel" (Zeyringer 555). As noted above, Adam appears on stage

not with a performance for his own benefit, but with a series of inventive tales to justify his fall. These opening scenes emphasize verbal disclosure, exemplified by Adam's prophetic dream and by Sosia's invented eyewitness account (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 79). The relationship between power and discourse is rendered clear. Jupiter and Adam are allowed to interrogate their female victims; both get away with their accomplished and attempted crimes (Wittkowski, "Juggling of Authorities..." 69). As for the female victims, Alkmene's situation of a "tragedy encapsulated within a comic context" (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 76) mirrors the dilemma of Eve, whose speaking or silence may cost her Ruprecht. The master-servant relationship between Sosias and Merkur and Sosias and Amphitryon provides a point of departure for investigating the body, while Ruprecht and Amphitryon project their loss of bodily integrity through the medium of their female counterparts.

If *Der zerbrochne Krug* represents the comic portrayal of the Old Adam at odds with the New (or "man" as type at odds with himself), *Amphitryon*, as a near-tragic comedy, invokes the nightmarish possibility of a divided, yet doubled and more powerful self. Here the threat of death, as the ultimate out-of-body-experience, is eliminated by the restoration of the bodies and identities of Amphitryon and Sosias. The comic resolution effectively undercuts the play's tragic potential, especially when Sosias accommodates himself to the new regime. Eventually confronted by a psychological and physiological copy, Sosias' pretended practice speech before an imaginary audience (a "Theaterprobe" in Nölle's words (168)) -- during which he plays the part of both speaker and audience -- foreshadows such a division of selfhood. His identity is not "gespielt", but "verspielt", in that "eine göttliche Heimsuchung durch das Verhalten des Betroffenen mitprogrammiert sei" (Nölle 165; cf. Hörisch 164)). His commentating remark during his exposition ("Mit dem Hauptkorps ists nicht richtig" (96)) represents "...eine Formulierung, die als Motto dem ganzen Kleistschen Text vorangestellt werden könnte. Die Spaltung von Haupt und Körper äußert sich ... im Verhältnis dieser beiden Momente zueinander" (Reuss, ""...daß man's mit Fingern..."" 21). After his rehearsal, Sosias confronts his self, his double Mercury, who argues and then beats his name out of him. In the aftermath of his encounter with Mercury, he claims:

...Ich kann mich nicht vernichten,
Verwandeln nicht, aus meiner Haut nicht fahren,
Und meine Haut dir um die Schultern hängen.
(276-278)

It should be noted that Sosias must give up his name under the threat of physical violence, under the sign and power of Mercury's "Stock", the phallus. Yet he does not and cannot relinquish his identity, because his body ("meine Haut") is inalienable. "Merkurs Prügel", in the words of Hoverland, "die gerade seine verwundbare Seite, nämlich die körperliche, angreifen, bringen ihn schnell zur Aufgabe seines Ich-Seins" (*Prinzip* 35). However, the anti-metaphysician Sosias surrenders his name, not his corporal reality, which does represent his sense of being. As we see in this remark, each "portion" of identity exists by way of the stomach (Zeyringer 567):

Ich sehe, alter Freund, nunmehr, daß du
Die ganze Portion Sosias bist.
(368-369).

Mercury appropriates Sosias' name not only through physical force, but also through "the most extraordinary argumentation" (Graham, *Word into Flesh* 81), by which he imparts to his victim information known only to Sosias himself. Since the body for Sosias is his most immediate evidence of his selfhood, his exchange with Mercury is conducted in a materialist idiom (Jauß 133). In the penultimate scene, he even chooses the "real" Amphitryon on the basis of who will service his culinary needs: "So kann, wer nach Essen verlangt, zur Wahrheit gelangen -- Sosias, der Diener" (Oellers 76). Despite Sosias' protestations, Amphitryon refuses to believe his account justifying his failure to perform his duty. He offers his only bodily proof as to how he was unable to enter his master's house: "Wie? Mit einem Stocke, / Von dem mein Rücken noch die Spuren trägt" (724-725); his "Zeuge, mein glaubwürdiger, ist der Gefährte meines Mißgeschicks, mein Rücken" (733-734) is his bodily witness. Unlike Amphitryon's bent plumage, Sosias' scarred back represents not only his objectified marking as a slave, but also simultaneously authenticates him as the true Sosias, unless Mercury also assumed the signs of the beating. Thus what distinguishes Sosias from Mercury is an identifiable

bodily sign, a "materielles, einziges, weil eben leiblich spürbares Pfand der Wahrheit" (Zeyringer 566).

Ironically, both Sosias and Amphitryon are "entsosiasiert" and "entamphitryonisiert" by Mercury and Jupiter respectively, the former taking his food and role of servant and husband, the latter his wife and social position. While the comedy may be seen as a satire on certain forms of religious authority (Wittkowski, "Juggling of Authorities..." 69), it should be noted that Sosias is robbed of his name by physical force in a direct confrontation; Amphitryon is symbolically robbed by Jupiter's taking of his wife (an extension of his bodily integrity) and his identity (his role as father) by stealth, both of which are intertwined. While Amphitryon defines himself through his access to Alkmene's body, so too does Alkmene define herself in relation to her husband. Amphitryon's disempowerment is not signified by a beating inscribed on his back, but by the reinscription of the diadem with Jupiter's initial and a self-inflicted metaphorical disfigurement, the bending of his helmet plumage. The association between the closed case of the diadem and Adam's writing on virgin paper in Eve's chamber, seen by Calhoon as a metaphor for intercourse (245), becomes visible. As Adam's robe is beaten, so too does Amphitryon bend his sign of authority; only as an unknown interloper is Adam beaten by Ruprecht, while as a judge only Adam's robes remain to be assaulted. Thus the depth of satire is somewhat reduced by the apparently status-appropriate forms of physical stigmatization projected upon Amphitryon and Adam, and imposed upon Sosias by Mercury and demanded by Marthe for Ruprecht. As Sosias notes, the possession of power ultimately decides the relative truth of an event. In what is to our ears an ideological commonplace, Sosias points out that the "truth" of any event has a fluid relationship to power:

> So ists. Weil es aus meinem Munde kommt,
> Ists albern Zeug, nicht wert, daß man es höre.
> Doch hätte sich ein Großer selbst zerwalkt,
> So würde man Mirakel schrein.
> (766-769)

It is also within the power of the male figures to extract or conceal the truth, through

physical or mental force. What is interesting about both dramas is that the apparently cuckolded Ruprecht and the verifiably cuckolded Amphitryon sustain no physical harm. as signs of their psychological ordeal, unlike any other main male character in Kleist's dramas: Adam, Achilles, Hermann, Homburg and vom Strahl. Additionally, unlike these listed protagonists suffering bodily harm, they imagine their own bodily self-fragmentation by way of similar imagery. Their wound is of dispossession, not of bodily trauma, which is apprehended through the physical senses. Hearing at first the sound of the garden door on the way to Eve's, Ruprecht presents the extension of his eyes in the following extraordinary image:

> Sieh da! Da ist die Eve noch! sag ich,
> Und schicke freudig Euch, von wo die Ohren
> Mir Kundschaft brachten, meine Augen nach --
> -- Und schelte sie, da sie mir wiederkommen,
> Für blind, und schicke auf der Stelle sie
> Zum zweitenmal, sich besser umzusehen,
> . . . . . .
> Und schicke sie zum drittenmal, und denke,
> Sie werden, weil sie ihre Pflicht getan,
> Unwillig los sich aus dem Kopf mir reißen,
> Und sich in einen andern Dienst begeben:
> (903-908, 911-914)

In the sequential order of the senses, Ruprecht at first hears the sound of the garden door and then looks for Eve. Ruprecht submits his eyes, which he projects ahead as messengers, to self-discipline; he is literally in full possession and control of his faculties, metaphorically extending his sensual organs at will. Yet, as argued above, Ruprecht is never fully in possession of his body, for his ownership exists under state control. On the one hand, the passage above illuminates the physicality of the sensual experience, but on the other, it enunciates the experience of the body alienated from the mind and engaged in a dialogue with it. The immediacy of sense experience is lost, producing the effect of postponement, as the event of perception becomes overshadowed

by reflection and threefold repetition. This process of alienation, to the extent that one's sense organs are inalienable, reaches its most extreme expression in Ruprecht's belief that his eyes could tear themselves out against his will and enter the service of another. Ruprecht's unstable sovereignty over the constituent parts of his body mirrors ironically how he may appear to be in control of his own subjectivity, but that he is not in control of his self and his body as a subject, but is rather an object of power. In opposition to this partial control, vom Strahl freely brandishes his arm as instrument (*Käthchen*: "Hier ist ein Arm, / Von Kräften strotzend, markig, stahlgeschient, / Geschickt im Kampf dem Teufel zu begegnen;" 2311-2313)), or Kottwitz of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* claims to have no concerns about losing his head, since it never belonged to him as a subject in the first place: "Als mich ein Eid an deine Krone band, / Mit Haut und Haar, nahm ich den Kopf nicht aus, / Und nichts dir gäb ich, was nicht dein gehörte!" (1607-1609)

The arbitrary extension and disassociation of his eyes is replicated when Ruprecht sees what he does not want to believe. Ruprecht, whose ability to see is limited by the sand thrown in his eyes by Adam, states: "So sag ich zu mir, blind ist auch nicht übel. / Ich hätte meine Augen hingegeben, / Knippkügelchen, wer will, damit zu spielen" (1031-1033). The wounds of Kleist's male protagonists represent their collisions with the often malignant physicality of people and things. Ruprecht, in contrast, speaks to himself, and by making the mental move inwards, he projects his bodily and sensual being outwards. He alienates his eyes as organs of sense as a result of a physical and mental trauma, returning to a tactile sense of credulity. In *Amphitryon* "...wird der eigene Leib als untrennbare Form des Selbst anders als bisher zum Prüfstein der in Frage gestellten Ichidentität" (Jauß 131). Amphitryon, who along with Ruprecht links his sense of intactness with his sole possession of his mate's bodily integrity, extends Ruprecht's nightmare vision to a further degree of extremity:

> In Zimmern, die vom Kerzenlicht erhellt,
> Hat man bis heut mit fünf gesunden Sinnen
> In seinen Freunden nicht geirret; Augen,
> Aus ihren Höhlen auf den Tisch gelegt,
> Vom Leib getrennte Glieder, Ohren, Finger,

Gepackt in Schachteln, hätten hingereicht,
Um einen Gatten zu erkennen. Jetzo wird man
Die Ehemänner brennen, Glocken ihnen,
Gleich Hämmeln um die Halse hängen müssen.
(1681-1689)

The above scenario itemizes totalized self-alienation. The "Schachteln" containing the fragmented body parts refer back to the "Schachtel" containing Alkmene's diadem. As with the incident in the *Krug*, man-made light (represented by Marthe's lamp (1028)) leads not to insight, but to blindness and deception, for the Kaiser and Jupiter seduce and impregnate Gertrude and Alkmene by fading light. When the person is reduced to a mere constellation of parts, he or she becomes instrumentalized as a mere vessel (Alkmene, who will give birth to Hercules) or branded as an animal. Amphitryon is to be physically marked by media that are traceable through sight (the brand) and sound (the bells), proprietary modes of identification which reflect Alkmene's wearing of the inscribed diadem as a way of naming Amphitryon's and Jupiter's territorialization of her body. When such boundaries are disrupted by a foreign body, such a trauma remains in the realm of the imaginary until Amphitryon, in a decisive moment of sexual humiliation, bends his helmet plume. In addition to the symbolism of the detached eyes (familiar to readers of E.T.A. Hoffmann's *Der Sandmann*), the bent plumage points more or less obviously to an act of self-castration, an innovative gesture on Kleist's part with regard to his three main sources (Reeve, "Feathers, Sex..." 139). According to David Wills, who works with Freud and the uncanny, "the idea of the castration complex as prosthesis complex" (115) lies not only in the loss of one's eyes, but also in their replacement with another's. The horror for Ruprecht and Amphitryon is in their belief that, metaphorically speaking, Eve and Alkmene were seen (visually appropriated) and thereby carnally known by another man.

Analogous to Amphitryon's bent plumage is Ruprecht's physical gesture, which enunciates the "Sprachgebärde" characterizing his physically aggressive mode of expression (Aust 73). His shock of discovery produces a physical symptom, a "Blutsturz" (963), whose erotic connotations did not escape Brüggemann's attention, who sees in

Ruprecht's metaphorical erection and attack on the locked door an "obszöne Parodierung des Goetheschen "Faust"" ("Satyrspiel..." 1555). His bursting heart, accompanied by the popping buttons of his shirt, causes him to pull open his shirt (964-965) and kick in the door to Eve's chamber, an interior space analogous to the case holding Alkmene's diadem.

In depicting the experience of violence and violation, Kleist distinguishes such trauma by gender. For example, Ilse Graham (*Word into Flesh* 84) notes that Alkmene refers to her bleeding heart ("das Herz sich blutend" (981)), while Amphitryon wishes to restore his bleeding honour ("meine Ehre blutend" (993)). Amphitryon's concern with externalized symbols (the helmet plumage, the diadem) or mental abstractions (his honour) contrasts with Alkmene's metaphorical grounding in her heart. Her aesthetic sense -- that is, her capacity to feel and judge -- situates her between the "lower" orders of sense (Sosias and his stomach) and the "higher" forms of rationalization (Amphitryon and his head). While the diadem, inscribed originally with Amphitryon's first letter, may represent his labelling his spousal property, the change in initials proclaims otherwise. That the diadem was in a sealed box and a symbolic extension of Alkmene's body -- as was the wig for Adam -- subtly suggests how Jupiter violates her chastity. That the diadem was formerly the property of Labdakus seems to have been overlooked by the critics. Merkur notes that "Das Diadem ward ihm [Amphitryon] des Labdakus, / Das man im Zelt desselben aufgefunden" (330-331), and that Amphitryon had his initials inscribed on it (333-334); Jupiter's theft and appropriation merely duplicates Amphitryon's acquisition and naming of a free-floating object, a sign awaiting a signifier. Such symbolic assocaitions imply the status of Alkmene as an object of erotic exchange between men. The diadem, round in shape and protected in a locked box, is a companion sexual symbol to Amphitryon's bent helmet plumage[24]: their respective accessories are inscribed with the name of another, or phallically bent out of shape. It is not surprising that the helmet covers Amphitryon's head, while the diadem is to be worn over "ihren Busen" (37), the site of Alkmene's heart. Although she has not yet received the diadem, she speaks metaphorically of its changed form: "..als / Du um die Abenddämmerung mir erschienst, / Trug ich die Schuld, an welche du mich mahnst, / Aus meinem warmen

Busen reichlich ab" (806-809). Penthesilea and the Amazons, discussed in the next chapter, claim to retain their feelings despite the absence of their right breast. Penthesilea's breast is torn by Achilles; Alkmene is likewise emotionally wounded, and expresses her sense of injury in a similar way: "Den Riß bloß werd ich in der Brust empfinden" (875). Thus the helmet and the diadem perform similar metonymic functions, by embodying what was a controversial theme in the nineteenth century: Jupiter's rape of Alkmene and cuckolding of Amphitryon, whose self-emasculation (Reeve, "Feathers, Sex..." 139) is explicitly rendered by his remark: "Ich fühle mir den Kopf benommen" (925), a double predicament of lost reason and alienated sexual power. Kleist carries the ironic commentary of Sosias' on events further by allowing the servant to parody this gesture opposite Mercury: Sosias' disenfranchisement is insistently sexually symbolized by his offer to eat from the same bowl as his counterpart, but with identifiably different spoons ("Den ersten nimmst du, und die ungeraden, / Den zweiten Löffel, und die graden, ich" (2004-2005).

Amphitryon's nightmare vision illustrates his particular way of compartmentalizing and enclosing his and other bodies. Amphitryon's self-fragmentation, the boxing of the body, expresses his instrumentalization of the body at the expense of its total functioning, for a body broken into its constituent parts is dead. While Amphitryon talks about his body, Kleist offers a parallel opportunity for self-representation to Alkmene, who addresses her self and her body:

> Ist diese Hand mein? Diese Brust hier mein?
> Gehört das Bild mir, das der Spiegel strahlt?
> Er wäre fremder mir, als ich! Nimm mir
> Das Aug, so hör ich ihn; das Ohr, ich fühl ihn;
> Mir das Gefühl hinweg, ich atm' ihn noch;
> Nimm Aug und Ohr, Gefühl mir und Geruch,
> Mir alle Sinn und gönne mir das Herz:
> So läßt du mir die Glocke, die ich brauche,
> Aus einer Welt noch find ich ihn heraus.
>
> (1157-1167)

The denial of the senses as a mode of recognition privileges an "eternally feminine" capacity for judgement through feeling, a capacity whose moral sense is either undermined or confirmed by Alkmene's choice of the "wrong" Amphitryon: the reader's estimation of Alkmene's view of the senses depends on his or her understanding of the play's ending as tinged with subversive irony or a sense of tragedy. Alkmene, by Oellers' account, "sieht nicht mit den Augen, sondern mit dem Herzen ... die Wahrheit des Geschehenen wird durch die Reinheit ihres Herzens verbürgt" (79). Unlike the "Augenmensch" Amphitryon, she reads the external world in a tactile way; the letter "A" engraved in the diadem leaves an impression so deep "daß mans mit Fingern läse" (1115). That Jupiter asks "Steigst du nicht in des Herzens Schacht hinab...? (1432) illustrates the interiority of Alkmene's belief in the gods (*KA* I 968), for the idol ("Götzen" (1433)) is an image locked within her heart where Jupiter eventually penetrates. The "Schacht" of Alkmene's heart is not only the casing of the core of her being, it is also the authentic bodily correlative of Amphitryon's diadem in a locked case.

This gendered relationship between the helmet and the head, the breast and the heart is also present in *Penthesilea*, whose fluctuating image patterns (both Achilles and Penthesilea are linked to the helmet, head and heart) inhibit any attempt to ascribe particular roles to any particular gender. Gerhard Neumann, in his discussion concerning these twin passges, remarks that "[d]iese Experimente Kleists mit Blick und Stimme als Medien intersubjektiven Erkennens (im Doppelsinn von Wahrnehmung und Sexualität, von Wissen und Liebe) machen deutlich, daß seine Texte an einem kritischen Punkt in der Geschichte des menschlichen Körpers und des Versuchs, ihm identitätsbildende Kraft abzugewinnen, stehen" (""Der Mensch ohne Hülle..." 273)

These dramas enact the construction and disruption of interpersonal togetherness and bodily integrity, an apparent unity that is under constant threat. The oneness, or identity, of the Schroffenstein family comes apart through the document that supposedly binds them together; Adam, in a spectacle of multiple doubling, is divided as judge and perpetrator only to be brought together with his wig. Such breakdowns are characterized not only by their symptoms of bodily injury, but also by the attempted restoration of a destabilized patriarchal order. Rupert and Sylvester, having erased their offspring and

standing over the violated bodies of their children, attempt to reconcile with a handclasp. Walter, who replaces Adam's paternal authority, exchanges the faked medical certificate for his money. Unlike the ethically violated Eve, Alkmene's role as a raped vessel bonds Amphitryon and Jupiter, potential biological and surrogate fathers. While this chapter has examined how *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon* represented the doubling and fragmentation of the familial or individual body, the next chapter examines *Die Hermannsschlacht* and *Penthesilea* and how they portray the relationship between the mobilized body, the state, and war.

Endnotes

1. Helmut Sembdner has reprinted four reviews (*LS* 98a, 98b, 99, 100a) in his *Lebensspuren* volume (cf. *KA* I 541-565 for an account of the play's reception). As Hinrich Seeba notes in his influential essay of 1970, the literary reception of Kleist's first drama usually follows the pattern: "Der allgemeine Tenor der meisten "Schroffenstein"-Interpretationen ist ein reserviertes "wenngleich - dennoch" ("Der Sündenfall..." 108). Walter Muschg juxtaposes Kleist's genius with his struggle with form and describes the play as follows: "Die Erstlinge großer Dramatiker sind meist explosive Entladungen, die das Genie noch in wüster Unform sichtbar machen. Das Grundthema der Meisterwerke wird bereits angeschlagen, aber noch grotesk verquickt mit Entliehenem, an Vorbildern Bewundertem, atemlos überstürzt und verfinstert durch die Angst des Anfängers vor sich selbst, vor seiner quälenden Vision, die noch mächtiger ist als sein Kunstverstand" (356). The play's reputation seems to be growing. Gerhard Neumann, in a recent assessment, sees this work as "sein großartigstes Stück" because of its "Klarheit der exponierten Probleme und die Vollständigkeit ihrer strukturellen Auffächerung" ("Hexenküche und Abendmahl..." 15).

2. Gerhard Neumann suggests that the play presents three ways of healing the damage wrought by the original sin of the inheritance contract: the sacramental oath of revenge, "aufbewahrt durch die Schrift der Väter" (15) and the "Hexenküche" incantation of Barnabe in the language of magic connected to the body of the mother. Between these discourses resides the attempt of Ottokar and Agnes to create their own world through the creation of a language of love ("Hexenküche und Abendmahl..." 16).

3. Other examples of the written bearing a symbolic or plot motivating function in his subsequent dramas include: Adam's false affidavit on Rupert's behalf and the judicial file inspection which brings Walter to Huisum; the alteration of the letters of the diadem in *Amphitryon* from A to J; the role of captured (*Die Hermannsschlacht*) or misdirected (*Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*) letters; and Homburg's failure to record the dictated orders, the exchange of letters between him and the Elector, and Natalie's falsification

of troop deployment orders. For analyses that directly concern themselves with "Schrift", see Wolf Kittler's "Militärisches Kommando und tragisches Geschick. Zur Funktion der Schrift im Werk des preußischen Dichters Heinrich von Kleist". *Penthesilea*, seen by Kaußen-Mandelartz as a "radikalisierte Werkanalogie" (75) to *Schroffenstein*, goes beyond the norm of written discourse and presents the spectacle of writing on the body (cf. Chaouli).

4. In addition to this anarchy of other sense impressions, even the meaning of sounds comes into question in an episode which is trivial in itself, but significant in its framing the central act III/2. The servants bring a bell for Rupert, because when he whistles, both dogs and servants respond to his summons (1520ff), both thinking the call is addressed to them. Rupert replies twice with " 's ist gut" (1522, 1525), then despite this measure whistles at the end of the scene, only to ask his appearing servants: "Wo sind die Hunde wenn / Ich pfeife?" (1823). This collapse of categories, between the human and animal species, renders servants dogs, and dogs servants. Humans become objectified as animals, with Agnes seen as a scorpion, or with Käthchen (with her "hündische[n] Dienstfertigkeit" (1868)) as a dog under vom Strahl's whip: "Hab ich hier Hunde, die zu schmeißen sind?" (1745). This episode of minor confusion mirrors a larger misapprehension of what is heard. For example, Eustache admits that only Sylvester's name extracted under torture was seen by Rupert as a confession. Rupert, though deceived by Ottokar's appearance before him in Agnes' clothing and with "**verstellter Stimme**", fails to recognize his own son's voice. Even when the senses function adequately in this fallen world, such sense data are radically misinterpreted.

5. I cannot agree with the commentator of the *Klassikerausgabe*, who glosses these lines with a comparison to *Penthesilea*: "Die Metapher des psychologischen Selbstmordes wird ausgeführt in *Penthesilea*..." (*KA* I 622). Johann, unlike Penthesilea, does not summon up a "vernichtendes Gefühl", but rather a literal wound of memory which bears little relation to psychological suicide. His desire to remember through bodily pain does not compare with her concluding desire for oblivion and self-annihilation. Penthesilea kills herself with and through language; Johann's later attempt at suicide goes beyond his self

and seeks Agnes as an external agent, to whom he offers a literal dagger.

6. One element of this scene, along with Ottokar's survival of a fall from fifty feet in IV/5, is highly improbable. Gerhard Kluge points out that this finger had already been cooked by Barnabe in IV/4, only to return with a recognizable "Blatternarbe" in V/1 ("Der Wandel..." 67). However, Ursula's detailed description of the circumstances surrounding her discovery of the body makes the identification of the finger's origin possible.

7. Cf. Penthesilea's words on the dead Achilles in the variant: "Du hielst mir wett ich, als ich dich erstickte / Gleich einer Taube still, kein Glied hast du, / Vor Wollust, überschwenglicher, o Diana! / Keins deiner Gleider mir dabei gerührt" (**Variant**, 883). In their 1969 article on the "Kleist-Aufzeichnungnen von Wilhelm v. Schütz", Klaus and Eva Kanzog demonstrate that Marie von Kleist excised parts of Kleist's letters to her which related exclusively to their relationship; they also suggest that Marie's criticism may have played a role in Kleist's altering and reducing the sensuality in the variant of the twenty-fourth scene for the book edition (42-44).

8. In terms of the textual origins of this composition, in which Kleist transformed *Die Familie Ghonorez* into *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, it is interesting to note one of the "Vor-fälle" which may have governed Kleist's construction of Juan/Johann's encounter with Agnes. His first recorded letter (of 1793) contains this account of the author's fall:

> Vor Naumburg liegt ein hoher Felsen; eine alte Burg stand darauf. Man erzählte mir, ein hundertjähriger Greis sei der einzige Bewohner dieses Ritterschlosses: dies hören, und den Entschluß gefaßt zu haben ihn zu sehen, war eins. Alles Protestierens des Herrn Romerio, der sich nicht gern aufhalten wollte, ungeachtet, fing ich an den **schroffen** Felsen hinanzuklettern. Ein Tritt auf einen losen **Stein** welcher abbrach, und ein darauffolgender 5 **Fuß** hoher **Fall**, schreckte mich von meinem Vorhaben ab, und hätte schlimmere Folgen für mich haben können, wenn unser zweiter Begleiter mich nicht aufgefangen hätte" (464, my emphasis).

The highlighted words illustrate the apparent similarities in diction between this letter and Juan's initial account of his fall. It is therefore possible to argue that Kleist transplanted his experience near Naumburg into his first draft of *Die Familie Ghonorez.*

9. The nature of Johann's and Adam's fall from grace contrasts with the use of the same image cluster occurring in *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn.* At the beginning of III/1, Gottfried and Theobald Friedeborn are leading Käthchen on a rocky path, while Theobald guides her steps:

> Nimm dich in acht, mein liebes Käthchen; der Gebirgspfad, siehst du, hat eine Spalte. Setze deinen Fuß hier auf diesen Stein, der ein wenig mit Moos bewachsen ist; wenn ich wüßt, wo eine Rose wäre, so wollte ich es dir sagen. --
>
> (1383-1386)

Käthchen, however, does not fall into the female "Spalte", nor does she slide off the mossy stone which brings down Juan in *Die Familie Ghonorez.*

10. The sequence of events surrounding the publication and literary reviews of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* and the composition of *Die Natürliche Tochter* pose some tantalizing possibilities. Although Goethe became acquainted with his historical source in 1799 and had composed the first act of *Die Natürliche Tochter* as early as 1801, this work underwent constant revision. Firstly, documents show that Kleist spent Christmas (1802) and some two months at the estate of C.M. Wieland (*LS* 86 - 94b) in Oßmannstedt near Weimar. An encounter between Kleist and Goethe (who was residing in Weimar at the time) remains a matter of speculation, although a recent discovery documents that Kleist visited the ducal library of Weimar precisely during this period (cf. Pabst). As for the circumstantial evidence, Kleist's play was advertised in November 1802, published anonymously in the New Year of 1803 by Geßner, and subsequently reviewed by L. Huber of the *Freimütige* (March 4th, 1803, *LS* 98a), whose allegiance to Kotzebue and Merkel (detractors of Goethe and co-editors of this journal) and praise of the unknown poet at the expense of Goethe and Schiller would have certainly drawn the attention of the Weimar circle of Goethe's admirers. It did. On March 9th, 1803, five

days after the publication of Huber's review, Karl August sent a letter to Goethe in which he attached a copy of the new journal, whose apparent aim was to act as a counterpoint to the *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*: " -- Übersendung einer neuen Zeitung, die G. vielleicht mit der "Zeitung für die elegante Welt" sammeln wolle. Man müsse sie halten, *um im Laufe der Impertinenzen zu bleiben*" (*Briefe an Goethe*, vol. 4, 200). Such impertinences on the part of Kotzebue's gibes and satires apparently made Goethe ill to the extent that he stayed at home for nine weeks, during which he worked on *Die Natürliche Tochter*. Christiane Vulpius' letters provide useful information on the work in progress and the effects of the feud. On February 7th, 1803, she notes that Goethe "vollendet sein Trauerspiel" and that "Kotzebue hat sich allgemein verhaßt gemacht. Goethe antwortet ihm nicht, aber er soll gezüchtigt werden" (*Gespräche und Begegnungen*, vol. 5, 329). However, the attacks take their toll: "Er [Goethe] ist nun seit 7 Wochen nicht aus dem Hause gegangen" and many are "auf des Kotzen Buben Seite" (*Gespräche und Begegnungen*, vol. 5, 330); in March she reports that he has not left the house for nine weeks, and that "[d]as Kotzebue. Wesen hat ihn sehr getroffen", although he continued to work on *Die Natürliche Tochter* (*Gespräche und Begegnungen* 332), which was performed towards the end of March, 1803. That Goethe had a crisis of confidence during this period is suggested not only by his apparent isolation, but also by a reported remark by Kleist's host Wieland, noted by Böttiger: "Goethe hatte die vorige Woche ein déjeûner gegeben, blos um sich wegen seines neuen dramatischen Products von den Hofdamen u.s.w. loben zu hören. Die Thränen hatten ihm in den Augen gestanden" (*Gespräche und Begegnungen* 336). In June, 1803, Brentano reports that this play brought Goethe himself to tears as he read it to the actors (*Gespräche und Begegnungen* 334). Goethe's sensitivity with regard to this particular play is exposed by the origins of the rift between him and Herder; after a private reading, after which the audience praised the work, Herder reportedly said: "Am Ende ist aber doch Dein natürlicher Sohn lieber, als Deine "Natürliche Tochter"" (*Gespräche und Begegnungen* 348). It is perhaps no coincidence that *Die Zeitung für die elegante Welt* -- to which Goethe subscribed -- also published an anonymous review of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* in July, 1803 (*LS* 99). The reviewer notes that "Vorschriften und Hindeutungen sind

übrigens bei einem wahrhaft genialen Schriftsteller überflüssig", while Goethe's letter to Kleist (of February 1st, 1808), in which he rejects *Penthesilea*, states: "Vor jedem Brettergerüste möchte ich dem wahrhaft theatralischen Genie sagen: hic Rhodus, hic salta!" (II 807); the echoes of the terms "theatrical genius" may be coincidental. One of the ironies of literary history is the contemporary view of Goethe's tragedy as "das große Schmerzenkind" among his dramatic works, as it is largely met with critical "Ablehnung und Verlegenheit" (Vaget 210).

11. Cf. Natalie's defence of Homburg's disobedience, in which she refers to him as "dieser Fehltritt, blond mit blauen Augen, / Den, eh er noch gestammelt hat: ich bitte! / Verzeihung schon vom Boden heben sollte: / Den wirst du nicht mit Füßen von dir weisen!" (1104-1108). Homburg's mis-step, infantilized and given an expressive twist by Natalie's choice of "stammeln", brings him to the ground, from which the Elector's forgiveness will raise him. The image of the loyal child being kicked away by a distant father figure brings to light a parallel with *Käthchen von Heilbronn*: "Du [vom Strahl] stießest mich mit Füßen von dir" (578).

12. Two scholars have pointed out Kleist's fascination with judges and judgement in connection with Goethe. Friedrich Michael suggests that Kleist had already borrowed characteristics from the minor figure of the "Amtmann" in Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*; Brüggemann further argues that in his letter to Goethe -- which enclosed the manuscripts of *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon* -- Adam Müller deliberately associated Goethe ("der einzige Richter..."), or expected Goethe to make the connection himself, with the figure of Adam. In fact, in Brüggemann's view, Kleist composed the play as a response to *Faust* and as a satirical "Großangriff Kleists auf Goethe" ("Satyrspiel..." 1551). If Mommsen's assertion that Kleist wove Eugenie's fall in *Die Natürliche Tochter* into the fabric of *Penthesilea* is correct, then it is possible that Kleist alluded to the "Gerichtsrat" of *Die Natürliche Tochter* in *Der zerbrochne Krug* as well.

13. See, for example, *Kleists Lebensspuren* 66, 67a, 67b, 68, which provide Heinrich Zschokke's account of the contest between Kleist, Zschokke and Ludwig Wieland. Jakob Otto Kehrli's booklet *Wie Der zerbrochene Krug von Heinrich von Kleist entstanden ist*

establishes that the copperplate engraving by Le Veau, which was a copy of an original painting by Debucourt, was the picture hanging in Zschokke's lodgings in Zürich (12).

14. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to account for the play's numerous sources and allusions employed by Kleist to supplement the main sources (ie. the Le Veau engraving, the Oedipus myth, and the biblical story of Genesis). Several scholars have found wide-ranging associations and literary sources. Among them are: John T. Krumpelmann, who discusses the comedy in light of Shakespeare's Falstaff dramas; Helmut Sembdner finds allusions to and echoes to Rabener's *Satirische Briefe*; As for Kleist's relationship with Goethe, Diethelm Brüggemann views *Der zerbrochne Krug* as a parody of *Faust* and a "Satyrspiel" on its author, while Hans Wolff sees the attempted seduction of Eve as a commentary on the Gretchen tragedy (155); Friedrich Michael establishes that Kleist was familiar with Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, and that his "Amtmann" is a prototype for Adam; Richard Wilkie notes that the plot and characters (including a corrupt judge interfering with a young couple and a benevolent court inspector) of Christian Felix Weiße's play *Der Krug geht so lange zu Wasser, bis er zerbricht* (1786) may have inspired Kleist; E. Theodor Voss, in his "Kleist's *Zerbrochner Krug* im Lichte alter und neuer Quellen", looks at the engraving's allegorical compositions and suggests that Kleist's notion of a corrupt judge may have been provoked by its juxtaposition of the court scene with the implied background of a brothel (347).

15. The origins of the word tragedy remain in dispute, the *Oxford English Dictionary* citing a reference that rejects any association of the goat with the word tragedy. However, the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* suggests that the Greek "trágos" means "Ziegenbock" (III: 1824), to which Adam refers (50, 60).

16. John Ellis has also noted the malevolence of the material world towards the characters in his 1970 study of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, for a similar transport problem comes to light: on their way to the see the Elector the axle on the Electress' wagon breaks: "Am Dorftor brach die Achse ihres Wagens" (503).

17. Sean Allan's provocative understanding of Eve's character places her in the biblical tradition, by suggesting that she is the temptress, yet goes beyond traditional

representations of her simplicity: "Kleist's Eve tempts her 'Adam' by offering him 'forbidden fruit' (albeit of a rather different kind) thereby bringing about his downfall" (82). Since in Allan's view she had been well aware of the price of Adam's cooperation and understands how to "perform" for Walter, "it is not possible to regard Eve as a straightforward embodiment of 'naive innocence'"(84), thereby disagreeing with Hans Wolff's assertion that "Eves Verhalten ist ... aus dem Gefühl, aus der Sphäre des Unbewußten motiviert" (163-164). She represents a "calm, resourceful intelligence" (86). When one takes into account the power of Eve's spoken words -- words which will unseat Adam -- Allan's argument becomes even more convincing. As a result of the trial's outcome, Adam is suspended, Eve is vindicated, and Walter is more or less forced to put his money where his mouth is, by purchasing Ruprecht's freedom. Hans Wolff does similarly view Walter's benevolence skeptically: "Walters edle Handlungsweise erscheint ihnen [Ruprecht and Eve] nur als ein politischer Schachzug, darauf berechnet, allzu großem Mißvergnügen unter der Bürgerschaft vorzubeugen" (168).

18. Ilse Graham (*Word into Flesh* 244) points out the significance of innocence and experience in the reading of signs as allegorized in a Wickram anecdote cited by Kleist "Von einem Kinde, das kindlicher Weise ein anderes Kind umbringt" (413). While playing the roles of cook, pig, and butcher, a group of playing children "auf kindlicher Weise" allow one of their group, the butcher, to kill another, the pig. A wise man suggests the following test of innocence or guilt: the highest judge will hold out to the boy an apple in one hand, a Rhineland guilder in the other. If he takes the gold, he shall be executed, but he laughingly takes the apple instead, and is thus spared punishment. The true innocence of the perpetrator is measured by his relative ability to read into objects their attributed symbolic exchange value. In religious iconography, the apple represents fruit from the tree of knowledge. Graham regards this anecdote as "the precise analogue, on the level of action, of Penthesilea's failure to grasp the symbolic status of words" (*Word into Flesh* 244). However, this anecdote is more applicable to Eve's reading of the coinage offered by Walter, in a play which contains extensive reference to religious symbolism. Oskar Seidlin, for example, reads Eve's acceptance of

the money as a second eating from the tree of knowledge ("Was die Stunde schlägt..." 51).

19. This reading of Eve's interaction with Walter is based on the variant, which is included in this discussion for the following reasons. Firstly, although the shorter version of the drama is more effective on stage, this study is focused on the text as it is read, not as it is performed. Secondly, Kleist's publication of the variant in the book form of the play in 1811 (Zenke 92), reflects his own intentions to include it as part of the complete work. Thirdly, the variant's inclusion on the grounds of aesthetic balance, as an "integrierender Teil des Ganzen" (Michelsen, "Die Lügen Adams..." 285), is compelling. One can argue that the impulse of the play is the revelation of the true circumstances, and each character's narration of his or her version of the last night's events. While Kleist dedicates the first four scenes and over three hundred sixty lines to defining the relationship between Licht and Adam under the pressure of Walter's visit, the shortened version effectively silences Eve, by giving her ten lines to tell her story. In other words, the variant -- of over three hundred lines -- gives Eve's version of the event, a counterweight to Adam's lies and inventions of the first four scenes and a supplement to the circumstantial evidence built up during the trial. Adam tries to create a sense of trust and solidarity with Licht, as Walter eventually appears on the scene; following Adam's temporary absence in the preceding scene, Eve and Ruprecht, as part and parcel of the comic resolution, must also restore a mutual sense of trust, this time not under the treat of Walter's intervention, but at his instigation. Licht, as Peter Michelsen points out, interrogates Adam; Walter, in the variant, interrogates Eve ("Die Lügen Adams..." 273). Interestingly enough, Adam and Licht are conspicuous by their absence in the variant. Walter, according to Frank Schlossbauer, represents "Adams Gelüste in sublimierter Form" (542), for in the variant he is allowed to kiss Eve (2378). Thus the variant explicitly parallels the play's beginning, in that Adam failed to achieve what Walter is permitted: physical contact with Eve, whom nobody except Walter touches on stage, although in the shorter version the reconciling kiss takes place between Eve and Ruprecht. Eve's sudden acceptance of the gold after a protracted debate provides an

interpretive impasse, whose critical solutions and detours are summarized in Grathoff's article ("Der Fall des Kruges..."), in which he suggests that the money in its modernized form exerts institutional authority. Anthony Stephens provides a viable answer, which really poses another question: "The dislocation of rational dialogue by the exchange concerning the golden coins ... is like the hole in the broken jug in which the founding of the Netherlands ... has to be imagined to occur" (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 65).

20. Kleist favours a strongly allusive use of names without necessarily imposing an allegorical framework which would overdetermine our reading of the characters. Although the name "Walter", according to Wolfgang Wittkowski, may be a reference to "Walten" (to govern or control)("Juggling of Authorities..." 69), such an interpretive possibility does not provide enough support for the belief that Walter possesses god-like, or even God-like, qualities. Borchardt, for example, mentions Walter's "Milde und Nachsichtigkeit Adam gegenüber", which is "sicher der göttlichen Gnade gleichzusetzen, die -- dem lutherischen Glauben entsprechend -- auch dem Sünder verzeiht" (118). Walter's arrival in Huisum in a broken coach with a sprained hand seems to parody the interventionist methods of Jupiter (who must take on mortal form in *Amphitryon*) or the numerous allusions in Kleist's work to the chariot-riding Helios (in *Penthesilea*). Walter, if a *deus ex machina* (albeit in a machine in need of repair), disavows any interference in local or mortal affairs and is a "god" who merely looks down upon the "Welt, die gebrechliche" (*Penthesilea* 2854).

21. It should be noted that the Le Veau engraving contains a spectator in the background; while the empirical audience views the scene depicted from some unfixed point outside the frame of the picture, another spectator, viewed through an open doorway, can be seen looking out of his or her window(frame).

22. Wolfgang Wittkowski's *Heinrich von Kleists 'Amphitryon'. Materialien zur Rezeption und Interpretation* (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1978) provides a useful documentation and collection of commmentary, while Hans Robert Jauß surveys the Amphitryon tradition from Plautus to Molière to Kleist. Since the fifth act of the second

scene is Kleist's innovative addition, and in the words of Gadamer belongs "zu den größten dichterischen Kostbarkeiten der Weltliteratur" (343), critical attention has largely concentrated on this particular scene. The debate centers on the play's treatment of Jupiter's authoritative superiority and the apparent coherence or incoherence of his doctrine. Anthony Stephens, for example, questions this emphasis and suggests that "[t]he reception of the text as a whole may thus be as trusting as Alkmene under Jupiter's interrogation" (*Plays and Stories* 77). Wittkowski believes that the play "is a satire, disguised as harmless comedy, on authority and on uncritical obedience to authority" ("Juggling of Authorities..." 69; cf. "Verschleierung der Wahrheit..."). Contemporary critical approaches assume the play's ironic commentary. Janet Lungstrum's Lacanian analysis understands the "often violent sexual encounter [as] a *metadrama* for the dialogic act of creative conception itself" (69); Jean Wilson's investigation of geneaology takes a parodic view of Jupiter, who "...finds himself in the preposterous position of having to imitate his own creation in order to possess what he himself has made" (125). Along with Wittkowski, she asserts that "...it is clearly impossible to declare unequivocally who wins and who loses at the end of Kleist's highly ironic play" (130).

23. The theatrical discourse of *Der zerbrochne Krug* is already apparent in the playful format of the trial, in which all the characters play their role and speak their parts before an audience. Both Adam and Ruprecht use the specular imagery of the theater: Adam sees himself as a "Spektakel" (186) following his nocturnal "Schwank" (154), and Ruprecht uses the former term to describe the scene at Marthe's (" 's war ein Spektakel..." 1040). Walter is unable to understand Adam's "Aufführung" (820), perhaps because Adam, the artist of improvised theater, has no script on hand and is improvising the text of the trial and the narrative of the night's events.

24. Following Amphitryon's attempt to certify his identity, the "erster Oberster" remarks on one method of deciding the case: "...ich, für mein Teil, / Bin für die kürzesten Prozesse stets; / In solchen Fällen fängt man damit an, / Dem Widersacher, ohne Federlesens, / Den Degen querhin durch den Leib zu jagen" (2139-2143). The pun on "Federlesen", literally "reading the feather" as opposed to its actual meaning "wasting

no time" alludes playfully to the uselessness of Amphitryon's ploy and points out (not so playfully) the possible dangers in losing the contest. Unlike Käthchen's mole, Amphitryon can only offer a prosthetic signifying device to contrast his identity with that of his body double. In Plautus, Jupiter and Mercury were identified by a golden cord and a wing on the hat respectively -- props tranferred by Kleist to his mortal characters in the form of Amphitryon's bent plumage and Alkmene's diadem (Jauß 118).

Chapter Two

The Mobilized Body Politic: *Penthesilea* and *Die Hermannsschlacht*

While *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon* have long been integrated into the German theatrical and literary canon of the twentieth century, and *Die Familie Schroffenstein* recognized for its dynamic originality, theatrical conventions and the circumstances of history had until recently not been particularly kind to *Penthesilea* and *Die Hermannsschlacht*. Despite their initial popular rejection due to the political and theatrical demands they make on their audiences, these dramas have enjoyed in the last twenty years a new degree of critical attention. It is not surprising that these works of emotional and bodily extremity, as they depict the collapse of the Amazonian state and creation of a new Germanic nation, have provoked and continue to provoke such extreme reactions among Kleist's contemporaries and later audiences and critics[1].

These dramas can indeed be seen as Kleist's most problematic plays: *Die Hermannsschlacht*, the national drama of Kleist's last years, and *Penthesilea*, which is after *Die Familie Schroffenstein* Kleist's only other tragedy ("Trauerspiel") to be labelled as such. Both embody total war in their extreme cruelty, the instrumentalization of total hatred, and the on- and offstage representation of violence. While their near-unperformability -- despite Kleist's deployment of teichoscopic effects to relate rather than show physical violence -- has frequently consigned them to the invisible theater, their physical and psychological extremity has promoted rather than hindered their status as objects of interpretive and performative experimentation. With his *Penthesilea*, Kleist "...wußte, daß er ... Grenzen überschritt und Tabus verletzte: Grenzen der Bühne und Schauspielkunst seiner Zeit, [und] ... des Einfühlungsvermögens der Zuschauer" (Nutz 163), while *Die Hermannsschlacht*, an "allegorisches Zeitbild" and series of "verstörende[n] Bilder" (Miller 98) rendered it unstageable at the time and one of Kleist's most controversial dramas. The latter, a partisan manifesto, delineates the extremes of hatred and bodily harm necessary for national liberation. Hermann places his body, and the bodies of friend, family and foe, at risk in order to achieve his political ends. He ultimately reinscribes the law of Germania onto the surface of the soil through the spilling of Roman and German blood, an act which not only expels the enemy but also

exterminates him.

Penthesilea, on the other hand, features a tragic heroine and military commander who willingly sacrifices her body and those of her allies to achieve corporeal integration with the desired object. While Hermann's abstracted vision of a Germanic utopia free of Roman tyranny permits him to dehumanize and objectify his enemies, Penthesilea's will to break with Amazonian law and personalize the larger conflict between men and women, Trojans and Amazons, allows her to commit the ultimate act of love and incorporate Achilles. If Hermann's successful campaign against the Romans depends on the objectification of the enemy, Penthesilea's conflation of personal attraction to Achilles, described by Emmel as a "gigantisches Bild der erotischen Maßlosigkeit" (154), the emotional (her mother's prophecy) and the political (the furtherance of the Amazonian state under its laws) motivate the tragic conflict. The characters' failure or success in coming to terms with difference determines the outcome of these works: Hermann radically separates the Romans from all traces of their humanity, conspires in their immediate extermination, and looks forward to the destroyed Roman Empire of the future. Achilles' and Penthesilea's will to subjugate and incorporate the other as lovers and enemies, in a drama of "sadomasochistic oscillation" (Paglia 261) between submission and domination, causes them to regress to the violent origins of the Amazonian society and to reenact its founding ritual. In his juxtaposition of each drama, Lukács notes how the climactic act of consumption of *Penthesilea* originates in "eine Kette von groben Mißverständnissen", and also points out the "bewußte und schlaue Irreführung" of the enemy in *Die Hermannsschlacht* (217). To use the phrasing of Walter Müller-Seidel's 1961 monograph: Hermann, whose realpolitical clearsightedness unifies the nation, embodies the principle of "Erkennen", while Penthesilea's drive for dominance leads to her "Versehen" and ultimate "Versprechen".

Although this chapter will investigate Hermann's fusion of bodies and texts and the body as text, the two dramas intersect in their feminized orality, for Penthesilea and her dogs and Thusnelda and the bear tear the breast of their suitors/enemies: Penthesilea deploys "Mund jetzt und Hand, und Hand und wieder Mund - ?" (2961) in her destruction of Achilles, while the hand and mouth images of *Die Hermannsschlacht*

permeate the discourse of extermination. In contrast to *Käthchen* and *Penthesilea*, Kleist's patriotic drama is set in a male world, with the exception of Thusnelda, whose disillusionment and outburst of hatred parallels Penthesilea's (Brown 128). Only through total liquidation (in *Die Hermannsschlacht*), or its absorption by the ravenous perceiving subject (expressed by Penthesilea's hungry gaze), can the non-identical foreign body be consumed and erased. Yet war, be it motivated by attraction or repulsion, exacts its cost on the body of the victim. In his letter to Marie von Kleist of late autumn 1807, Kleist writes on Penthesilea and Achilles: "Sie hat ihn wirklich aufgegessen, den Achill, vor Liebe" (796). What occurs at a micro-political level in *Penthesilea* in a war centered on "Vereinigung" of bodies (Nutz 167)) occurs macro-politically in *Die Hermannsschlacht* (Germania devours the Romans in a war of extermination). The oscillating forces of "Vereinigung" and "Vernichtung" characterize the extremes of love and hate in each drama.

At this point at which the body assumes a representative role with regard to the state, the two dramas under discussion intersect. Nutz's insight, that *Penthesilea* is a "Körperdrama" built around the readings and misreading of bodily signifiers, serves as a point of departure, in that these works depict the reading, misreading, and appropriation of bodily sign systems. Such sign systems function through Penthesilea's omnivorous gaze fixed on the body of Achilles, or are represented in Hermann's manipulative strategies of signification, defined here as his facility to read, manipulate and compose messages by assembling or deploying bodies and texts. The following exegetically itemizes the discourse of the body firstly of *Penthesilea* and then of *Die Hermannsschlacht*, drawing out in a concluding section the broader implications of such collisions, interactions, and stigmata for the bodies and states in question. These dramas produce a paradox: the momentary return of the body, front and center of dramatic action, and its ultimate erasure.

Penthesilea

As a "geniales Ärgernis" (*LS* 279a) which fascinated and repelled contemporaries and later critics, *Penthesilea* has suffered no shortage of critical attention. Helga Gallas

outlines at least six prevalent ways of viewing the text: as "Staatskritik", "Kampf der Deutschen mit Napoleon-Achill", "Widerspiegelung des Kampfes Goethe - Kleist"[2], "Manifestation des mörderischen Wesens von Liebe und Sexualität", "Manifestation von Homosexualität"[3] and finally "Ausdruck verschiedener narzißtischer Störungen" ("Lacans vier Diskurse..." 203). In light of its depiction of a strong female figure, Jost Hermand's critical account (in both senses) of *Penthesilea* scholarship has recently evoked the spectacle of a "Kreuzfeuer geschlechtsspezifischer Diskurse" (1995). In his rejection of "wilden Interpretationen" (34), Hermand recognizes the effectiveness of a feminist approach that links the drama to Kleist's ideological position, without retreating to the timeless ahistory of the mythological, archetypal, psychological, or biological (44). As Benno von Wiese points out, in opposition to the mode of classical drama, in which characters represent ideas (312), Penthesilea and Achilles are bodies and desires. The following reading of the politics of the body recognizes two factors: that a drama actualizes an action, that is a movement of a body through time and through space, and that an approach that integrates the body in all its manifestations does not necessarily collapse into the ecstatic rhetoric of sensibility, by celebrating, for example, Penthesilea's cannibalism as parodying the feast of Dionysus. Secondly, the body of Kleist exists under the sign and power of the state, a relationship that will be examined further in this section, which begins where the drama begins and ends: in the construction and destruction of Achilles' body.

The first three scenes of the drama illustrate Kleist's gift for teichoscopic representation, in which "Auge und Zunge, Schauen und Sprechen", fundamental elements of theater, attain ascendancy over the representation of such action (Klotz, "Kleists extremes Theater..." 129). The narration of the Amazons' intervention and Penthesilea's reaction to the sight of Achilles overcomes the visual representation, and could be see as more authentic and dramatically effective (Klotz, "Kleists extremes Theater..." 139). Instead of a simple entrance onto the stage, Kleist describes the gradual appearance of Achilles on the horizon through the eyes and words of an observing soldier:

Seht! Steigt dort über jenes Berges Rücken,

Ein Haupt nicht, ein bewaffnetes empor?
Ein Helm, von Federbüschen überschattet?
Der Nacken schon, der mächtige, der es trägt?
Die Schultern auch, die Arme, stahlumglänzt?
Das ganze Brustgebild, o seht doch, Freunde,
Bis wo den Leib der goldne Gurt umschließt?
(356-362)

Firstly, the twice-repeated phatic "seht" emphasizes the pleasure of seeing and recognition, although the identity of the emerging figure is revealed eight lines later. Secondly, the itemized body parts are coupled with subsequent attributes: a helmeted "Haupt", a "Helm" overhadowed by plumage, a powerful "Nacken", "Arme" and "Schultern" sheathed in steel. Kleist cuts off this homoerotic inventory of body and steel at the waist, in that the belt reins in the spectators' view of the hero, an act of looking which is impelled in an almost cinematic fashion towards the heads of the horses (364-365). Achilles, however, is ascribed no distinguishing facial features. He exists and is recognized under the gaze of the Greeks as a conglomerate of gradually assembled body parts, weapons, and armour. This re-membering evokes for Chaouli the Lacanian mirror stage (by which the body parts come together and are then allocated a signifier) and foreshadows Achilles' final dismemberment (141). Mohammad Kowsar describes Achilles' emergence as embodying a perceptual paradox: "On the one hand the subject of the vision is flesh emerging into a perceptible form, on the other it is all the emblems that shape armatures around flesh itself" (66). The confinement and restriction of the body is in line with Carrière's delineation of "höchste Bewegung und tiefste Starre" (14), the alternating moments of explosive activity and stillness which characterize this drama. For Carrière, Achilles' flight resembles the "Alptraum von einem, der auf der Stelle läuft und nicht weiterkommt" (101). However, as the appearance of the marked body of Achilles visually demonstrates, what the shaping "male gaze" has brought together can also be taken apart.

The arm wound of Achilles (from scene four) provides this section's point of departure, for this bodily trauma physically and visually characterizes him before he

speaks. Although its limited material meaning for the drama's action has caused most critics to neglect this incident, its associative import in relation to other dramas will be examined in this and subsequent chapters. For example, both Achilles and Hermann suffer minor wounds on the arm (*KA* II 831) at the beginning of *Penthesilea* and in the last act of *Die Hermannsschlacht*. What is interesting about these physiological events, in which a male figure is injured, is how these moments of bodily harm differ in some key ways. Both Achilles and Hermann are injured in single combat, and initially neither senses -- or at least indicates any concern toward -- the wound he suffers. Achilles seems concerned with military matters, the care of the horses, and finally the prospect of Penthesilea, and refuses to acknowledge the need for medical attention. During Achilles' first appearance on stage, returning from his first encounter with Penthesilea, he fails to notice the treatment of his wound according to the following stage direction: "**Zwei Griechen ergreifen, ihm unbewußt, einen seiner Arme, der verwundet ist, und verbinden ihn**" (491-492). While being treated by the two, Achilles becomes angered at their distracting attentions ("Was neckt ihr" (505)) and subsequently expresses his indifference: "Nun ja" (507). His attention is held by two objects: his gaze falls initially on the horses (537) and then shifts to the scene of his encounter, when he asks: "Steht sie [Penthesilea] noch da?" (558-59). The discussion that follows among the Greeks brings three elements into focus: the associative imagery of the plumes, the wound which is conclusively bound, and Achilles' state of distraction:

ACHILLES **in die Ferne hinaus schauend.**
Steht sie noch da?
DIOMEDES. Du fragst? --
ANTILOCHUS. Die Königin?
DER HAUPTMANN.
Man sieht nichts - Platz! Die Federbüsch hinweg!
DER GRIECHE **der ihm den Arm verbindet.**
Halt! Einen Augenblick.
EIN GRIECHENFÜRST. Dort, allerdings!

DIOMEDES. Wo?

DER GRIECHENFÜRST.

Bei der Eiche, unter der sie fiel.

Der Helmbusch wallt schon wieder ihr vom Haupte,

Und ihr Mißschicksal scheint verschmerzt. -

DER ERSTE GRIECHE. Nun endlich!

DER ZWEITE.

Den Arm jetzt magst du, wie du willst, gebrauchen.

DER ERSTE. Jetzt kannst du gehen.

(558-565)

Firstly, the "Federbüsche", whose traditional implications of "aggressive virility" have already been explicated by Reeve ("Feathers, Sex..." 131) inhibit the mens' view of Penthesilea, while her "Helmbusch wallt schon ihr vom Haupte" (566) once the Greeks' have moved their helmet plumes. As an extension of her body and sign of her momentary ascendancy (Reeve, "Feathers, Sex..." 133), Penthesilea's erect helmet plumes are juxtaposed with Achilles' absent helmet, which he replaces later in the scene. Achilles' initial inattention echoes Homburg's confusion at the discovery of Natalie's glove at the distribution of the orders (I/5); while Homburg distractedly replies "Wer? lieber Golz! Was? Ich?" (303) and "**träumt vor sich nieder**" (331), Achilles responds to the strategy discussion in a similar fashion: "Mir vorgestellt? / Nein, nichts. Was war's? Was wollt ihr?" (565-566). Achilles' return to some form of awareness occurs at the conclusion of his treatment, which results not in a return to consciousness, but rather a descent into a gendered form of male blindness:

Kämpft ihr, wie die Verschnittnen, wenn ihr wollt;

Mich einen Mann fühl ich, ...

(587-588)

Achilles' remark comes just after he replaces his helmet, presumably with its plumage intact: in other words, he regains his sense of male self following the re-placement of his male headgear ("**in dem er sich den Helm wieder aufsetzt**"), which he had removed at the beginning of the scene (Reeve, "Feathers, Sex..." 136). On the other hand, his

reference to the "Verschnittnen" bears an ironic meaning when he suffered a temporary loss of manhood, as the wounded arm may represent a symbolic, though momentary, castration: "Den Arm jetzt magst du, wie du willst, gebrauchen" (559).

It is interesting to note that the earlier version of *Penthesilea* lacked three elements added to the later version: the removal and replacement of Achilles' helmet in the stage directions, the Hauptmann's order to move the helmet plumage blocking the view of Penthesilea, and finally the detailed placement of the oak tree, under which she fell. The earlier version of the dialogue cited above reads as follows:

ACHILLES **in die Ferne blickend.**

Kann man die Göttliche hier sehen?

DIOMEDES. Du fragst -

ANTILOCHUS. Er meint die Königin.

DIOMEDES. Ich zweifle nicht.

EIN GRIECHENFÜRST.

Macht Platz! - Dort, allerdings.

ACHILLES. Wo?

DER GRIECHENFÜRST. Bei der Eiche -

DER GRIECHE **der ihm den Arm verbindet.**

Halt! einen Augenblick -

DER GRIECHENFÜRST. Wo sie gestürzt.

EIN HAUPTMANN.

Der Helmbusch wallt schon wieder ihr vom Haupte,

Und das Geschick des Tages scheint verschmerzt.

DER GRIECHE. Jetzt ists geschehen. Jetzt geh.

Er verknüpft noch einen Knoten, und läßt seinen Arm fahren.

(Variant, 821)

The insertion of the oak tree, now spatially linked to Penthesilea, dramatically foreshadows the closing words of Prothoe, which fuse the heroine with the organic symbol: "Die abgestorbene Eiche steht im Sturm, / Doch die gesunde stürzt er schmetternd nieder, / Weil er in ihre Krone greifen kann" (3040-3041). While the

detailed stage direction concerning his entrance from the later version implies that Achilles ignores the two Greeks treating him ("**ihm unbewußt**") and addresses his question to Odysseus and Antilochus ("Was ist? Was gibt's?" (493)), the earlier version leaves the possibility open that his question is directed at the two Greeks. His second remark, for example, is not addressed to his interlocuters but "**zu den zwei Griechen**".

In both versions of this scene Penthesilea has captured the male gaze of Achilles, who seems unaware of the wound he has sustained in combat, even referring to her as "die Göttliche" in the first version. The appearance of a bleeding, sweating and disoriented hero, who has just barely escaped with his life from a female pursuer, serves to relativize Achilles' heroic posturing and to put the Greeks' depiction of his appearance into question. Secondly, "Kleist does not want us to miss this wound: for seventy-five lines of text ... two medics busy themselves with bandaging Achilles" (Chaouli 131). The wound, to return to Kowsar's point, must be seen in the context of his initial teichoscopic appearance. To bandage Achilles arm is to bind him ("verbinden"), to enclose and restrict his freedom of bodily movement, and as is the case with his armour, to delimit his sphere of action. The dressing complete, he may use his arm, emblematic of a will to action, as he wishes. His replacing his helmet and the restoration of his arm through the bandage render him whole, by completing the warrior's picture and covering up externally visible signs of fragmentation.

The reappearance of this wound in the critical fifteenth scene compounds Kleist's initial emphasis. When Achilles' wounded arm, inscribed with Penthesilea's desire (Chaouli 131) comes to her notice, Achilles echoes Hohenzollern's insistence that Homburg's wound was "Nichts von Bedeutung" (379) by unconsciously lending more weight to his wound by attempting to deny its significance. As with the revisions of scene four, Kleist altered the import of Achilles' injury. In the earlier version of the fifteenth scene, Penthesilea notices that he is injured, and he replies:

> Geritzt am Arm, du siehst, nichts weiter.
>
> PENTHESILEA. Was! Mein Spieß!
>
> ACHILLES **ungeduldig.**
>
> Er steckt' dir schief am Latz, du hörst. Das Schicksal Wenn man

mit Weibern kämpft. Was willst du mir?

(Variant, 872)

In the final version, when she presses the issue, he asks: "Wenn du mich liebst, so sprichst du nicht davon. / Du siehst es heilt schon" (1763-64). By gendering the wound, in that Penthesilea's weapon injures his pride (cf. his "**ungeduldig**" response) and his body, the open wound of the variant scene foreshadows the fate of men who engage in combat or make contact, as in the case of vom Strahl, with women who recognize no spatial or gender boundaries. This is one of two male fears central to *Penthesilea*: "ein Reflex der alten Angst der Männer vor starken, unkontrollierbaren, verrückten Frauen" (Wolf 165). However, Kleist's conciliatory revision transforms Achilles' hostility towards the exposure of his vulnerability into words of love and healing, thus accentuating the intertwined roles of Achilles as lover and warrior. This crucial enhancement of Achilles' roles proves to be consistent with the tragic conclusion: "Er [Achilles] aber hat an seinem Leib erfahren müssen, wie gefährlich es sein kann, wenn man einer geliebten Frau nicht als Krieger, sondern ausschließlich als Liebender gegenübertritt" (Kittler, *Geburt* 187). For Chaouli, this scene brings into play the broader inscription of desire on the body: "we can read it [*Penthesilea*] as a long and increasingly violent writing exercise in which Achilles is writ, is written upon, at steadily decreasing range and with steadily increasing harm" (139), culminating in the use of her teeth, which replace the extension of the arrows and the spear, as writing tools (139).

Ulrich Beil notes that the arrows of Penthesilea represent the arrows of Amor, the hunter's arrows, and the feathered writing instrument of the pen (298). The textuality of the body, emphasized by Chaouli's understanding of the drama as a monstrous writing exercise, is already articulated in the eleventh scene. Achilles, protected by his Greek allies, but himself unarmed, provokes these words. When an Amazon demands that the arrow ("Pfeil") should hit him "wo er die Hand jetzt hält" (1411), another replies: "Daß er das Herz gespießt ihm, wie ein Blatt, / Fort mit sich reiß im Flug -- " (1412-1413). The heart of the unarmoured Achilles, who is already wounded on the arm, is seen as a further target, a leaf ("Blatt") or sheet of paper to be punctured and torn away by the

flight of the arrow/pen, a feathered messenger ("Brautwerber...gefiederte" (596) in Achilles' words). Already foreshadowed by Penthesilea's spear wound from their first encounter and later extended by carresses of arrows and iron, the superficial wounding of Achilles concludes with Penthesilea's writing/biting the core of his being, his heart. That the hero as text should be "bound" carries this metaphor further, in the words of the "Meisterin des Bogens" (1440): "Die Schenkel will ich ihm zusammen heften" (1443), an act which will ultimately fix and immobolize the moving **Bild** of Achilles. These associations are confirmed by the equivalent usage of "Blatt" for "Bogen" and "Reißen" (to tear, inscribe) for "Ritzen" (to etch) (cf. Chaouli). Finally, the metaphors of the written are printed out, expressed ("ausdrücken") in the blush of Penthesilea's face: after killing Achilles (2697), her expression recedes to "ein leeres Blatt" and mirrors the immobility of his dead features. Her blood, at their first encounter, shoots outward in a blush. Her cannibalistic "körperliche Ausdruckssprache" brings blood to her mouth and hands, except that it belongs to Achilles (Klotz, "Kleists extremes Theater..." 137).

When viewed teichoscopically and described by their respective female and male allies, Penthesilea and Achilles are assigned conventionalized feminine and masculine attributes. Achilles is every emerging inch a male warrior, while Penthesilea, preceding her suicide, is described as "sittsam" (2677) and "voll Verstand und Würd und Grazie" (2680), who sang and danced "reizend" (2679) (Sternberger 102). When the Amazons view Achilles, and the Greeks view Penthesilea, the gendered gaze becomes redefined: Achilles, pursued by Penthesilea, becomes more feminized as he turns his neck to her, an actor in the "romance of the male heroine" (Paglia 264). Penthesilea fights like a man and is frequently compared to an animal or monster (Stipa 34). Achilles, in the gaze of his comrades in the third scene, is built up ("aufgebaut": Nutz 170), and is constructed piece by piece; Penthesilea, his pursuer, remains in the eyes of the Greeks a chaotic constellation of "Naturgewalten" (Nutz 170). Such a general pattern of misperception occurs at the individual level, as neither Achilles nor Penthesilea recognizes and truly sees the other. For Sigrid Lange, this mutual "Versehen" lies at the root of the tragedy: "Beide Protagonisten ... bauen ihre Beziehung über konventionelle Leitbilder von Mann

und Frau auf und müssen sich gerade deshalb als menschliche individuelle Subjekte verfehlen" (Lange 719). Although they misperceive each other as subjects by failing to connect, they collide against each other as bodies. What also characterizes their specular fixation is their construction of one another's bodies. Penthesilea's silken hair, silver-toned voice and small hands and feet represent "klischeehaft wahrgenommene[...] geschlechts-spezifische[...] Merkmale" which are "Attribute eines Körperwunschbildes" (Nutz 169). Dolf Sternberger notes the constant reference to her small hands and feet to the degree that they represent "ein süßes, zärtliches Klischee" (99). Achilles is a hybrid construct, like vom Strahl, of armour and flesh; Penthesilea is seen essentially as a woman, whose use of armour and weapons is portrayed as unnatural.

While Achilles is objectified in the gaze of his allies as a constellation of weapons and armour, Penthesilea possesses those facial features missing from the teichoscopic description of Achilles (356ff):

> Gedankenvoll, auf einen Augenblick,
> Sieht sie in unsre Schar, von Ausdruck leer,
> Als ob in Stein gehaun wir vor ihr stünden;
> Hier diese flache Hand, versichr' ich dich,
> Ist ausdrucksvoller als ihr Angesicht:
>
> (63-68)

Penthesilea's expressionless face transforms before the eyes of those watching her: at the sight of Achilles she, in a moment of gender-specific physiology, blushes: "Und Glut ihr plötzlich, bis zum Hals hinab, / Das Antlitz färbt ..."(78-79). She does so again out of fury or shame, "Die Rüstung wieder bis zum Gurt sich färbend" (97-98). Kleist relies on the "Unmittelbarkeit der Gebärde" (Fricke 369) to enunciate what can be told but not easily shown. Once again, as with his initial presentation of the emerging Achilles, Kleist interrupts this outburst of sensuality at the belt, interrupting the emblematic fusion of bodily sexuality (the glowing skin) with the tools of violence (the reflecting armour). What is important is the emphasis on the "Gurt", "Rüstung" and "Federbüsche", external markers which Achilles and Penthesilea have in common. The constellation of characteristics cited above illustrates not only how Kleist distinguished between bodily

representation for male and female figures (Penthesilea blushes, while Achilles sweats and bleeds), but also how in this drama he explicitly collapses the identity of Achilles and Penthesilea by means of shared visual signifiers. One should also note that Penthesilea, as the most "male" of Kleist's female dramatic characters, is the only exception to the generalized gendering of bodily wounding, in that her ability to inflict wounds is counterbalanced by her vulnerability to wounding.

Nearly all critics have noted that *Penthesilea* illustrates the collision of two bodies, "a horror that includes all others in a potent combination of sex and violence" (Angress, "Kleist's Nation of Amazons..." 8). These collisions, which alternate their roles as "Verfolger und Verfolgtem" (Klotz, "Tragödie der Jagd..." 20) and present parallel actions, expose their mutual attraction and repulsion, as well as their interchangeability by means of gesture. But the first brutal encounter in the myth of the *Iliad*, as Angress points out ("Kleist's Nation of Amazons..." 6-8) is the desecration of Hector's body, to which Kleist has Penthesilea refer numerous times in the fifteenth scene. Achilles and Penthesilea relate to each other in a way strikingly analogous to the Elector and Homburg's unconscious medium of interaction in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. As argued in the next chapter, the blasted and absent body of Stallmeister Froben, literally a stand-in for both "father" and "son", sublimates the mutual aggression between the Elector and Homburg. Correspondingly, Stephens notes how the body of Hector "...becomes for both of them the projection of their aggression toward each other" (*Plays and Stories* 104). This violence demonstrates how the relationship between the two depends on more than a dialogic exchange of Hector's absent body.

Their first encounter is a pantomine that encapsulates the tragedy (Fricke 370). For example, after falling off her horse in their first narrated encounter, Penthesilea stands "das Haupt entblößt" (451) and "Wischt ..., ists Staub ists Blut, sich von der Stirn" (453). Immediately thereafter, Achilles "**nimmt den Helm ab**" (477ff) and "**wischt sich den Schweiß von der Stirn**" (492ff). The parallel gestures of this first combat, which are centered on the head of each protagonist, invoke not only their interchangeability, but also the potential violence of future collisions. Achilles' light arm

wound, for example, will be paid back in kind: Odysseus desires to see "die Spur von deinem Fußtritt / Auf ihrer rosenblütnen Wangen" (535-536). Penthesilea's face, expressionless as the palm of one's hand, is to be imprinted with the boot of her captor as a sign of presence (since it lacks an imprint) and subjugation. Achilles is not the only character undergoing a process of writing on the body: Penthesilea's lack of facial expression, which precedes her inner wounding, characterizes her first and last encounter with Achilles. Following her killing and consumption of him, her face, belonging to a "Leiche" (the High Priestess' term also employed for Achilles' desecrated body (2728)) is described as a "leeres Blatt" (2697). Unlike Achilles, whose wound "speaks" as a visual symbol of that which he had experienced and emblematizes Penthesilea's impression on him, Penthesilea remains, however temporarily, externally unscathed.

Internally, however, Penthesilea is wounded. Sharing the vulnerability of vom Strahl, whose heart is struck through a gap in his armour, Penthesilea is wounded by a vision of herself ("in dem Innersten getroffen" (649)) reflected back to her upon gazing at Achilles' armour:

> Ist das die Siegerin, die schreckliche,
> Der Amazonen stolze Königin,
> Die seines Busens erzne Rüstung mir,
> Wenn sich mein Fuß ihm naht, zurückgespiegelt?
> (642-645)

Since her deflected gaze cannot penetrate his armour, Penthesilea's desire to reach his most interior space finds fulfilment in her tearing open his unarmoured breast, her consumption/consummation of and with his body, and her death. What fascinates Penthesilea, aside from his fame and brutal desecration of Hector's corpse, is his armoured torso and marble-like chest; yet at the same time she seeks a vulnerable spot (Gallas, "Lacans vier Diskurse..." 209).

Penthesilea's fatal wound has already been struck in the fifth scene. Her "Herz" becomes "Erz". They have infected each other with desire, and analogous to Jakob der Rotbart's wound in *Der Zweikampf*, the superficial graze -- or, as in *Penthesilea*, the penetrating gaze -- enters and explodes from within the body:

indessen ein Hieb von seiner [Friedrich's] Hand, der kaum die äußerste Hülle meines Lebens zu berühren schien, in langsam fürchterlicher Fortwirkung den Kern desselben selbst getroffen, und meine Kraft, wie der Sturmwind eine Eiche, gefällt hat (259).

In addition to the parallel imagery of the oak tree ("die abgestorbene Eiche steht im Sturm ... " (3041)), Kleist employs this constellation of inner wounding to evoke innner paralysis, that is the power of a word or sight to immobilize a character. Penthesilea, for example, feels "Gelähmt" (649) after receiving a blow to the breast, which may either come from "Amors Pfeil" (1085) or from the fall she suffered in pursuit of Achilles. In the eleventh scene, Achilles uses the same series of images to describe the Amazons' wounding gaze and to demonstrate their mutual ability to interpenetrate each other: "Mit euren Augen trefft ihr sicherer / ... / Ich fühle mich **im Innersten getroffen**, / Und ein Entwaffneter, in jedem Sinne, / Leg ich zu euren kleinen Füßen mich" (1414-1418, my emphasis). Although he approaches the Amazonian army to surrender with these conventionalized expressions of love, he commands his troops to kill any Amazons intending to harm him (1444ff) (Angress, "Kleist's Nation of Amazons" 19-20).

The spirit of paradox similarly surfaces between the desired and the realizable for Penthesilea, who wants to defeat the greatest warrior of ancient history in single combat without hurting him:

Ich nur, ich weiß den Göttersohn zu fällen.
Hier dieses Eisen soll, Gefährtinnen,
Soll mit der sanftesten Umarmung ihn
(Weil ich mit Eisen ihn umarmen soll!)
An meinen Busen schmerzlos niederziehen.
Hebt euch, ihr Frühlingsblumen, seinem Fall,
Daß seiner Glieder keines sich verletzte.
(856-862)

Understandably, some critics saw the uncomfortable paradox -- the embrace with iron -- as falling into rhetorical excess. They may do so under the assumption that *Penthesilea* is about love, even when the two protagonists do not actually speak to each other until

the fifteenth scene. When seen as exemplifying the relationship between physical power and physical attraction, the above passage emphasizes the dynamic of how such relationships occur as collisions of forces and bodies. Achilles and Penthesilea not only are sexual beings and individuals, but also represent "Kraftlinien" (Carrière 58), that is forces such as "zwei Sterne" (1080) or "Donnerkeile" (1123), whose trajectories intersect. Of course, in addition to the elements of the body and the forces which move it, their mutual mirror-like capacity to create each other through the gaze has inspired numerous psychoanalytical interpretations. Achilles is Penthesilea's constructed "Spiegelbild" (Gallas, "Lacans vier Diskurse..." 209) or her "ins Männliche gespiegelte Verdoppelung" (Pickerodt, "Penthesilea und Kleist..." 57). Joachim Pfeiffer also uses a psychoanalytical model: "Die Idolisierung des Liebespartners erscheint ... als Wiederbelebung archaischer narzißtischer Konfigurationen, als Reaktivierung idealisierter Selbstobjekt-Imagines" (*Die zerbrochenen Bilder* 138). Whatever the psychological origins of their attraction, their compulsive combat occurs at a physical level.

In their second encounter, narrated in the seventh scene, the high priestess is shocked at Penthesilea's loss of control to the arrows of Amor (1082), since she lacks the "Busen", the "Ziel der giftgefiederten Geschosse" (1084-1085). Their lances break, but Penthesilea, "mit zerrißner Brust" (1150) is brought back to the Amazonian encampment, while Achilles previously "in Stahl geschient", throws aside his sword, shield and armour from his breast (1159) and follows her.

Aware of her defeat, Penthesilea curses the world:

> Daß der ganze Frühling
> Verdorrte! Daß der Stern, auf dem wir atmen,
> Geknickt, gleich dieser Rosen eine, läge!
> Daß ich den ganzen Kranz der Welten so,
> Wie dieses Geflecht der Blumen, lösen könnte!
> (1226-1230)

Kleist used the verb "verdorren" in only one other drama, *Die Hermannsschlacht*, and in connection with the religious imagery of self-flagellation and regret; similarly, her curse desires that the flow of time stop, that the season, the earth, and the galaxy stop

their course. The "Stern" may be Achilles (later associated with Helios), who shall be phallically bent, once she has received the "Kranz", a circular symbol of victory, or sexual activity (Angress, "Kleist's Nation of Amazons" 19), for the circular wreath of the festival of roses expands to a circle of planets. The wreath, expanded to encompass the gigantic image of a chain of planets, returns as the literal head dress for the feast of roses, only to become a wreath of wounds on Achilles' head. This image of the wreath, simultaneously evoking the head and the vagina, victory and sex, juxtaposes two, if not the only, themes of Kleist's dramas: love and war.

Until the thirteenth scene, their physical contact up to this point has involved the material collision of metal and iron and the exchange of each other's gaze, and unlike vom Strahl's armour, which is seen by Prandi as an aspect of characterization (38), Achilles sheds his armour in the hail of arrows from the Amazonian troops and points to his vulnerability:

> Soll ich den seidnen Latz noch niederreißen,
> Daß ihr das Herz mir harmlos schlagen seht?
> (1408-1409)

Aside from the echo of the chinked armour that failed to protect his arm, the thirteenth scene parallels the "Hollunderbuschszene" of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*: a male suitor approaches a desired and unconscious woman and bares her skin to his touch. Vom Strahl loosens Käthchen's scarf, while Achilles opens Penthesilea's armour; in the words of Prothoe, she has been either wounded in body or soul (1482-1483), an injured state which integrates the motif of inner and outer wounding. Without the external trappings of their military roles -- analogous to Agnes' and Ottokar's shedding of their genders and family identities in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* -- Penthesilea, no longer "vom Kopf zu Fuß in Erz gerüstet" (1881), and Achilles finally speak to one another[4]. The fifteenth scene, in which the drama's time (through Penthesilea's historical narration) and place (through the absence of the battlefield) are suspended, is apparently the "utopische Situation" (Lange 711). However, since Penthesilea relates the history of the state, and Achilles neither hears nor understands her history, their failure to validate each other undermines this Utopian dimension. Secondly, this idyll owes its existence to a lie, in

that the dialogue occurs under the pretense that Achilles is Penthesilea's prisoner.

After drawing attention to his arm wound, the emphasis shifts to the dressing of Achilles, whose body free of armour is to be wreathed with roses: "Um deine Scheitel, deinen Nacken hin - / Zu deinen Armen, Händen, Füßen nieder - / Und wieder auf zum Haupt - - so ists geschehen" (1777-1779). Achilles, described by the first maiden as "leuchtend" and "in Stahl geschient" (1037-1038) or by Penthesilea as an "in Erz gepreßte Götterbildung" (1264), is transformed under her gaze into a static image, a **Bild**. The retardation of the frenetic movements of the previous scenes takes place in the relative immobility of the protagonists. In this way Penthesilea objectifies Achilles, recognizing him through his armour: "Nicht der prüfende Blick auf seine Gestalt verbürgt die Identität, sondern die Rüstung wird als Beweis akzeptiert" (Nutz 174-175). Achilles, at first an idolized statue of metal built by his male and female percipients, then an unarmoured body covered by roses, finds his wish to kiss her interrupted by her ritualized dressing of him. The physical contact is replaced by "Schaulust" of her scopophilic desire: "O sieh, ich bitte dich," (1784), a pleasure in seeing that is shared by Achilles, for she appears to him as a "Glanzerscheinung" (1809) whose image in locked within him. As no full exchange of names (Penthesilea never uses Achilles' name) or bodily contact takes place, the scene presents an exchange of mental images, of internalized **Bilder**. For Helga Gallas, the postponement of physical intimacy represents the awakening of "Genuß also durch Umgehung des Genusses" ("Lacans vier Diskurse..." 211), expressed by Nutz's terming Penthesilea's pleasure as "Augenlust" (Nutz 176). Since for Penthesilea "...die Gefühle dieser Brust, o Jüngling, / Wie Hände sind sie, und sie streicheln dich" (1772-1773), the language of embodiment substitutes for physical presence. The construction of Achilles body, teichoscopically presented under the male gaze as an armoured god, becomes a feminized static vision dressed in roses:

> Ich sagte still! Du wirst es schon erfahren.
> - Hier diese leichte Rosenwindung nur
> Um deine Scheitel, deinen Nacken hin -
> Zu deinen Armen, Händen, Füßen nieder -

Und wieder auf zum Haupt -- so ists geschehen.

-- Was atmest du?

(1775-1780)

She fixes his position for the ritual of dressing, covering those previously moving parts of his body which had been functionalized as military components. It is not surprising that during this process of turning to stone ("Versteinerung") she asks him what -- if at all -- he is breathing.

The idyll is brought to an end by an Amazonian counterattack and the revelation of Achilles' and Prothoe's deception. Achilles "**reißt sich die Kränze ab**" (2264ff) and arms himself with his weapons and with the power of military discourse: "Mit meinem Wagen rädern will ich sie!" (2266). His challenge finally demystifies him and reduces him, in the eyes of Penthesilea, to an object of stone, consecrated by her hand: "Ein steinern Bild hat meine Hand bekränzt?" (2391). Achilles falls from his status as an immobile and ceified statue of his viewer's making, appearing at first as the warrior of steel, then as the bearer of roses, in this scene as a picture of stone, and finally as the lover/challenger of flesh and blood. The outcome of this demystification process, by which the hero encased in metal becomes a mere man, is the death of Achilles and the striking of mutual and reciprocal wounds.

As an aspect of the recurrent topoi of the hunt (also found in *Die Hermannsschlacht*), Penthesilea brings Achilles down with an arrow to the neck, killing her prey in the way that Odysseus had projected Achilles' pursuit and capture of her[5]. Achilles' feminine neck is his Achilles' heel, "phallically penetrated by the Amazon" (Paglia 261). Reeve notes that *Penthesilea* "has constant recourse to the neck", pointing out that the image of Achilles placing his foot on Penthesilea's neck is mentioned three times (""Mit dem Hals..." 249), only to have this image ulitmately inverted. Reeve also points out that the Greeks initially view Achilles' strong neck as a sign of his masculinity, which under the gaze of the Amazonian witnesses to his death becomes his Achilles' heel (""Mit dem Hals..." 256-257). Penthesilea's shot to the neck aims for the throat, not the heart, forcing Achilles to "learn another form of speech ... the death rattle of disbelief" (Jacobs 106).

The penultimate mutual wound on the neck -- the final cut being their torn breasts -- has a prophetic and allegorical function.Following her return to the encampment, Prothoe notices "Eine Wund und das recht tief!" (1821) on the queen's neck when removing her scarf. I would argue that Penthesilea's inner wound, struck by her view of Achilles in scene one, extends outwards, for the question remains as to how the wound would be inflicted from under the scarf. Penthesilea's wound of mysterious origin "does preserve the equilibrium between the two main characters, sustaining their at times seeming interchangeability" (Reeve, ""Mit dem Hals..." 255-256), as it occurs "in spiegelbildlicher Entsprechung" (Pfeiffer, "Eine Deutung..." 201).

The mirroring effect occurs at the level of gesture, metaphor, and body trauma as well. After their first encounter, for example, it is reported Penthesilea rests against an oak tree and wipes blood or sweat from her brow. The head is subsequently linked with the wreath. Achilles, alluding to his brutalization of Hector's body, wishes to drag her through the streets, "die Stirn bekränzt mit Todeswunden" (614). At the drama's conclusion, both have obtained the desired wreath of victory: Penthesilea has "den Lorbeer ... den dornigen" (1818), while Achilles is memorialized through "diese blutgen Rosen! / Ach, dieser Kranz von Wunden um sein Haupt!" (2907-2908). Victory brings with it sacrifice, a second sacramental meaning of the wreath, supported by Penthesilea's baptism of water (2823ff). Moreover, with regard to the oft-discussed interchangeability between the figures of Achilles and Penthesilea, it should not be forgotten that she mourns Achilles' "Kranz von Wunden um sein Haupt" (2906); her bleeding fingers may symbolically invoke his wounded head, and both wounds occur under the unifying image of the wreath. The possibility of a Eucharistic parody also exists in Penthesilea's consumption of Achilles' body and blood. Penthesilea is hungry in all her senses: "Sie stürzt sich auf ihn, den sie zuvor mit den Augen verschlungen hat, um es jetzt mit dem Mund zu tun, dem es die Sprache verschlug" (Klotz, "Kleists extremes Theater" 138). She devours Achilles through her senses, drinking the air and eating up the distance between them (Nutz 170-171).

What finally kills Achilles is her final act of penetration:

Sie schlägt, die Rüstung von ihm reißend,

Den Zahn schlägt sie in seine weiße Brust,

(2669-2670)

The image of Achilles no longer sustains her. Her tearing the armour off his body, the removal of his reflecting second skin, not only allows her to enter the temple of his body, but also removes the reflection of her own image. She bites into his left breast, figuratively rendering him an Amazon and extinguishing "[d]en Funken des Prometheus" in his breast (2923). Most psychoanalytical critics agree on the motivation behind her bodily iconoclasm: "Indem Penthesilea das ideale Bild des Achill zerstückelt, zerfetzt sie dieses Bild von sich selbst" (Gallas, "Antikenrezeption..." 217). Analogous to Amphitryon's fantasy of fragmentation, "die Desintegration des Ich verbildlicht sich dramaturgisch in der Phantasie von der Zerstückelung Achills, von dem Zerfall seines Körpers in einzelne Teile" (Pfeiffer, "Kleists *Penthesilea*" 201). Kittler seemingly echoes the words of the wounded Achilles on the fate of men who fight against women: "Dem einen Mann, der sich ganz an eine Frau verliert, ist das Schicksal der Zerstückelung gewiß" (*Geburt* 187). Cannibalism is an act of love carried to its extremity, by which the lover validates her sole possession of the beloved.

The variant passages to scene twenty-four emphasize their interchangeability. However, in two instances Penthesilea is shown schematically projecting her action against Achilles against herself:

Eh bög ich hungrig auf mich selbst mich nieder,
Also, sieh her -! Und öffnete die Brust mir,
Und tauchte dies Hände so - sieh her!
Hinunter in den blutigen Riß, und griff
Das Herz, das jungende dampfende, hervor,
Um es zu essen, ach, als daß ich nur
Ein Haar auf seiner lieben Scheitel krümmte.

(Variant, 882)

These words are tragically ironic when compared to Achilles' conviction that she would not harm him: "Eh wird ihr Arm, / Im Zweikampf gegen ihren Busen wüten, / Und rufen: "Sieg"! wenn er von Herzblut trieft, / Als wider mich!" (2471-2474)[6]. She

already lacked one breast -- and aims for Achilles' head, but tears at his left side, the site of the heart (Gallas, "Lakans vier Diskurse..." 211). If we assume that Penthesilea's act of cannibalism enacts the total incorporation of an other's identity, then Achilles' metaphor becomes literally true: her breast is his breast, his heart is her heart.

For Penthesilea, it is her constructed image of Achilles which is of importance, since her rage is not directed at the person who killed Achilles ("Ich frage nicht, wer den Lebendigen / Erschlug" (2915-2916) or "Ich will nicht wissen, wer aus seinem Busen / Den Funken des Prometheus stahl" (2922-2923), but at her who "entstellt" his god-like features (2930). Penthesilea's fatal "Versehen", with its emphasis on the visual, unmakes Achilles (Paglia 262):

> "- So war es ein Versehen. Küsse, Bisse,
> Das reimt sich, und wer recht von Herzen liebt,
> Kann schon das eine für das andere greifen.
> (2981-2983)

In her "Küsse/Bisse" rhyme, Penthesilea "wendet ... das Sprachzeichen des Mundes gegen den Körper selbst" (Neumann 1986 26), this time as a "Versprechen". The problem of "Versehen" and "Versprechen", in a drama the presents a "Lektüre der Sinne" (Nutz), is supplemented by misshearing. Despite his physical and verbal gesture of naming both person (Penthesilea) and function (his "bride") and touching, by which he "Rührt ihre sanfte Wange an, und ruft: / Penthesilea! meine Braut! was tust du?" (2663-2664), Penthesilea bites into his chest. Only in the variant is Achilles ascribed the face absent in the drama, with the remainder of his lip bent into a smile: "Sieh, Prothoe, sieh - der Rest von einer Lippe - / Sprich, dünkts dich nicht als ob er lächelte?" (**Variant**, 884). Penthesilea wishes to once more devour Achilles with her gaze, even if the monstrous mouth of the wound -- for his mouth is silent and torn -- silently speaks to her: "Und wenn mir seine Wunde, / Ein Höllenrachen, gleich entgegen gähnte: / Ich will ihn sehen!" (2893-2895). Achilles' "Kastrationswunde" (Pfeiffer, "Kleists *Penthesilea*" 200) embodies the silence of the emasculated tongue. Moreover, Jacobs points out that *Achilles* means "lipless", for according to legend he did not put his lips to the breast of his mother (215). Thus the pattern of seeing and kissing/biting reverses

itself: Achilles the non-eater becomes the eaten. Penthesilea initiates yet again this act of consumption, in that she has already seen and literally eaten of his living body, and wishes to do so again metaphorically, this time articulating of the difference between "Küsse/Bisse": "Doch jetzt sag ich dir deutlich, wie ichs meinte / Dies, du Geliebter, wars, und weiter nichts. / **Sie küßt ihn**" (2988ff).

The culmination of Penthesilea's cannibalistic desire eventually and temporarily restores her sense of equilibrium. For Ingrid Stipa, Penthesilea's path to madness is seen in her regressive movement from the Symbolic order (characterized by the disjunction between sign and signifier) to the Imaginary order (continuous relationship between the two) (Stipa 33-34). The reintegration of sign and signifier closes the wound separating a name from that which it represents, a rejoining which seems to reflect more a notion of Romantic unity than a psychological imbalance. By Gallas' account, which enumerates Penthesilea's falls, faints, slips of the tongue and of the body, "...die Gespaltenheit der Penthesilea" shows itself "im nicht-koordinierten Körper" ("Lacans vier Diskurse..." 207)[7] in danger of collapse. Where Penthesilea falls or fails, the underlying structure of her inner architecture supports her self under the pressure of crisis. In the following section we will examine the inner structures which hold Penthesilea together.

The fusion of the inorganic and the organic, the natural and the made, is depicted by the collision and collusion of flesh and steel. Although the body encased in armour is one of the dominant motifs of *Penthesilea*, by which flesh fused to metal gives way to flesh incorporating flesh, the play offers a number of metaphorical connections between the body and architecture, namely the metaphorical affiliation of the body to architectonic structures. This link does not surface unexpectedly in a drama centered on the making and unmaking of the body. That Kleist divided the imagery of self-construction and collapse by gender bears further examination, for a line of contrast between Achilles and Penthesilea can be drawn on the basis of their interior architecture. Achilles possesses the interior depth of a mirror reflecting back the image of the percipient; it is the gaze and the words of Penthesilea (and others) that literally hold his body together. In contrast to Achilles' capacity for surface reflection[8], Penthesilea's bodily presence and interior space are repeatedly conceived as constructs in crisis that

ultimately collapse into the "Ruine ihrer Seele" (2789).

However, Achilles' body, constructed piece by piece, becomes a sacred temple, an "unbewußtes Symbol für den Körper des Liebespartners" (Pfeiffer, "Kleists *Penthesilea...*" 200), for Penthesilea is fascinated by his "marmorharten Busen" (2202) and is "voller Bewunderung für die glatte Heldenbrust des Achill, eine marmorharte, erzgepanzerte Brust" (Gallas, "Antikenrezeption..." 214). Typical gender roles are reversed in the sense that Penthesilea becomes "die phallisch Eindringlinge" (Pfeiffer, "Kleists *Penthesilea...*" 200):

> Daß eures Tempels Pforten rasselnd auf,
> Des glanzerfüllten, weihrauchduftenden,
> Mir, wie des Paradieses Tore, fliegen!
> (1642-1645)

This fantasy of penetration, abstracted to the temple of Diana as the site of consummation, ascends to the heights of Elysium in the following metphor used to describe her first blinding view of Achilles:

> - wie wenn zur Nachtzeit
> Der Blitz vor einen Wandrer fällt, die Pforten
> Elysiums, des glanzerfüllten, rasselnd,
> Vor einem Geist sich öffnen und verschließen.
> (2213-2216)

It is through the opening of the portals that Penthesilea desires access to the core of Achilles. Yet these images, in a continual dialectic of opening and closure which operates in tandem with the removal and replacement of his armour, illuminate his alternating exposure and invulnerability. But the intruder does not enter through the opened portals, but smashes through the walls. Achilles' opened body becomes itself the open temple, but only in its decay and destruction:

> Doch wer, o Prothoe, bei diesem Raube
> Die offne Pforte ruchlos mied, durch alle
> Schneeweißen Alabasterwände mir
> In diesen Tempel brach ...

(2926-2929)

The creation of Achilles as a temple is part of the idolization process which climaxes in the mutual demolition of Achilles/Penthesilea; such a mode of totalized identification as cannibalistic incorporation is expressed by the reflexive pronoun "mir" and her concept of the robbery of Achilles' body as occurring to her.

The significance of body as temple in *Penthesilea* implies more than a metaphor for destructive sexual intimacy. As competing spatial locations and visions of happiness, the temples of Diana in Themiscyra and the throne in Ptia represent Penthesilea's and Achilles' respective desires to physically overcome the other and to acquire a captive and queen. In the sixteenth scene, the struggle over their final destination (in Phtia or Themiscyra) concludes with Achilles' nearly comical assertion: "Ich bau' dir solchen Tempel bei mir auf" (2292), a casual "fast prahlerisch" remark (Sternberger 97), as if the struggle were about buildings, rather than dominance ("Und wenn der Sel'gen Sitz in Phtia wäre, / Doch, doch, o Freund! nach Themiscyra noch," (2288-2289)). Penthesilea wants no architectural copy, she wants the original. His refusal to validate the sanctity of her temple causes her indirectly to misrecognize and destroy what she visualizes as his temple: his body.

The specific association between Achilles and the temple stands in contrast to the various manifestations of Penthesilea's architectural landscape, which alternate between tropes of collapse and suspension. In the first instance, Prothoe urges Penthesilea to retain her sense of physical and psychological equilibrium with an image taken from Kleist's letter of the 16th of November 1800 (*KA* II 820-821), in order to derive a sense of comfort from collapse:

> Steh, stehe fest, wie das Gewölbe steht,
> Weil seiner Blöcke jeder stürzen will!
> Beut deine Scheitel, einem Schlußstein gleich,
> . . . . . .
> Nicht aber wanke in dir selber mehr,
> Solang ein Atem Mörtel und Gestein,
> In dieser jungen Brust, zusammenhält.

(1349-1351, 1353-1356)

Here the head is the uppermost stone of the arched structure, the mortar and stone suspended in the breast. Ilse Graham finds this figure "contrived ... with its incongruent metaphor of breath quickening mortar and stone" (*Word into Flesh* 125). Contrived or not, this constructedness of the self -- through the blood and breath of the body -- is at the center of this work. The "Bogen" metaphor, this time as the arch, illustrates how joint elements can support the whole as a model for human subjectivity (Cullen and von Mücke 477). What strikes Carrière about the semiotics of this passage is the location, or dislocation of her self: "Wo ist dieses "Selbst" der Penthesilea ...? Dies Zentrum ist der Moment der Spaltung selbst. Es ist das "Selbst" des katastrophalen Begehrens, ein gespaltenes, deplaziertes, dezentralisiertes Zentrum..." (76). The constructed arch metaphor provokes Carrière's account of Penthesilea's self reacting temporally (at the moment of division) and spatially (through displacement and decentering). This architectonic image buttresses and absence produced by desire, in the sense that the arch suspends itself over an empty space and creates a gap.

It is not surprising that Kleist inserts immediately following the "Gewölbe" metaphor the only man-made structure in the drama's stage directions, a bridge (Reuss, ""Im Geklüfft..." 6), whose appearance literalizes Prothoe's words. Choosing between the heights of the "Felsen" or the depths of the valley as an escape route (1358-1359), Penthesilea suddenly stops at a bridge: "**indem sie plötzlich, auf eine Brücke gekommen, stehen bleibt**" (1365ff). Once again, the ritual of suspension and projection is repeated, by which she gazes into the river, not only to see herself, but also the reflection of Helios, the sun-god which she equates with Achilles. Confronted by the insubstantiality of the narcissistic vision which nonetheless collapses her identity with his, she expresses an extreme form of bodily alienation by imploding like an outer shell without a body to support it: like a "Gewand, in unsrer Hand zusammen" (1390). She wants to submerge herself in the water, to tear away the cornerstone and cause the arch (or bridge) supporting her self and body to collapse.

Despite Penthesilea's disembodiment, the chain of images continues. Prothoe, as part of the ruse to convince her that she was victorious, compares her loss of

consciousness with the absence of a host ignoring a guest ("gleich einem jungen Fürsten" (1542)) who enters her bosom and is surprised to find the "liebliche Behausung" (1544) empty.

The pressure from above and outside on the arch, or the refusal of a "Gast" (1547), represent forces external to Penthesilea's body. Through the presence of Achilles a force explodes from within as a sexual and biological charge in the third moment of inner architecture:

> Hinweg jetzt, o mein Herz, mit diesem Blute,
> Das aufgehäuft, wie seiner Ankunft harrend,
> In beiden Kammern dieser Brüste liegt.
> Ihr Boten, ihr geflügelten, der Lust,
> Ihr Säfte meiner Jugend, macht euch auf,
> Durch meine Adern fleucht, ihr jauchzenden,
> Und laßt es einer roten Fahne gleich,
> Von allen Reichen dieser Wangen wehn:
> Der junge Nereïdensohn ist mein!

The heart, as with a dwelling, has its chambers. The moment of stasis, in which her blood stood still (Achilles believes that she is dead at the beginning of the thirteenth scene), culminates with a rush of blood. What astonishes in this passage, whose animated vitality is analogous to her death speech, is the bodily self-discipline capable of conjuring a physiological effect, her blush that is metaphorized by a flag waving over a kingdom. This sovereignty over her body is demonstrated by her capacity to reanimate herself through speech, and conversely to talk herself ultimately into death. The physiological effects of Achilles' sight alternate between the recurrent reanimating blush, when conquest and Achilles's proximity seems possible, and physiological collapse, should she suffer defeat.

This passage marks a transformation in the inner architecture of the body, which had up to this point been measured on the stasis of structure and had been expressed through Prothoe. Instead of the rhetorical representations of arches, dwellings and the oak in the mouth of Prothoe, Penthesilea herself produces figures of her own desire that

exceed the created and become creative. The arch, suspended over the absence within, is replaced by the productive figure of the forge. The forge, however, is one element in the triadic formation of the arch ("Gewölbe") and the bow ("Bogen"), and ought to be viewed in relation to the latter.

The term "Bogen" includes the meaning of the bow, the arch, and the arc or trajectory, symbolizing the beginning and ending of the drama in a circular trajectory. Reuss' close reading of the "Textkörper" of the dramatis personae, with its bowed brackets grouping the Greek and Amazon characters ("{"), investigates the visual significance of the bow. Penthesilea takes a path of pursuit, following Achilles' bending route ("Bogen"), during which she collides with a rock[9]. Penthesilea "fliegt, wie von der Senne abgeschossen" (399) and takes a "Sehne", the most direct route towards Achilles, and because of her "Sehn-sucht" overshoots ("vorbei / Schießt" (425-426) her goal (Chaouli 133); Reuss suggests that Penthesilea's drive in her first pursuit is to "cut off", that is to castrate Achilles in the crossing over of power ("Herrschaft" symbolized by the bow) and gender (""Im Geklüfft..." 8). Additionally, I would argue that Achilles' bow and Penthesilea's string bind them together as one instrumental force, a force that unites in a kiss in the twenty-third scene[10].

The forge and the bow play a significant role in the fifteenth scene's narration of history, for it acquires sudden relevance when seen opposite the creation of the state and the reshaping of the Amazonian body. This narrative describes how the extermination of one state (the "Stamm der Skythen" (1915)) gave birth to another. The victorious Ethiopians under Vexoris slaughter the men and rape the women; the women, including the queen Tanais, fashion weapons from jewelry and massacre their oppressors:

> Die Betten füllten, die entweihten, sich
> Mit blankgeschliffenen Dolchen an, gekeilt,
> Aus Schmuckgeräten, bei des Herdes Flamme,
> Aus Senkeln, Ringen, Spangen: nur die Hochzeit
> Ward, des Aethioperkönigs Vexoris
> Mit Tanaiis, der Königin erharrt,
> Der Gäste Brust zusamt damit zu küssen.

Und als das Hochzeitsfest erschienen war,
Stieß ihm die Kön'gin ihren in das Herz;
Mars, an des Schnöden Statt, vollzog die Ehe,
Und das gesamte Mordgeschlecht, mit Dolchen,
In einer Nacht, ward es zu Tod gekitzelt.
(1940-1951)

The events in this passage are described through a series of parodies, incongruities, and transformations. Along with Achilles, who notes the paradoxical relationship between a "vernichtend" fate (1932) and the granting of life to a state, most commmentators have taken such incongruities as symptomatic of an abnormal community. For example, jewelry, as ornamentation, is forged into murder weapons; men are kissed and tickled to death with daggers; a wedding night, already a mass rape, is turned into a massacre. This particular jewelry ("Senkeln, Ringen, Spangen") on the one hand adorns the women's body, but on the other it seems in its clasping, linking and enclosing functions to constrict its female wearer. The melting of the jewelry at the hearth (a traditional site of cookery) is an act of shedding the conventional female role and of achieving bodily liberation . The transformation of the jewelry into the murderous weapons of the male aggressor alludes to the extreme trnasformation of the Amazonian body. Out of such a beginning springs "Ein Staat, ein mündiger ... [e]in Frauenstaat" (1957-1958)[11].

The liberating act of violence does not stop with the liquidation of the enemy. Self-mutilation, with the kissing of the enemy's breast with the daggers as precedent, constitutes the coronation of the queen on the steps of the altar. Transformed jewelry is insufficient for the defence of the state. Jewelry, fitted to the woman's body, becomes the dagger embedded in the man's; the female body, more adaptable than the bow it wishes to bear, must be adapted by way of the same dagger. The bow, now embedded in the female body, emblazons the mark of technology on the body. Tanais tears "die rechte Brust sich ab, und taufte / Die Frauen, die den Bogen spannen würden, / Und fiel zusammen, eh sie noch vollendet: / Die Amazonen oder Busenlosen! - / Hierauf ward ihr die Krone aufgesetzt" (1986-1990). The sacrificial baptism of blood and the act of naming embody twin aspects of a community's establishment. The Amazonian state

creates itself "als Welt der Mütter und der namenslosen Körper" (Neumann, "Hexenküche und Abendmahl..." 24). The matriarchy is named and defined by the act of identification (rendering the women the same), while the men who participate in the feast of roses are nameless bodies, for to name the body as Penthesilea does, by attaching a signifier to the body of Achilles, is to break the law. The act of self-mutilation not only marks the Amazons as physically different, but also renders them more efficient soldiers. This particular act, however, also creates a hybrid gender: in Sigrid Lange's view, "...mit einer Brust als "Sitz der jungen, lieblichen Gefühle" (2013) und einer fehlenden, die dem Bogen Platz schafft, sind die Amazonen halb liebende Frau, halb tötender Mann..." (709). The bow is not only a prosthesis, but in combination with the body, is also a machine which produces and extends desire ("Agencement"): "Tanais verstümmelt, verwandelt ihren Körper, um das neue Agencement Frau-Bogen möglich zu machen", an act which paralyzes her (Carrière 88) and animates the new state.

The bow, previously borne by the now-dead king, is a phallus substitute in the hands of the high priestess -- which she allows to fall:

> Nichts als der Bogen ließ sich schwirrend hören,
> Der aus den Händen, leichenbleich und starr,
> Der Oberpriesterin daniederfiel.
> Er stürzt', der große, goldene, des Reichs,
> Und klirtte von der Marmorstufe dreimal,
> Mit den Gedröhn der Glocken, auf, und legte,
> Stumm wie der Tod, zu ihren Füßen sich. -
>
> (1997-2001)

The descending bow, bequeathed to Penthesilea, foreshadows the apparent end and rebirth the state, because it forges a link between the bow, and the breast, the organic and the inorganic. For the bow returns to play a final consummating role in the death of Achilles:

> [Sie] spannt mit Kraft der Rasendnen, sogleich
> Den Bogen an, daß sich die Enden küssen,
> Und hebt den Bogen auf und zielt und schießt,

Und jagt den Pfeil ihm durch den Hals; er stürzt.

(2646-2649)

Klotz interprets this overextended metaphor in this way: "...wie sich die beiden entgegengesetzten Enden des Bogens berühren, gehen in Penthesilea äußerste Liebe und Vernichtungstrieb ineinander über. Überspannung des Gefühls schafft eine Vereinigung des Unvereinbarem" ("Tragödie der Jagd..." 14-15). The bow stretched so that its ends "kiss" produces a temporary unification of opposites. These opposites may also represent Penthesilea and Achilles, two extremes, who also kiss at the conclusion of the drama's trajectory. There is also a third possibility: the return of history, whose "Bogen", literally a trajectory, turns back upon itself and then collapses. After cleaning the arrow that brought Achilles down, Penthesilea "**läßt den Bogen fallen**" (2767ff):

DIE ERSTE AMAZONE.

Der Bogen stürzt ihr aus der Hand danieder!

DIE ZWEITE.

Seht, wie er taumelt -

DIE VIERTE.

Klirrt, und wankt, und fällt -!

DIE ZWEITE.

Und noch einmal am Boden zuckt -

DIE DRITTE.

Und stirbt,

Wie er der Tanais geboren ward.

(2769-2772).

When viewed in the context of the drama's concluding symbolism, the bow's particular positioning becomes relevant. The falling bow, a historical moment that links the first and the last of the Amazonian queens, objectively correlates to fall of a people, in the same symbolic way that the souvreign's unsteady crown implies unstability. Tanais had transformed her body by removing one defining characteristic, her breast, and replacing it with another, to make the new combination of woman-bow possible (Carrière 88). Penthesilea incorporates Achilles' body, lets the bow fall and creates a new androgynous

combination: woman-man[12]. The birth and naming of the Amazonian nation, through Tanais' removal of her breast and her defining her people ("taufen") as the "Busenlosen", is mirrored as the return of history by Achilles's torn breast and Penthesilea's ritual purification through water[13]. After the descent of the bow, Penthesilea returns to forge, which animated the very beginnings of the Amazonian state.

The forge or hearth, "Feueresse" (431) or "Herd" (1942), couples the possibilities of domesticity and violence. *Penthesilea* enacts a process of proximity, during which the flames of the hearth, used to forge weapons against the Ethiopians in the pre-history of the Amazon state, finally come to reside in the body of Penthesilea. This spatial transformation can be seen in the consistently more specific associations between the forge and the Amazons. Firstly, the hearth fires had transformed jewelry into weapons. While the collective crash of the Amazon pursuers in seen by the Greeks as chaos personified, "[w]ie in der Feueresse eingeschmelzt" (431), this generic grouping gives over to an explicit link to Penthesilea.

The historical digression of the fifteenth scene, with its image of the forge, forms the third term of an organic-inorganic constellation that includes the bow and the breast, a constellation culminating in the last words of Penthesilea. In a second instance, the forge dematerializes into an affective metaphor, as Penthesilea places a chain of feeling around Achilles' heart:

> "Wie Blumen leicht, und fester doch, als Erz, Die ich mir fest
> verknüpft, ums Herz zu schlagen.
> Doch bis sie zärtlich, Ring um Ring, geprägt, In der Gefühle Glut,
> und ausgeschmiedet,
>
> (833-836)

The "Fesseln" linking Achilles and Penthesilea together are the chains forged by mutual desire, a desire interwoven with the paradoxical need to dominate and to escape from domination. For example, the symbolic "Fesselkranz" (1608), which Achilles would supposedly place upon himself at Penthesilea's behest, illustrates the paradox of a voluntary submission that must yet be wrested from the other. Achilles is also trapped and framed by Penthesilea's gaze, "In deiner Blicke Fesseln" (1613). For the high

priestess, who specifically and deliberately trivializes Penthesilea's pursuit in terms of her flapping clothes[14] rather than her military or hunting prowess, these manacles are nothing more than the chains of male oppression:

> Kannst ihn mit flatterndem Gewand ereilen,
> Der dich in Fesseln schlug, und ihm den Riß,
> Da, wo wir sie zersprengten, überreichen.
> (2331-2333)

The high priestess is also aware that only Achilles can fill the empty space created out of Penthesilea's desire; the "Riß" or tear is at once present as an absence, a lack, and cannot be handed over. Since such a break cannot materialize, it can be inflicted on the other: in her laconic "Ich zerriß ihn" (2975), Penthesilea speaks of the unspeakable in literal and metaphorical terms. As Chaouli points out, the rhyme pair "Riß" and "Biß", relatively neglected in comparsion to the notoriously misspoken "Küsse/Bisse", "...points to a process in which disgusting acts and literary production are fused", since one meaning of "reißen", related to "ritzen", is the writing or inscription of letters and signs (139)[15]. In a last act of creativity, Penthesilea forges her own form of writing.

In her final monologue, both metal and flesh, language and body melt into one. The forge activates the body of the queen in her death speech, in a radically interiorized impression of feeling:

> Denn jetzt steig ich in meinen Busen nieder,
> Gleich einem Schacht, und grabe, kalt wie Erz,
> Mir ein vernichtendes Gefühl hervor.
> Dies Erz, dies läutr' ich in der Glut des Jammers
> Hart mir zu Stahl; tränk es mit Gift sodann,
> Heißätzendem, der Reue, durch und durch;
> Trag es der Hoffnung ew'gem Amboß zu,
> Und schärf und spitz es mir zu einem Dolch;
> Und diesem Dolch reich ich meine Brust:
> So! So! So! So! Und wieder! - Nun ist's gut.
> (3025-3034)

In an effacing movement that extinguishes the difference between the inside and outside, Penthesilea forges an iron dagger from the smithy of her soul and offers it to her breast. She surrenders the dagger and the arrows, the physical implements of death, and substitutes for these weapons with the physicality of her gesture. She completes the writing process, which began with her writing on Achilles' body, by writing with the body. "Es ist der Moment," suggests Gerhard Neumann, "wo die Frau den Kampf noch einmal aufnimmt: in der Form der tödlichen Sprache der Körper" (Neumann, "Hexenküche und Abendmahl..." 25). The physical presence of Achilles must be compensated for the absence of the image: "Sie findet mit dem Mund den Weg ins Innere des Körpers, den ihr Gefühl nicht gefunden hat" (Nutz 181). Achilles has her "Bild" within himself; when he destroys his "Bild" that exists within her, she must obliterate the living original (Klotz 1985 138). She knows, so to speak, the way to a man's heart.

For what reason does Penthesilea die? Although "the dagger of language" (Jacobs xii) effectively describes the relationship of her will to the creative and destructive capacities of the word, her metaphorical dagger may be formed from other motives associated with Achilles' death. Her disarmament, by which she surrenders her dagger and arrows, parallels Achilles refusal to fight. Her incorporation of his body, in which she bites into his breast[16], illustrates the danger of self-alienation, for her missing breast, and the hunger which drives her, can be neither replaced or fulfilled. She becomes Achilles, not because she killed him, but because she ate him. When Penthesilea follows Achilles, she does not do so by going to Ptia, but into her innermost being. As she broke through the alabaster walls of Achilles body/temple, she too descends within herself where both her and Achilles' hearts reside. Her forge is fired by the Promethean fire that burned in his breast: Prometheus was maker, Penthesilea is the unmaker of the body.

Die Hermannsschlacht

In reference to Penthesilea's consumption of Achilles, Mathieu Carrière notes how Kleist "schreibt nie von Sexualität ohne einen Akt von Verstümmelung" (107), a remark that also bears on the founding of a the Amazonian and Germanic nation. Self-mutilation, or the mutilation of another body, are the plus and minus that link *Penthesilea* and *Die*

Hermannsschlacht together, in that the states have at their foundation an act of bodily subtraction, the removal of Tanais' breast, and bodily division, the butchering of Hally. Thus these dramas enact the parallel process of unmaking the body to make a state. These constitutive acts of bodily violence are predicated on the self-inflicted or involuntary violation of womens' bodily integrity. The history behind the founding of the Amazon nation, narrated by Penthesilea in the fifteenth scene, includes several elements: the link between sexuality and violence (the mass rape and the massacre), the act of self-mutilation (the tearing of Tanais's own breast), the symbol of the bow, and the conflation between the organic and the inorganic, the last of which joins the founding and collapse of the Amazonian state.

In *Die Hermannsschlacht*, Kleist demonstrates the process of a state's creation as the main component drama's plot, moving from the mythical background of *Penthesilea* to the historical myth of national origins. The symbol of the bow, which dominates the text of *Penthesilea* from beginning to end, signals among other things the drama's trajectory of alternating tension and velocity, control and release. For the opening of *Die Hermannsschlacht*, Kleist (or perhaps his first editor Ludwig Tieck) inserted another instrument: the lyre, with which the poet would sing Germany into existence against the absence of German history (Müller 15):

> Wehe, mein Vaterland, dir! Die Leier, zum Ruhm dir, zu schlagen,
> Ist, getreu dir im Schoß, mir deinem Dichter, verwehrt. (I 553)

Although the poet's lyre of the motto's distich is silent due to its being in the hands of the nation, Kleist's weapon of choice produces not the direct physical harm of the bow's arrow hitting the body, but the physiological and emotive response that mobilizes the senses. This drama offers a paradigm of a guerilla resistance campaign without the predominant teichoscopic effects of a battle as they are presented in *Penthesilea*. The battle for German liberation was to take place not on stage, but in the hearts and minds of the audience.

The birth and apparent death of the German nation had already been a concern

of Kleist's, as expressed in a letter to Adolphine von Werdeck, as early as 1801:

> Also an dem Arminiusberge standen Sie, an jener Wiege der deutschen Freiheit, die nun ihr Grab gefunden hat? Ach, wie ungleich sind zwei Augenblicke, die ein Jahrtausend trennt! ... - Wohl dem Arminius, daß er einen großen Augenblick fand. Denn was bliebe ihm heutzutage übrig, als etwa Lieutenant zu werden in einem preußischen Regiment?"
>
> (700)

The ex-lieutenant Kleist, whose involvement in a political conspiracy as early as 1808 has been documented[17], chose his moment in this millenium and sought to vindicate Germany history through his *Hermannsschlacht*, which he described in its potential producer Josef von Collin as a gift to the German people (824). Although "[f]ür den Augenblick berechnet" (821), this play on politics is more than propaganda, it is a drama about propaganda in its depiction of how a national myth is constructed. In its form it resembles an analytical drama, in that the battle's background and strategy is performed (*KA* II 1106) and takes precedence over the battle itself. It is not a historical, but a national drama[18] which fictionalizes German history, while at the same time looking back to 9 A.D. and eighteen centuries forward to the future: following the lesson ("Lektion") carried out on Aristan, "Wir, oder unsere Enkel, meine Brüder!" (2631)[19] may represent the concluding pendant to "In Staub mit allen Feinden Brandenburgs!" (1857) of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*.

The first problem with this drama is its relationship to recent history. Sigurd Burckhardt's remark on *Die Hermannsschlacht*, that "[h]istory sometimes seems to do the work of interpreting for us" (116) aptly sums up the difficulty of reading such a drama, which has been functionalized for legitimizing non-literary purposes (*KA* II 1102). The liberating combination of blood and soil, an integral aspect of National Socialist ideology, made *Die Hermannsschlacht* one of Kleist's most popular works during the Nazi period (cf. Busch; Reeve, *Kleist on Stage* 146-150); the four seasons which preceded and followed 1933 saw the number of its performances increase almost tenfold

(Busch 247). The post-war period brought an enduring attitude of skepticism and outright rejection. "Die Gestalten Kleists", notes a critic writing on *Die Hermannsschlacht* in 1947, are "von einer geradezu beängstigenden gegenwärtigen Modernität. [..] Die Seelenverfassung von Kleists Gestalten würde es noch eher als bei Shakespeare nahelegen, sie mit modernen Anzügen zu kostümieren, Hermann und seine Paladine in SS-Uniform, kein abwegiger Gedanke" (Joerden 561). In one of the most frequently cited studies on Kleist, Walter Müller-Seidel comments in 1961 that "[n]ur mit immer erneut auszusprechenden Vorbehalten wird man dieses Stück in das dichterische Werk Kleists einbeziehen dürfen" (*Versehen und Erkennen* 53). In the case of this controversial drama, most critical combatants (those who either include or exclude it from the Kleist canon, or strike a compromise) agree on the play's "prophetic" or allegorical status. Nationalist critics have readily seen in Hermann a Bismarck (cf. Busch 138-39), or an apotheosis of the "Führer" type (cf. Busch 258-59). Historically speaking, Kleist may have seen a Freiherr von Stein in his Hermann (cf. Samuel). For Wolf Kittler, however, "...es geht ja gar nicht darum, das Drama als Schlüsseltext zu lesen, sondern vielmehr um die Erkenntnis einer historischen Konstellation" (*Geburt* 229).

The second problem concerns its apparent celebration of ends over ethics. Burckhardt rightly characterizes reception of the drama: the work, for many critics, remains "something we would rather avoid than contemplate" (116). Kurt May, while admitting to its status "als Vorbild eines aktivistischen Dramas" (255) nonetheless notes that it remains "uns heute am stärksten entfremdet ... in seinem völligen Mangel an Humanität" (261). Graham comments on how the play has been "so persistently read as a violent and unhinged poetic comment on the immediate political scene" (*Word into Flesh* 201). However, since Peymann's groundbreaking staging of the work in 1982, several critics, among them Wolf Kittler, have attempted to rehabilitate and recontextualize the drama[20]. Despite its length, Wolf Kittler's remark deserves citation:

> Von faschistischen Ideologen vereinnahmt, danach strikt abgelehnt von einer Literaturkritik, die die zarten psychischen Valeurs und die Subtilitäten von Kleists Sprachskepsis ins Zentrum des

> philologischen Interesses rückte und die "Hermannsschlacht" nicht nur aus ideellen, sondern auch aus ästhetischen Gründen für mißlungen hielt, dann aber im Jahr 1982 von Claus Peymann in einer Inszenierung vorgeführt, die bewies, daß man das Stück nur beim Wort zu nehmen braucht, um ein theatralisches Meisterwerk zu produzieren" (*Geburt* 15).

Recent criticism has, however, attempted to follow a cautious path: on the one hand, one carefully deplores the rhetorical and physical violence of *Die Hermannsschlacht*, while on the other one cannot ignore its aesthetic properties. At stake is more than merely the question of the play's historical relevance for the Napoleonic period, since it represents one of the few works of this period, as opposed to the works or E.M. Arndt or T. Körner, that has yet to lose its contemporary relevance (Zons 199). Although he was no friend of the "bornierter Junker", Georg Lukács had already set the tone for future Kleist criticism in 1936 when he remarked that *Die Hermannsschlacht* was "...das einzige deutsche Drama dieser Zeit, in dem die nationale Befreiungssehnsucht der Deutschen -- bei allen reaktionären Inhalten -- in großartiger Weise gestaltet wird" (208). At stake, however, is more than the separation or mixture of politics and aesthetics.

Kleist's composition of a "Zeitdrama" and Hermann's mastery of various media raises the question of *Die Hermannsschlacht*'s possible status as a propaganda play. Although widely seen as a Prussian form of agitprop, three critics (Sammons; Angress, "Kleist's Treatment...",; Fischer) on the one hand discuss Kleist's drama with recourse to Brecht's *Die Maßnahme*, while on the other they acknowledge the play's problematic status as propaganda. For Sammons, this drama is "the most Brechtian of all Kleist's dramas" (35), while Angress suggests the following shift in interpretive emphasis: "This is a play about a propagandist, yes, but hardly a propaganda play" ("Kleist's Treatment..." 26); for Wolfgang Wittkowski, it is a "Lehrstück für Intellektuelle" ("Terror der Politik..." 102). For *Die Hermannsschlacht* clearly lacks the one-dimensionality of the *Lehrstück*, as Hermann's use of Thusnelda, his sons as hostages, and the execution of both Roman enemies and German traitors renders Hermann at least

an ambivalent figure; secondly, nationalist interpreters have seemingly underplayed the occlusion of the victorious battle, which is in fact fought and won by Marbod (*KA* II 1102-1103). Hermann's unheroic qualities make him "the only consistently political being in all of Kleist's work" (Angress, "Kleist's Treatment..." 26); for Zons, Hermann represents "jenes Wunschbild von Autorschaft in der politischen Welt" (197).

If Hermann is an author, what are we to make of his project? Should one take aesthetics in its root meaning, that is the capacity for sensual cognition, one could accept this play as a work of art in Hegel's sense: the idea rendered sensual. With this relation in mind, Hermann's actions as a player/actor on the geopolitical stage acquire a different emphasis, for his "staging" of the ambush represents not only a political, but also an aesthetic process of invention. Hermann's process renders sensual the idea of Germania, an abstract vision that is conclusively imprinted on the body of friend and foe. In light of this construction of symbols, Andreas Dörner's discussion of the staging of political myths in connection to the Hermann myth proves useful. Political culture, according to Dörner, is "ein kollektiv geteiltes und meist im Modus des Unbewußt-Selbstverständlichen wirksames Bündel von Wahrnehmungs-, Denk- und Handlungsmustern gemeint, dessen kulturelle Objektivation sich als semiotischer Ausdruck in Zeichen vollzieht" (200-201). Political culture "manifestiert sich in sinnlich faßbaren Zeichenräumen", through which political and cultural conventions ("Selbstverständlichkeiten") can be mediated (201). The key term at work is political semiotization ("**politische Semiotisation**"), understood as "Einübung in Muster der Produktion und Rezeption von Zeichen" (201). While Dörner, during his treatment of the Hermann myth beyond and outside Kleist's text also looks specifically at the *Hermannsschlacht*, I would employ his terminology to investigate in the following how Hermann's manipulation and creation of meaning builds a myth within the play itself.

Ilse Graham's assertion that Hermann's vision encompasses the abstract idea of *Germania* requires some differentiation: for her, *Die Hermannsschlacht* "is concerned with the inevitability of large abstractions degenerating into bestiality in the process of realisation" (*Word into Flesh* 201). But the Germanic nation at the drama's conclusion

may be damaged by the war, but it is neither abstract nor bestial. In the following passage, Hermann juxtaposes what one must lose (private property) in order to gain the abstract concept one needs (freedom):

> Kurz, wollte ihr, wie ich schon einmal euch sagte,
> Zusammenraffen Weib und Kind,
> Und auf der Weser rechtes Ufer bringen,
> Geschirre, goldn' und silberne, die ihr
> Besitzet, schmelzen, Perlen und Juwelen
> Verkaufen oder sie verpfänden,
> Verheeren eure Fluren, eure Herden
> erschlagen, eure Plätze niederbrennen,
> So bin ich euer Mann -:
> (374-381)

His suggestion that the princes must be prepared to destroy their own material culture in order to preserve their freedom contrasts the material with the abstract. Although he provides the lens through which the tribes visualize themselves and the Romans, Hermann does deploy an instrumentalized sense of the concrete in order to direct his followers. The sensual is mediated and realized through the body and its senses. Hence Hermann, who makes use of "the power to envisage and create a symbol" (Graham, *Word into Flesh* 207), sets in motion an aesthetic process which fuses the abstract and the concrete. While Penthesilea constructs a **Bild** of Achilles' body which seems separate from his real physical existence, Hermann's vision of a Germanic nation is mediated through the the individual and collective body.

His distribution of Hally's body, for example, is provoked by his subjects' inability to conceptualize Roman oppression. Because the rhetoric of abstraction cannot arouse rebellion, he resorts to the visual and concrete, the inspiration of the corporeal in conjunction with the abstract. In *Penthesilea*, for example, the "Namenlos'" action of committing an indignity to a corpse, whose potential is augmented by Achilles' reputation as the brutalizer of Hector and the threats made to Prothoe (Angress, "Kleist's Nation of Amazons" 8), receives its name in *Die Hermannsschlacht*: Hally, "die Jungfrau, die

geschändete" (1609).

The Roman atrocity committed against the virgin Hally initiates the Cheruskan process of retaliation. What is unusual in this scene is not only the instrumentalization of her body after her death, but the mode of presenting her before she is executed by her father and male relatives. In the stage directions for IV/4, she is an unconscious "**Person**" (1527ff), a designation repeated in the stage directions and text (1543ff, 1548ff, 1549, 1559), or a "Mensch" (1533). As the people ("Das Volk") view her destroyed features, they also deindividualize her as a being and as a form: "O des Elenden, schmachbedeckten Wesens! / Der fußzertretenen, kotgewälzten, / An Brust und Haupt, zertrümmerten Gestalt" (1545-1547). She is also genderless, identifiable as neither man nor woman (1548). In order to cover up their shame, the men throw a "**großes Tuch**" over her, keeping it over her and forcing Teuthold to identify her by her feet (1564ff). In an action mirroring that of the three Romans who raped her, Teuthold asks Ralf and Rudolph to hold her arms as he stabs her; as with the Romans, immediately "durchbohrt" (1540) by their superior, so too does Teuthold exact the punishment on Hally and "**bohrt sie nieder**" (1572ff). To summarize the scene: a faceless and genderless victim, veiled by a blanket, silent except for a "**kurzen Laut**" upon her death, is executed by her father. "Die Szene," argues Hans Peter Herrmann's article on masculinity, "ist von Kleist mit allem Instrumentarium sexueller Verfügungsphantasien ausstaffiert" (43). The veil over her body resembles a blank sheet, an empty sign, upon which Hermann inscribes his own meaning and translates the victim's body into an explosive signal for revenge. It is no accident, in his linking the "Gestalt" of Hally to the message, that Kleist uses the literary term "Sinnbild" (2549), a fusion of "Sinn"/meaning and "Bild"/image.

The destruction and distribution of Hally's body, an allusion to the Old Testament story of Virginia (*KA*), to *Emilia Galotti* (Zons 185) and to Marc Anthony's funeral oration in *Julius Caesar* (Reeve, *Pursuit of Power* 66, 210), is carried out according to Hermann's instructions:

Wir zählen funfzehn Stämme der Germaner;

In funfzehn Stücke, mit des Schwertes Schärfe,
Teil ihren Leib, und schick mit funfzehn Boten,
Ich will dir funfzehn Pferde dazu geben,
Den funfzehn Stämmen ihn Germaniens zu.
Der wird in Deutschland, dir zur Rache,
Bis auf die toten Elemente werben:
Der Sturmwind wird, die Waldungen durchsausend,
Empörung! rufen und die See,
Des Landes Ribben schlagend, Freiheit! brüllen.
(1611-1620)

The dismemberment of a woman forces the Cheruskers to re-member their collective consciousness. The tribes are as fragmented as the destroyed body of a real woman, who represents the violated and shamed body of Germania ("des Landes Ribben" (1620)). But the revenge is not carried out against the aggressors -- who had been immediately executed by the Roman officer -- but against Hally (Herrmann 42), whose defilement by the Romans initiates the process of her total erasure at the hands of the Cheruskan men. As Helmut Moysisch notes: "Erst der zerstückelte Körper kann eine neue (Volks-) Identität begründen, der Agens - wie so oft bei Kleist - eine **gewaltige** Leidenschaft ist; hier der Affekt der Rache" (56).

Such an association between fragmentation and wholeness, victimization and vengeance, is not accidental. Following the expanding itemization by groups of fifteen (the flesh, the messengers, the horses, the tribes), which takes on larger and larger configurations in its ripple effect, Hermann's rhetoric moves to the pathetic fallacy of an animated nature. The "dead elements", as with Hally's flesh, speak of rage, revenge, and freedom. The wind and water speak, the water representing the heart of Germania beating against the ribs of the land. The fragmentation of Hally effects the rendering whole of the body politic, the united nation of Germania personified as a living, speaking and united "Volkskörper" (Zons 185). For Hans Peter Herrmann, the imaginary national community "...ist kein wesenloses Schemen, sondern mit Körperbildern besetzt" (44); the "Leib Germaniens" must be freed from the Roman parasite (44-45). But as a male

"Gruppenphantasma" (Herrmann 44) or as a dream of the "male nation state of early ninetheenth-century Germany" (Kennedy 30), Germania's body, as an apotheosis of the feminine under male domination, comes into being at the cost of the female body. In other words, the absence of women as real physical presences is proportional to the actualization of the personified "female" state. Thusnelda, for example, speaks with Hermann only in the beginning of the penultimate scene (V/23) and is silent during the final transfer of power.

This process of exacting vengeance is therefore initially one-sided: the creation of the universally viable concept of a nation requires not only the destruction of relationships among Germans (between men and women/Hermann and Thusnelda, parent and child/Hermann and his sons, and person and property/the scorched earth policy) but also the erasure of the foreign enemy. After turning his own troops on his own people and putting Hally's body to the sword, Hermann then turns his attention to the Romans.

The corpse of Hally finds its living double in the figure of Thusnelda. If the satirical figure of Kunigunde in *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* represents "Frau Welt" in her physical and moral corruption, Thusnelda, who adopts Roman fashions and entertains a Roman suitor, plays a similar role in *Die Hermannsschlacht*'s political allegory. If the Romans represent the French, her initially accepting Ventidius' gifts of jewelry and fashion advice illustrate her progression of consciousness, from a misguided follower of the imperial, international style, to the politically and personally vengeful German woman. As a colonized consciousness, she transforms herself from an imitator, with Roman hair, belt, and style of dress (985-986) to a consuming Cheruskan bear. The dismemberment of Hally is evoked by the confiscation of German womens' teeth and hair, the desired accoutrements of Kunigunde's bricolage in *Käthchen*, by the invading Romans.

Where Thusnelda intersects with Penthesilea is in their shared deployment of their mouths -- a terroristic, perhaps gynophobic instance of female orality -- and their metaphorical transformation into animals in response to their objectification by Achilles and Ventidius, the latter's objectifying gaze being mediated and replicated by Hermann. The dominant image of the hunt (cf. Reeve, *Pursuit of Power* 97-100) is reinforced by

the allusion to the arrows of Amor, discussed above with relation to *Penthesilea*. In the opening incident bringing Ventidius and Thusnelda together, first Thusnelda, then Ventidius, fire their arrows at the bison, an action that not only bonds them, but also demonstrates their susceptibility to psychological or emotional manipulation. Ventidius **"kreuzt ... seinen Nacken durch noch einen"**. The "crossing" of arrows in the bison wounded in the neck, in view of the Cupid motif, inextricably links the two, especially when the bear's bristles, like Thusnelda's locks, are to grace Livia's crown: "Wenn sie um ihren Nacken niederfallen!" (2408). These arrows of desire, shot at the surrogate bison, expend their usefulness once the attraction between Thusnelda and Ventidius becomes apparent. By way of parallel gestures, they relinquish their bow and arrows (118ff, 125ff), an ominous act on Ventidius' part: "Hermann renders his foe defenceless: of his own accord he surrenders his weapons and, in his overconfidence, makes himself fully vulnerable" (Reeve, *Pursuit of Power* 29). They eventually take up other weapons: Ventidius' scissors and Thusnelda's key. As with Achilles and Penthesilea, the attraction between two enemies, conveyed through the common image of Amor, shifts to a hatred that results in the tearing of Ventidius' breast. The motif of the vagina dentata, found in the window/feather connection of *Käthchen von Heilbronn*, also surfaces in *Die Hermannsschlacht*. The Romans, at least according to Hermann, are metaphorically raping and denaturing German women, by cutting off their hair and pulling out their teeth to furnish wigs and dentures for Roman women. We can never know if such assaults took place, or if such narratives of colonial aggression were of Hermann's invention. In the context of the Medusa imagery seen in *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*'s Kunigunde, such interventions can be characterized as an attempt to denature the feminine, and to destroy woman's power by altering her body; it is not surprising that one of the Romans' parallel acts of sacrilege is the cutting down of a sacred oak belonging to Germania (921-923). In this sense, in which the natural may be seen to be equated with the feminine, Thusnelda's song in the presence of Ventidius (II/7) represents on one hand an attempted rape and on the other a parable of Narcissism (*KA* II 1124). It warrants full citation and closer examination:

Ein Knabe sah den Mondenschein
In eines Teiches Becken;
Er faßte mit der Hand hinein,
Den Schimmer einzustecken;
Da trübte sich des Wassers Rand,
Das glänzge Mondesbild verschwand,
Und seine Hand war -
(593-599)

The mirror, when touched, no longer holds the image, in the same way that Penthesilea's inability to see herself reflected in Achilles' armour (once he has removed it) causes her undeflected and hungry gaze to transform itself into an orally cannibalistic desire. The song's symbolic constellation enunciates a number of clearly defined mythological and psychoanalytical associations: Ventidius, suffering from the narcissism of desire, is at once captivated as character ("der Knabe") and audience in the narrative structure of the song. His rupture of the water's membrane, a physical invasion of the "female" principles of the moon and its reflection in the water, foreshadows Ventidius' transgressing social codes in his cutting the lock of Thusnelda's hair. Diana, the huntress (ie. Thusnelda) is also goddess of the moon; Ventidius is Acteon, who is eventually devoured (Reeve, *Pursuit of Power* 105). Burckhardt suggests that the song presents "the first clear hint of what is to come" (160), in that Ventidius'/the boy's hand was in light of the rhyme scheme "Drecken" (Burckhardt 160; Graham qtd. in Pfeiffer, *Die zerbrochenen Bilder* 147). Even if Graham's inserted word fits the rhyme and meter of the song, Pfeiffer's suggestion that the "Leerstelle" be read precisely as an absence is more compelling (*Die zerbrochenen Bilder* 147), for the song's performance and Thusnelda's lock of hair are cut off at the same time. The uncertainty -- or perhaps oblivion -- of what awaits those who reach for the Imaginary is analogous to the disappearance and destruction of that desired image (Pfeiffer, *Die zerbrochenen Bilder* 147).

The boy pushing his hand into the water may also refer to the Roman invasion

in a broader political sense. While Burckhardt sees the song as representing Thusnelda's baptism ("a total immersion into the unredeemed physicality of man's origins" (160)), I would locate the medium of baptism elsewhere, in the spilling of Roman blood. The positioning of the boy in relation to Thusnelda does not suggest a baptism, since the reflection of the moon, as a surface phenomenon, cannot be submerged, unlike the hand of the boy. Secondly, the penetration of the hand suggests not a "purification and redemption" (Burckhardt 160) but rather a metaphorical rape, the male attempt, initiated and mediated by his gaze, to enter physically a taboo female space. Lawrence Ryan's broader view of the song reads it as a political allegory: the boy's attempt to possess the moonlight has "die Harmonie von gespiegeltem Licht und spiegelndem Wasser zerstört und im dunklen Grundelement bisher ruhende Tiefen aufgerührt", an act that stirs up the Germans against their oppressors (205-206).

Without Ventidius' rape of the lock[21], Hermann would not have retained the physical fetish at his disposal which would convince her of her eventual fate at the hands and tools of the Romans. Even Thusnelda, under Hermann's concretely brutal tutelage, at the same time learns to accept the relationship between national and corporeal self-determination and to then deploy it in her act of revenge. Hermann renders the personal political, in that he describes the potential for Thusnelda's twofold victimization at the hands of the Romans: "Sie [the Romans] scheren dich so kahl wie eine Ratze" (1000) or will remove her teeth by force. There is more at stake here than her hair or teeth, and when Hermann convinces her of Ventidius' duplicity in III/3, her revenge takes on a physical dimension. As Stephens notes, the lock contained in Ventidius' letter "confronts Thusnelda with irrefutable evidence derived from her own body" on the home front, analogous to Hermann's transport of Hally's body to the popular front (*Plays and Stories* 166). In the following exchange between Thusnelda and Hermann, the encroaching hand and the theft of hair and teeth surface again:

> **THUSNELDA.** Nun, meine goldnen Locken kriegt er nicht!
> Die Hand, die in den Mund mir käme,
> Wie jener Frau, um meiner Zähne:
> Ich weiß nicht, Hermann, was ich mit ihr machte.

HERMANN lacht. Ja, liebste Frau, da hast du recht! Beiß zu!

(1102-1105)

When encroaching male fingers are bitten by a female mouth, the castration imagery, as a consequence of a rape, is relatively obvious. The significance of the hand in particular merits further investigation, in view of Varus' arrival with the Roman delegation. Varus acknowledges Hermann's request that clemency be shown the Roman lawbreakers with a physical gesture:

Nun, Freund Armin; beim Jupiter, es gilt!
Nimm diese Hand, die ich dir reiche,
Auf immer hast du dir mein Herz gewonnen! -

(1149-1151)

The Romans, who seem unable to keep their hands off the Cheruskers' women or their sacred trees, are about to pay the price for their intrusion. Similar to the relationship between the hand and the heart of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, once the hand is taken the heart will follow.

The Romans do not attempt to remove Thusnelda's teeth, but her revenge for Ventidius' stealing a lock of her hair does take the form of metonymic biting; the bear tears at Ventidius' breast as Penthesilea does to Achilles, and this destruction of the enemy stands in for the larger battle of liberation and extermination. While the Romans allegedly use tools such as scissors ("Mit welchem Werkzeug weiß ich nicht" (632)) or pliers ("mit einem Werkzeug" (1028)), Thusnelda vicariously exacts her revenge on Ventidius by key, tooth and claw: "Sie [the bear of Cheruska] schlägt die Klauen in meine weiche Brust!" (2413). There remains the purifying and redemptive possibility in Ventidius' execution by the bear, in which his blood is spilled as a human sacrifice to prove Thusnelda worthy of Hermann. As Pfeiffer points out (*Die zerbrochenen Bilder* 147), Ventidius' idyllic monologue of V/17, which precedes his mauling in the park, explicitly parodies the "Mondlied" of Thusnelda:

Wie mild der **Mondschein** durch die Stämme fällt!
Und wie der Waldbach fern, mit üppigem Geplätscher,

Vom **Rand** des hohen Felsens niederrinnt! -

(emphasis mine, 2357-2359)

The echoing of moonlight, water, and border illustrate the construction of this scene in relation to the trangression of II/5 and portend how Ventidius' pastoral musings devolve into the experience of execution[22]. The arrival of Thusnelda and the bear on the scene further demonstrates the murder of Ventidius as a stylistic parallel. In response to his pleas for help, she sarcastically suggests that he use the scissors to collect the fur of the bear for the Empress Livia. Thusnelda's revenge is not entirely without tools: Burckhardt, as evoked in the title of his essay, notes that Thusnelda's "Werkzeug" is the key, "the tool not of abstraction but of *inclusion*, of locking in, of trapping the abstractors into the most fearful of confrontations" (143).

The bodily constellation of *Die Hermannsschlacht* employs a particular juxtaposition of Roman heads and hands with the Germanic hair, teeth, and mouths. The Roman assault on the territory of Germania is, according to Barbara Kennedy's understanding of the drama, concretely metaphorized by the physical assaults on Hally and Thusnelda. However, I would go further and suggest that the Roman invasion, in which the Romans cross "die Lippe", enter a dark and menacing forest, lose their collective head and spill their blood (Septimus, Ventidius, Varus, Aristan), enacts a politicized rape and revenge-by-castration fantasy. For example, Zons reads the forest at night, occupied by the "Stammmütterchen", as a force that "verschlingt" the Roman cohorts (Zons 185). Although Kennedy's study "aims to demonstrate ... the manner in which imagery of victimization and actual mutilation serves to position the woman's body as the chief casualty of nationalist fervour in the unified male nation-state" (18), I would suggest a larger modality of corporal objectification practiced by both Germans and Romans. Numerous examples support Kennedy's main argument. Ventidius characterizes Thusnelda in purely objectified sensual terms: in their first private encounter, he refers to her "Lippe" (534), her "Herz" (538), her "süßer Mund" (552). He **"ergreift ihre Hand"** and begs her for the "Schleife, diese goldne Locke -" (564). Ventidius represents the souvenir collector who wishes to claim the physical traces of a sensual experience:

Was für ein Strahl der Wonne strömt,

Mir unerträglich, alle Glieder lähmend,
Durch den entzückten Busen hin...
(549-551)

In a passage mirroring Penthesilea's reaction to Achilles' objectified image, Ventidius expresses his attraction to the idea of Thusnelda and seeks in the extremity of his desire a fetishized, metonymic representation of her. Barbara Kennedy also shows how Hermann and Ventidius are linked by their common pattern of objectification centering on Thusnelda's hair: "Hermann consistently reduces the whole person of his wife to an individual body part" (25). It is likewise Teuthold and his relatives who perpetuate and conclude the Roman's initial brutal attack on Hally, by killing and butchering her. The objectification of the body has a broader application and range of victims, as the practice of instrumentalization with regard to Hermann's strategic use of his own body and other male bodies becomes prominent in the latter half of the drama.

In this state of total war, woman and Romans are not the sole victims of bodily harm. Since Hermann's campaign relies less on physical confrontation, his manipulation of writing and language achieves his political goals. Thus the scene of Hermann's wounding (V/22) is unique in one respect, in that he also suffers a wound on his arm, with one strategic distinction: unlike the the arm wound of Achilles or the hand wounds of vom Strahl and Homburg, his combat with Fust takes place on stage rather than being narrated in a subsequent scene. Such a setting of the scene would seem appropriate if one takes into account Sammons' assertion that Hermann not only leads the uprising, but also in fact stages it (35). Thus Hermann's struggle between his drive for revenge and the requirements of political expediency takes place on the site of his body[23].

Varus, already wounded by a failed suicide attempt and having lost the battle, appears on stage. Fust and Hermann, accompanied by Gueltar, confront him, only to argue and eventually duel for the privilege of liquidating the Roman commander. What some critics see as a temporary loss of control, that is, a moment in which Hermann's desire for fame drives him to carry out actions against a rival and ally, may be regarded as a feint. I would argue that Hermann's enactment of this theater of cruelty -- the only instance in Kleist's dramatic work in which blood is spilled on stage -- shifts at a critical

point in this scene[24]. When Hermann and Fust engage in single combat ("**sie fechten**") in order to establish precedence in the liquidation of Varus, it seems clear that their entrance from opposite sides of the stage is intended to produce a theatrical effect. The victor would be the one who first "hit" the other. When Hermann "**hält inne**" the spectator witnesses one of those Kleistian pauses, a moment of reflection, in which a critical psychological event takes place. Fust's victory over Hermann is decided not by his acknowlegement of the hit, although Hermann "**hält inne**", but by the interjection of Gueltar acting as an unofficial judge of the contest. Following his "defeat", Hermann suddenly acknowledges Fust's precedence in taking revenge. Then there follows a second "**Pause**" following the cheer of the "Gefolge". The first pause may embody Hermann's sudden globalized understanding of the duel, Hermann's moment of recognition. The implications of Fust's defeat are manifold: Fust would feel displaced in his right of precedence to claim revenge. As it stands, Fust retreives his honour, is honoured by the shouts of the "Gefolge", and following the second pause "**fällt ihm** [Hermann] **um den Hals**", the ultimate gesture of commiseration and subservience. Had Hermann simply allowed Fust to kill Varus, the former would have owed him nothing. Hermann is obviously willing to use his own body to political advantage, in the same way that the effective distribution of Hally's body in a (per)version of the Eucharist had its rhetorical effect. The spilling of blood becomes a purifying ritual for Hally's father and for Hermann: "Das schmutzige Blut des Verbrechens wird durch das frische Blut des heiligen Opfers gereinigt" (Dörner 208). Thus Hally's dismemberment finds its correlative in the sacrificial moment of Hermann's "defeat", in that the subsequent scene reinvokes Hally's body as sign(al) and emblem:

> Hally, die Jungfrau, die geschändete,
> Die du, des Vaterlandes grauses Sinnbild,
> Zerstückt in alle Stämme hast geschickt,
> Hat unserer Völker Langmut aufgezehrt.
>
> (2448-2551)

Hermann's wound and Hally's dismemberment are components of a cannibalistic metaphor complex, expressed by the communal consumption of her body fragments'

message. The tribes of Germania consume not only the medium but also the message by which they nourish their hatred.

The above intepretation of this scene assumes that Hermann's defeat allows him a dramatic moment of recognition. However, in the one scene of the entire drama that shows Hermann in actual combat, Kleist depicts his fighting against an ally for the prize of liquidating an enemy -- and losing. Aside from demonstrating Hermann's political instincts and paralleling Hally's sacrifice, this scene (V/22) employs an intriguing series of body and blood metaphors that explicitly evoke the Eucharistic nature of consumption and sacrament. The consequences of Hermann's wound are outlined in the following exchange:

FUST. Hermann! Mein Bruderherz! Was hab ich dir getan?
Er fällt ihm um den Hals.
HERMANN. Nun, es ist alles gut.
GUELTAR. **umhalst ihn gleichfalls**. Du bist verwundet - !
FUST. Das Blut des besten Deutschen fällt in Staub.
HERMANN. Ja, allerdings.
FUST. Daß mir die Hand verdorrte!
GUELTAR. Komm her, soll ich das Blut dir saugen?
FUST. Mir laß - mir, mir!
(2527-2530)

This sacramental moment, as with Hally's body given to Germania, is repeated as catharsis in Gueltar's impulse: "Komm her, soll ich das Blut dir saugen?" (2531), which on the one hand depicts the documented practice of sucking wounds, but on the other points toward some form of acquiring spiritual nourishment[25]. Fust had noted that "Das Blut des besten Deutschen fällt in Staub" (2529), and in a pseudo-biblical moment of regret, wishes rhetorically that his own hand, instead of Hermann's arm, should wither. German blood, particularly if it belongs to Hermann, is sacred, and should not be spilled in the dust, even on German soil. Roman blood, on the other hand, can feed the thirst of the German soil, or be functionalized to wash away the "Schandfleck" of Fust. The blood of Varus is instrumentalized by Fust as a spiritual cleanser: "Den Schandfleck

wasch ich ab in seinem Blute..." (2497). Fust also threatens Varus in the following way: "... Auch noch im Tode / Zapf ich das Blut dir ab, das rein mich wäscht" (2521-2522), an image whose coarseness is emphasized by comparsion with the value placed on Hermann's blood ten lines later. The same contrast applies to the disposal of Hally, whose treatment as a parceled object contrasts with the almost absurd attention paid to Hermann's minor wound.

Blood in this scene emphasizes its role in belonging. Fust wishes at the beginning of the conflict to inscribe his right to revenge on Hermann's forehead ("Mit Blut schreib ichs auf deine schöne Stirn" (2493)), a possible association with the mark of Cain, as Fust names Hermann his "Bruderherz" (2526). The law ("Recht") is not inscribed on Hermann's forehead, nor do Fust and Hermann kill each other as brothers. In a peculiar echo of *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, the two former enemies Fust and Hermann embrace and reconcile over a dead victim, in the same way that Rupert and Sylvester clasp hands over the bodies of their children. The unity of the tribe, be it the Germans or the split family unit of Rossitz and Warwand, brings with it a terrible cost to those who breach the integrity of a family or nation.

Fust and Gueltar's solicitude demonstrates Hermann's psychological control, exemplifed by his remark "Du bist nicht klug" (2535) and his indifference to his injury, which seems to provoke Fust and Gueltar's sense of guilt. He deals with the healing of the material body and the restoration of psychological balance in these two synctactically balanced commands: "Laß einen Herold gleich nur kommen, / Der deinen Namen ausposaune: / Und mir schaff einen Arzt, der mich verbindet" (2535-2539). Bernd Fischer is one recent Kleist commentator who has taken note of the instrumental aspects of this scene: "Das Geschäft des Tötens bekommt in diesem Drama den Charakter des Schlachtens" (312) to the extent that Hermann and Fust duel for the privilege of killing Varus like a cornered animal. Fischer's second point draws on his finding a literary predecessor in this scene in Friedrich Klopstock, who composed a trilogy of dramas centered on Hermann[26]. While Fischer sees Hermann's wound on the arm as insufficiently motivated in itself, he does point out this scene's possible allusion to the opening scene of *Hermanns Tod*, in which Horst is binding Hermann's arm. As a pointed

remark against Klopstock's "erotisiertes Wundenpathos" (Fischer 302), Kleist's Hermann rejects their solicitude and demands a return to business. While Klopstock's Hermann, with fire in his veins, wishes to cool his wound and allow the blood to flow ("Es erfrischt mich, wenn ich nachblute" (802)), Kleist's Hermann, unlike Achilles, reasserts his control and asks to be "bound" ("verbinden"), to have the exercise of his will placed within bandages and boundaries.

Since Kleist so rarely alluded directly to other literary works in either his letters or his works, it is difficult to establish his familiarity with Klopstock's dramas. However, Fischer's suggestive argument opens up not only the question of literary influence, but also the issue of the wound's motivation. Firstly, due to its multiple occurrences, the wound on the arm or hand exists as a motif throughout Kleist's works, whose various functions and motivations are integrated in this study. That Hermann accepts the light wound as a sign of his defeat has a number of possible motivations: on a day in which no German blood should flow from German hands, Hermann realizes the necessity of his example. Not his blood, but Aristan's, should provide the example. His arm wound, which results in laughter, may also embody a purgative effect, the excision of "bad blood" between him and Fust. In this case the wound is associated with an **Affekt**, that is Hermann's indeterminate laughter, which in a Freudian sense may express his feeling of complete superiority in total victory for the Germans in their total war against the Romans, in ironic juxtaposition to his minor defeat at the hands of Fust. The spilling of Hermann's blood, while redolent of self-sacrifice, must be compensated and complemented by the second sacrifice of Aristan.

As with *Penthesilea*, the spilled blood is a message. If the spatial movements of *Penthesilea* present the spectacular process of bodily proximity, in that she writes on Achilles' body, *Die Hermannsschlacht* writes on the body and with the body. Since the ancient world of Kleist's Greeks and Amazons is pre-literate, the medium of the written is preceded by the immediacy of the oral and gestural. Such discursive components are presented in Kleist's national drama as well, with the addition of written letters (the abstraction of language) frequently in combination with the body (the concreteness of physicality). When pursuing the hearts and minds of his allies, Hermann deploys such

textual power in a concretely manifested sense: his letter to Marbod is accompanied by his two sons and a dagger. Should Marbod doubt Hermann's intentions, he should kill them both, so sure is Hermann of the effect of his words. Hally's body, as argued above, is presented to the spectator as an empty sign broken into its constituent parts, filled with the meaning Hermann ascribes to them. Should Thusnelda harbour mixed feelings towards the Romans, Hermann's performance of Ventidius' letter (by reading it aloud, as opposed to the dramatically weaker effect of simply giving it to her) would unlock her anger and give her the "key" to revenge. This performance is justified by Thusnelda's strategic illiteracy: sharing Ruprecht's credulous tactility, what she can read and believe is the tangible truth of her stolen lock of hair. "Kleists Texte", as well as Hermann's, "verweigern sich den Identifikationsbedürfnissen von Leserseelen, weil sie nicht an Seelen, sondern an Nerven und Körper adressiert sind" (Zons 182). The effect of such texts is the total mobilization of the body. One could argue, for example, that Hermann had already won the duel with Fust on another, disembodied front: through the power of text. Hermann's preceding victory is acknowledged by Fust at the very beginning of the scene:

> Den Schandfleck wasch ich ab in seinem Blute,
> Das habe ich heut, das mußt du wissen,
> Gestreckt am Boden heulend, mir,
> Als mir dein Brief kam, Göttlicher, gelobt!
> (2497-2500)

In his acknowledgement of guilt, Fust attributes to Hermann a form of omniscience ("Das mußt du wissen") and recognizes the physical effect of Hermann's implementation of his message. Man to man, body against body, this single combat relativizes Hermann's heroic skills, while suggesting that his bringing Fust abjectly to his knees by the power of his word compensates for his inability to overcome Fust physically. In these scenes of textual embodiment there are degrees of distance between sender and receiver, and between body and text: Fust and Aristan receive written messages ("ein Blatt" with differing effects); Marbod and Thusnelda receive and read letters with bodily attachments (Hermann and Thusnelda's sons and her retrieved lock of hair); Hally's body, inscribed

and divided with "des Schwertes Schärfe" (1612), is deployed as a medium and a message. Wolf Kittler suggests that the distribution of Hally's body is analogous to the three ingredients of the message addressed to Marbod: a dagger, an innocent body (Hermann's sons) and a letter ("Militärisches Kommando..." 64)[27]. The oppressive tools of Roman civilization, the pliers and scissors, are confronted by the German swords, axes and clubs, the "writing" instruments that will leave their traces on the Romans' bodies. Their spilled blood, transubstantiated as ink, writes Hermann's message in the soil of Germania.

When Septimus is to be executed and sacrificed to the state of emergency, Hermann insists that his Roman blood will quench Germania's thirst for revenge and yet sanctify the holy war against the invader:

> Führt ihn hinweg,
> Und laßt sein Blut, das erste, gleich
> Des Vaterlandes dürren Boden trinken!
> (2201-2204)

Kleist once asked "Was gilt es in diesem Kriege?" Everything is at stake. Everything, including the body, is negotiable, despite Hermann's injunction: "...Es soll kein deutsches Blut, / An diesem Tag, von deutschen Händen fließen" (2273-74). The discourse of the sacred, deployed by Hermann and Romans alike to describe their status, has only a conditional validity. Hermann, when ordering that those aligned with the Romans be spared, describes them as "heilig" (2276), while Septimus, when reminding Hermann of the victor's duty towards his captives, suggests: "Mein Haupt, das wehrlos vor dir steht, / Soll deiner Rache heilig sein" (2212-2213). Like Septimus, Aristan is executed in the name of political expediency, for only Germania's territory is ultimately holy (2629), even when Hermann had asserted that the traitors were also sacred. Aristan's "Jedoch was galt Germanien mir?", perhaps a hidden polemic against the cosmopolitanism of Goethe (*KA* II 1145-1146) is indeed the last question asked by anyone in the drama.

The traitor Aristan, who may not have received the embodied message of Hally's body, receives "ein Blatt von deiner [Hermann's] Hand" (2604) which he ignored at the

cost of his own body: he becomes himself a lesson and message. Kittler notes: "Namen und Buchstaben entscheiden über Tod und Leben. Und wer die Schrift nicht im Moment der Entscheidung inkarniert, dem wird sie gewaltsam auf den Leib geschrieben" ("Militärisches Kommando..." 66). The Cheruskan witnesses, including Fust, who collapsed "heulend" at the sight of Hermann's message, or like Marbod were convinced of Hermann's integrity by the letter, dagger and his sons' bodies, get the message loud and clear. "Die Lektion" says Marbod "ist gut" (2619). The "Lektion" and the "Lektüre" has its root in the Latin **lectio**, the act of reading. There is more at stake than Aristan's head. The execution, despite Hermann's humanizing "Weh mir! Womit soll ich mein Amt beginnen" (2599), is the "erste und konstituierende Handlung des neuen Staats" (Fischer 317).

Although *Die Hermannsschlacht* explicitly thematizes violence against women, the war between the opposing armies, the execution of captives, and the exercise of militiary discipline, the violence claims all people as victims and aggressors in a total war. Secondly, although the conclusion of the drama unambiguously places men on the seat of political power, the nation-state of the newly liberated Germania can be metaphorically characterized as a female -- albeit invisible -- figure. Women's bodies are metonymies for an abstraction. While Kleist himself put forward the polarity between *Penthesilea* and *Käthchen von Heilbronn*, the scenic and political parallels between the former and *Die Hermannsschlacht*, as well as the singular violence of the cannibalistic imagery, make a compelling case for this chapter's comparison, for both dramas represent the formation of statehood. Although the constellation of power in *Die Hermannsschlacht* effaces of women from the political arena, women on the one hand function as colonized objects of Roman desire, representing the conquered and raped territory and the bearers of future generations. On the other hand, in a drama dominated by the imagery of the hunt, Hermann uses Thusnelda as bait and risks the lives of his own sons to promote the national political message -- an action to which Thusnelda does not apparently react. As dictated by male-determined political expediency, the pattern of objectification results in Thusnelda's final incorporation of Hermann's vision. The victim

becomes the victimizer, the object becomes the objectifier, and as a "Bärin" she destroys Ventidius in an encapsulated representation of a battle which neither appears on stage (cf. Seeba "Die Aussparung...") nor is teichoscopically narrated. Thusnelda, acting through the surrogate Cheruskan bear, tears her suitor apart and continues the process of baptizing the German soil with the blood of her enemies. The victory of Germania over the Romans, which comes through her extermination of the foreign body, effects the birth of a nation-state.

The alienation of the politicized body from the body politic is nowhere more concretely expressed than in this image taken from Hermann's only monologue: "Nun wär ich fertig, wie ein Reisender, / Cheruska, wie es steht und liegt, / Kommt mir, wie eingepackt in einer Kiste, vor: / Um einen Wechsel könnt ich es verkaufen" (1656-1659)[28]. In Hermann's view, Cheruska, unlike the living body and its working senses, is as alienable and objectifiable as the cut and cartoned body of Hally or the stolen hair of Thusnelda. As with the Amazon state of *Penthesilea*, in which the queen's last commmand is to disperse the ashes of Tanais, the creation of Hermann's Germania enacts opposing impulses: the integrity and intactness of the body is violated in order to fuse the abstracted body politic together.

Endnotes

1. The following will provide a few examples to demonstrate the broad range of the drama's critical reception. With regard to *Penthesilea*, Goethe wrote to Kleist: "Mit der Penthesilea kann ich mich noch nicht befreunden. Sie ist aus einem so wunderbaren Geschlecht und bewegt sich in einer so fremden Region daß ich Zeit nehmen muß in beide zu finden" (qtd. in Semdner, 806). Goethe's rejection was not as severe as the Italian critic's Mario Praz, of over a century later: *Penthesilea* is a "work which strives to give the impression that it is the product of a mind full of obsessions and hallucinations, but only succeeds in being pretentious and ridiculous..." (10). Peter Goldammer, in his study of its reception, defends the drama against Lukács' accusation that it barbarizes the ancient period, by noting that the violence of Homer's portrayal of the Trojan War is comparable (Goldammer 211).

2. In addition to Katharina Mommsen's study (*Kleists Kampf mit Goethe*, 1974), which brings to light parallels between Goethe's *Die Natürliche Tochter* (1804) and *Penthesilea*, Gerhard Pickerodt notes how elements of *Penthesilea* reflect and respond to issues raised by Goethe's *Iphigenie* ("Kleist und Penthesilea..." 52). Gallas explains that Goethe's rejection of Kleist's tragedy originates in the fact "...daß seine Antiken-Auffassung sich an Winckelmann orientierte, und das heißt an der griechischen Plastik, am schön gestaltenen Körper" ("Antikenrezeption..." 213). Thus erotic drives overcome the forces of reason and self-discipline: "Wo Goethe in der *Iphigenie* angelangt war, bei der Ersetzung der antiken Herrn durch die innere Selbst-Beherrschung und aufgeklärte Selbst-Gewißheit, da fängt Kleist an zu fragen: gerade dieses Selbstbewußtsein der Iphigenie zerfällt der Penthesilea, sie fühlt sich gespalten und nicht-autonom" (Gallas, "Antikenrezeption..." 218). Sternberger argues for Penthesilea's contemporaneity, in opposition to the timeless nostalgia of the eternally feminine: "Penthesilea ist nicht als ein menschliches Monster der Vorzeit gedacht, sondern als radikales Modell des Ewig Weiblichen in einem anderen als dem Goetheschen Sinn, des Gegenwärtig-Irdischen" (Sternberger 103). Finally, Nutz sees in *Penthesilea* an anti-classical return of the body (165), a body present in the ancient tradition of Euripides' *Bacchae*, but repressed in the products of Weimar classicism.

3. Kleist expresses his fascination with the male body in an erotically charged letter to Ernst von Pfuel, whose opening imagery parallels the description of Penthesilea's "Sturz" (scene two, 300-330) and Achilles' emergence: "Ich habe Deinen schönen Leib oft," wrote Kleist to Ernst von Pfuel (01.07.05), "wenn Du in Thun vor meinen Augen in den See stiegest, mit wahrhaft *mädchenhaften* Gefühlen betrachtet. [...] Dein kleiner, krauser Kopf, einem festen Halse aufgesestzt, zwei breite Schultern, ein nerviger Leib, das Ganze ein musterhaftes Bild der Stärke, als ob Du dem schönsten jungen Stier, der jemals dem Zeus geblutet, nachgebildet wärest" (749).

4. This created idyll, with its ritual dressing of Achilles as the selected mate, is directly analogous to the wedding and naming ritual between Agnes and Ottokar in *Die Familie Schroffenstein* (Müller-Seidel, "*Penthesilea* im Kontext..." 148).

5. While their first encounter, as a kind of physical pantomine, foreshadows their final meeting, so too does Odysseus' perceptive understanding of their obsession, in which he recognizes that both Achilles and Penthesilea are capable of animalistic drives: "Denn wie die Dogge entkoppelt, mit Geheul / In das Geweih des Hirsches fällt: der Jäger, / Erfüllt von Sorge, lockt und ruft sie ab; / Jedoch verbissen in des Prachttiers Nacken..." (213-216), even when the game is shot through with an arrow (221). In the twenty-second scene, the stag meatphor, the neck and the arrow resurface as key elements in Achilles' death.

6. A parallel image is found in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, by which Homburg, similar to Achilles, misapprehends the Elector's capacity to inflict bodily harm, by projecting his projected mode of dying onto his executioner: "eh er dies Herz hier, das getreu ihn liebt, / Auf eines Tuches Wink, der Kugel preisgibt, / Eh sieh, eh öffnet er die eigene Brust sich, / Und sprützt sein Blut selbst tropfenweis in Staub" (873-876).

7. Gallas summarizes the physical symptoms of her disordered desire in the following: "Die Hand versagt ihr, die Pfeil und Bogen oder das Schwert führen soll, die Füße versagen ihr, wenn sie stolpert, wenn sie fliehen soll; ihr ganzer Körper ist gelähmt,

wenn sie Achill sieht, die Zunge versagt ihr; und schließlich das auffälligste Symptom: die entfernte rechte Brust -- Penthesilea hat ständig Brust-schmerzen; wenn sie stürzt, fällt sie auf die Brust, wenn Achill sie verletzt, trifft er die Brust" ("Lacans vier Diskurse..." 207). As for understanding Penthesilea's drives, Ilse Graham relates the "flawed and sullied spot on the mirror of their soul, and the physical token of it is -- the mutilated breast" (*Word into Flesh* 124) to her misrecognition of Achilles' motives. Aside form Graham's own metaphor replacing Kleist's, why is her "distorting mirror that is built within her very being" (Graham, *Word into Flesh* 127) the flaw in Penthesilea, when she sees herself reflected in the armour of Achilles? There seems to be an assumption at work: that the tragic heroine suffers from a moral defect, or a defect of the sense organs, for which he or she must pay the price, when it is clear that Achilles is also subject to the "Raserei" and loss of control attributed to Penthesilea.

8. Sternberger characterizes Achilles more or less as a "Kavalier", whose casual and superficial roleplaying, by word and gesture, brings about his downfall (98). Although one could suggest that his claim to being "...im Innersten getroffen" (1416) allows for a measure of psychological depth (seen by Allan as reflecting the "hollowness of his rhetoric" (154)), it should be noted that this feeling mirrors and follows Penthesilea's inner wounding, and that he makes this remark while his archers are killing Penthesilea's companions. Since Achilles neither understands nor respects Penthesilea and the Amazonian laws governing her, it seems that his words, like his armour, merely reflect what the listener wants to hear. Hilda Brown sees in Penthesilea a psychological depth lacking in Achilles (78). Ilse Graham, seemingly taking Achilles' words at face value, takes a sympathetic view of Achilles' motives, as he is the "tender lover who leaves behind all that is his -- his camp, his companions, his values and conventions and, indeed, his warrior's honour -- in order to see life through the beloved's eyes" (*Word into Flesh* 127). She takes no notice of his remarks describing the Amazonian customs as a "Grille" or his intention to remain with Penthesilea only temporarily (2474).

9. Gerhard Neumann, in his account of Kleist's cultural anthropology, finds that the "Straucheln des Körpers" is one of the building blocks for Kleist's view of human fallability (literally: our capacity to fall). It is no coincidence that Juan, of the edited "Vorstufen" of *Die Familie Ghonorez*, has the following fall: "In grader Linie fort durch Strauch und Moor / Und moosigem Gestein mich winde, gleitet / Mein Fuß, mein Haupt zerschlägt sich an dem Felsen" (**Variant**, 827). Likewise in *Penthesilea*, when Diomedes compliments Achilles on his prescience in placing "[d]en Feldstein ..., über welchen / Die Königin zusammenstürzen sollte" (516-517). She stumbles and falls while attempting to take the most direct route after Achilles. In Kleist's world, these obstacles are merely externalized signs of inner imbalance: for Adam, everyone has the fall-provoking "leidigen Stein des Anstoßes" (6) within him or herself (*Der zerbrochne Krug*).

10. That Kleist was fascinated by the relationship between theoretical science and literature -- as seen, to name one example among many, in his algebraic formulation regarding Käthchen and Penthesilea -- is further confirmed by the meaning of "Bogen", "Sehne", and "Pfeil" as related mathematical figures. The word "Bogen", according to Adelung's *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der Hochdeutschen Mundart* (1793), has the meaning "Ein jeder Theil einer krummen Linie. Daher ist in der Mathematik der Bogen, **arcus**, ein Stück einer Zirkellinie" (II:1112). The geometrical meaning of "Sehne" is outlined as follows: "Nach einer von diesen Bogensehnen entlehnten Figur ist in der Geometrie die Sehne, **Chorda**, eine jede Linie, welche außer dem Mittelpunkt von einem Punkte der Peripherie eines Zirkels zu dem anderen gezogen wird" (Adelung IV:26-27). Grimm states that "bogensehne" is "die einen **bogen** abschneidende gerade linie" (16:151). Adelung's definition of "Pfeil" complements this constellation: "...in der Mathematik wird derjenige Theil von dem halben Durchmesser eines Zirkels, welcher zwischen dem Bogen und seinem **Sinu** liegt, **Sinus versus**, von einigen der Pfeil genannt" (III:719); architecturally speaking, the "Pfeil" is the rise of an arch or arc. The **Sinu** is the sinew or "Sehne". Grimm's definition of "Bogen" provides further evidence to suggest that Kleist was thoroughly familiar with these words' connotations: "die krumme linie, im gegensatz zur geraden, der kreis ist eine geschlossene krumme linie,

deren beide enden sich wieder berühren" (2:217), a parallel to the moment in which Penthesilea "...spannt mit Kraft der Rasenden, sogleich / Den Bogen an, daß sich die Enden küssen" (2646-2647). This geometric allegory may resemble this pattern: Firstly, Penthesilea attempts to cut into Achilles' trajectory, as a "Sehne" cuts into a circle. The circle, however, is none other than a closed arcing line, a "Bogen", which is incised by and connected to the "Sehne"; the arrow/"Pfeil" interrupts in turn the connection between the bow/Achilles and the string/Penthesilea. Penthesilea's "Pfeil"/"Feder" inscribes Achilles' "Bogen"/"Blatt". The reinsertion of this geometric figure, embedded in the topography of the **dramatis personae** (Reuss 1992) and the symbolic structures of the opening scenes, completes the circular nature of the drama's mathematical logic.

11. In addition to viewing *Penthesilea* as a spectacular tragedy on the war between the sexes -- implied by the etymological relationship between "Schlacht" and "Geschlecht" (Reuss, ""Im Geklüfft..." 5) -- a number of critics have attempted to evaluate and compare the Amazonian and Greek societies. Perhaps because so much of the key events are reported through the accounts of the Greeks, some critics either adopt their point of view or repeat Goethe's misgivings. Cullen and von Mücke take to task Gerhard Kaiser's reimparting the "patriarchal prejudice in his unproblematical celebration of love, personhood and a dialogical understanding" (472) even when he somewhat idealizes the Amazon society; Müller-Seidel "ventriloquizes Achill in order to support his reading of the play" as a tragedy of Penthesilea's soul (Cullen and von Mücke 474). If the Amazon state began with the elimination of all men and the rape of the women, do the women repeat the process, by eliminating male children and capturing others? The Amazon state owes its existence not to the massacre of the Ethiopians, but to the liquidation of the Scythian male population by the aggressors. Volker Klotz points out that the Amazon state is "einst enstanden als Antwort auf kollektive männliche Vergewaltigung" ("Kleists extremes Theater..." 135). Müller-Seidel remarks that "...der entscheidende Punkt nicht im Amazonenstaat, sondern in den Voraussetzungen liegt, die zu seiner Gründung führten" (Müller-Seidel, "*Penthesilea* im Kontext..." 158). Ingrid Stipa clarifies the state's reactive origins, as it "...was born of sexual violence, murder and self-mutilation,

and its members continue to maintain their independence through aggressive acts differing only in degree from those of which their ancestors had been the victims" (33). While accepting the victimization of the women as the motivation for statehood, Gallas questions those interpretations which critique the ritual amputation as inhuman and allege that: "Die fehlende Brust der Penthesilea als Zeichen der Verstümmelung des weiblichen Geschlechts weise auf die totale oder wenigstens partielle Unmenschlichkeit des Amazonenstaats" ("Antikenrezeption..." 213), while pointing out that the bodily dichotomy between completeness and incompleteness is at issue. Against critics who condemn the Amazonian state's "abnormality", Ruth Angress cites the distorted nature of unisexual groupings: the Greeks may be just as repressed as the Amazons, and the drives governing Penthesilea and Achilles are not necessarily gender-specific, because "weakness is caused by the passions, not by gender" ("Kleist's Nation of Amazons..." 13). For example, Kleist's letter of March 19th, 1799 to Martini outlines his experience of and skepticism towards military logic: "Die größten Wunder militärischer Diziplin ... wurden der Gegenstand meiner herzlichsten Verachtung [...] Ich war oft gezwungen, zu strafen, wo ich gern verziehen hätte, oder verzieh, wo ich hätte strafen sollen; und in beiden Fällen hielt ich mich selbst für strafbar" (479). Any reading of the play taking a skeptical view of the words of the Greeks places Amazon society neither above nor below that of the Greeks, but rather may take into account the repressive nature of both military cultures. The worst example of political/personal moralizing I am aware of is to be found in *Penthesilea. Versuch einer neuen Interpretation*, in which Albert Sieck attempts to consign Penthesilea in the category of evil ("Penthesilea ist von der Dimension des Bösen erfaßt" 428) and concludes with the observation: "Auffallend und überraschend ist die charakterliche Ähnlichkeit mit Hitler" (431).

12. In Kleist's source (*Benjamin Hederichs gründliches mythologisches Lexikon*, 1770) Tanais is a male who views women with contempt. Venus punishes him by causing him to fall in love with his own mother; to avoid succumbing to this impulse, he plunges into the river Amazonius. "Die Verschiebung des Namens Tanais von einem Mann auf eine

Frau" argues Kittler, "beschreibt nur die Bewegung, die der kannabilistische Liebesakt vollzieht: nämlich die restlose Einverleibung des Mannes durch die Frau" (*Geburt* 190). Kittler's discussion of this passage argues that Achilles' death suggests the reincarnation of the spirit of Tanais -- originally a male figure -- which leads to the combination mother-son through the "verschlingende Mutter" (*Geburt* 187-188). His invocation of the mother archetype seems in agreement with V.C. Hubbs' argument that Penthesilea "is an atavistic manifestation of a more primitive stage of man's development" ("Plus and Minus..." 194) and that she represents both negative and positive aspects of the feminine archetype (194).

13. Kleist's cyclical plot structures, immediately apparent in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* and suggested by Adam's dominance of the first three scenes and Eve's prominence in the variant, is found in *Penthesilea*. In addition to the reenactment of the bow ritual, Roland Reuss observes how scenes one, two and three offer respectively an expository epic account, a messenger's report, and a teichoscopic narration. The last three scenes, twenty-two, twenty-three and twenty-four, are in relation to the first three "spiegelsymmetrisch", in their teichoscopy, Meroes' report, and Penthesilea's narration (""Im Geklüfft..." 11). The appearance and disappearance of Achilles' body, whose dominance of the opening scenes is replaced by Penthesilea's predominance in the last scenes, plays out the suicide of Penthesilea, which counterpoints indirect representation/narration, effacing the border between acting and speaking, thereby bringing an end to acting and speaking (Reuss, ""Im Geklüfft..." 11). The threefold account of Achilles' death, a "Ballung von Teichoskope, Botenbericht and Selbstdeutung" (Pickerodt, "Kleist und Penthesilea..." 53) brings the agent closer to her actions.

14. The term "Gewand" serves several functions that alternates the feminine body between sensuality and physicality. Penthesilea, for example, collapses like "ein Gewand, in unserer Hand zusammen" (1390) following her first defeat by Achilles. The reining in of one's clothing is used as an externalized visual symptom of inner discipline: "Und all ihr flatternden Gewänder, schürzt euch," (1653) is one of Penthesilea's commands for

preparing the feast of roses. As fighting soldiers, the Amazons exchange their cloth for iron, and fight "im erzenen Gewand" (2060).

15. The word "Riß", which according to *Grimms Deutsches Wörterbuch* contains the meaning of cutting furrows in a field (Chaouli 139), may encode a reference to Penthesilea's madness. Stipa, citing Foucault on madness, notes that "delirium" also has the same root: "lira" means furrow, while "deliro" means to go out of line, to deviate from the path of reason. The path taken by Penthesilea, her "Riß" that composes her trajectory of pursuit, leads to her slip of the tongue into her "Biß". These terms create the premiss for Penthesilea's conclusion, for she has not changed her course, as suggested by the double meaning of "verrückt": "Ich war nicht so verrückt, als es wohl schien" (2999).

16. See Ventidius' words in *Die Hermannsschlacht*: "Sie [die Bärin] schlägt die Klaun in meine weiche Brust!" (2413).

17. A recent general account of Kleist's involvement in the nationalist cause against Napoleon can be found in Otto Johnston's *Myth of a Nation. Literature and Politics in Prussia under Napoleon* (1989). In his chapter on Kleist, Johnston argues that Fichte and Kleist "not only experienced identical metaphysical conversions during their stay in Königsberg but also expressed the same political viewpoints after the Peace of Tilsit" (31) of July, 1807, to the extent that *Die Hermannsschlacht* and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* "contain striking parallels to Fichte's work" (31). Wolf Kittler's 1987 study, *Die Geburt des Partisanen aus dem Geist der Poesie*, places Kleist's work in the historical-military context of the time: "Die Frage an Kleists Werk ist also nicht, wie die *Hermannsschlacht* als peinlich-agitatorische Propagandaschrift gerechtfertigt werden kann, sondern vielmehr die nach ihrer von ästhetisierenden und moralisierenden Deutungen verschütteten Aktualität" (16). Kittler was also among the first to give Richard Samuel's exhaustive research into the Prussian reformers Freiherr vom Stein and Gneisenau and Kleist's politically engaged literary activities its due. See, for example, Richard Samuel's "Kleists *Hermannsschlacht* und der Freiherr vom Stein" (1961): "Cheruskas Lage in den ersten 3 Akten [spiegelt] genau das Schicksal Preußens im

Sommer 1808 wider. Hermann handelt hier -- allerdings dem Schein nach -- genau wie Friedrich Wilhelm III. in Wirklichkeit nach 1806 handelte" (65).

18. Although Hermann's inhumane actions originate in "moralisch-tragische Notwendigkeit" (Wittkowski, "Terror der Politik..." 98), Kleist chose to designate *Die Hermannsschlacht* "ein Drama". While most critics would agree with Lukács that all Kleist's dramas contain something comical in their structure or plot (qtd. in Angress, "Kleist's Nation of Amazons" 15), there is little or no agreement as to humorous elements in *Die Hermannsschlacht*. Rolf Linn, for example, elucidates the play's hatred of and subsequent expulsion of the alien, a common comic mode (161). On the other hand, Linn supports the contention of an earlier critic John Blankenagel and sees Hermann's attitude towards Thusnelda as playful and indulgent (161), while Miller finds the "nachsommerlichen Eheszenen" an irritation (98) and Gönner labels the wartime marriage idyll a "Kleinbürgergroteske" (72). A separation of more than ten years separates Linn's relatively uncritical view of Hermann in the domestic sphere (his article appeared in 1972) from Miller's or Gönner's critical interrogation of the representation of Thusnelda (from 1984 and 1989 respectively). Linn is nonetheless on target with his understanding of Kleist's plays on words: the "pfiffige" guides mislead the Romans under Varus neither to Pfiffikon nor Iphikon (165), but to nothingness, a depiction of Germanic "Sprachwitz" which could have appealed to an audience of Kleist's time.

19. In the *Zeitschwingen* variants of the last four scenes (published 1818), Kleist alters Marbod's "**halblaut**" comment to Wolf "Die Lektion ist gut" (2620) in the following way: "Beim Styx! Die Lektion ist gut erfunden, / Zum Denken über diesen Gegenstand, / In Deutschland die Gemüter anzuleiten" (**Variant,** 908). At first a private pronouncement addressed to another individual regarding Aristan's learning process, Marbod's words are replaced by Kleist in a globalized context of an event addressed to "Deutschland". Marbod's words move beyond the boundary of the play's immediate historical setting and addresses the contemporary audience.

20. Peymann's 1982 production of a "Psychohistorie der Deutschen", as Zons names this reading (176), has brought to the foreground the play's quality as a work of dramatic art.

The debate, however, on how to evaluate Hermann's actions ethically and politically has never abated. Ruth Angress, for example, writes of "the moral dilemma of total politics" ("Kleist's Treatment..." 19) and that "Hermann is shocking because Kleist chose to present him as an extremist and did not allow audience or reader to confuse him with a conventionally humanitarian freedom fighter" ("Kleist's Treatment..." 17). Wittkowski takes up the general thrust of Angress' argument on the side of the oppressed and then takes on critics such Peter Michelsen and Raimar Zons, who see in the Romans "die Formen klassischer Humanität" (Wittkowski, "Terror der Politik..." 95). In terms of the Romans' character, William Reeve sees how "from the very first scene..., Kleist has gone to great lengths to stress the duplicity and untrustworthiness of the Romans" (*Pursuit of Power* 26). In Wittkowski's view, critics who vilify Hermann's actions overlook the distinction between attackers and defenders ("Terror der Politik..." 96) and ignore the contrast between the brutality of the Roman invaders towards their own soldiers and the Germans and the relations between the German leaders. Secondly, Hermann takes extreme measures out of self-defence ("Terror der Politik..." 95). Finally, Wittkowski dismantles the disfunctional political allegory deployed by many critics. Since Hermann is seen as Hitler, then the Romans are Hitler's victims. However, since the Romans have a closer resemblance to the expansionist forces of Nazism, denouncing Hermann's actions in turn denounces by analogy the "illegal" resistance against National Socialism ("Terror der Politik..." 96). The phrase ""Politik des Terrors" im Dienste von Humanität und Ethik" ("Terror der Politik..." 97) encapsulates the ambiguous nature of Hermann's enterprise of liberation. Where Wittkowski's rehabilitation project runs into trouble, however, is when he projects on Hermann a great deal of psychological prescience and downplays his divided and contradictory nature. Hermann apparently loses the duel with Fust voluntarily ("Terror der Politik..." 99), a conclusion unsupported by the vehemence of their exchange and the fact that Hermann has to be wounded in order to end the combat. In view of Hermann's lesson to Aristan, Wittkowski does not cite Hermann's remarks at all: "Es soll kein deutsches Blut, / An diesem Tag, von deutschen Händen fließen!" (2273-2274) or "Vergebt! Vergeßt! Versöhnt, umarmt und liebt euch!" (2282), both of which preceded Hermann's extra-

judicial execution. Since the execution of a countryman is the first act of the new state, Norbert Miller, for example, sees in Hermann a "Schuldigen, Korrumpierten, ... Machthaber vor einer ungewissen Zukunft" (101).

21. The commentator of the *Klassikerausgabe* hears an echo of Alexander Pope's mock epic (1714): "Der Satire Popes auf die mondäne englische Gesellschaft entspricht bei Kleist die mondäne Rhetorik des Galans Ventidius, der so gestelzt schwärmt, als wäre er -- aus der deutschen Perspektive des späten 18. Jahrhunderts -- ein französischer Höfling" (*KA* II 1123).

22. "Auf kunstvolle Weise", writes Pfeiffer, "hat Kleist Mond und Spiegel mit der grausamen Zerstückelung des Ventidius in Verbindung gebracht" (*Die zerbrochenen Bilder* 148). This thread of imagery is transfered to Varus' encounter with the "Alraune" (V/5), which implicates these preceding scenes through the same imagery in the buildup towards the coming disaster; when the Roman armies in the Teutoberg forest are at the crossroads, Varus asks if she was "Der Schein des Monds, der durch die Stämme fällt?" (1987). That "Sie hat des Lebens Fittich mir / Mit ihrer Zunge scharfem Stahl gelähmt" (1990-1991) demands little explication of its castrative meaning.

23. The placement of this duel ironizes Hermann as a heroic man of action, because it points out to the reader/spectator a number of possibilities: firstly, the only scene in which Hermann engages in combat depicts him fighting an ally, who wounds and defeats him. Hermann is a "Theoretiker der Kriegslist" and not a particularly effective soldier (Zons 188). This duel, with its opponents entering from opposite sides of the stage, has an aspect of the "situation comedy" (Linn 162-163) and shows "gruesome comic potential" (Stephens, *Plays and Stories* 164). Secondly, such a scene deflects attention from the offstage battle, which is neither teichoscopically narrated nor won by Hermann; thirdly, Hermann's characterization as an apparent man of action is undermined by his verbal and oral skills: the execution of captives (Septimus and Aristan are executed on his orders) and acts of revenge (Fust and Thusnelda liquidate Varus and Ventidius respectively) are carried without his physical intervention. Hermann, for example, orders the butchering of Hally and leaves the scene.

24. In his short piece "Berechtigte Berichtigung" Manfred Heidecke takes to task a written response from the director to his review of a 1957 *Hermannsschlacht* performance, which chides him for asserting that some scenes in the drama had been substantially altered for performance. After having received a copy of the stage manuscript, Heidecke notes that he did in fact see this scene during the performance in question, for example, with the alteration that Hally's father Theobald enters the stage and kills Varus.

25. Lawrence Ryan describes Fust and Gueltar's desire for the honour of sucking Hermann's wound as "recht grotesk" (202), thereby ignoring the play's admittedly superficial historical accuracy. Klopstock, who provided his Hermann plays with commentary supported by a misreading of Tacitus, had already depicted this practice among the Germans (*KA* II 1145). Despite its erotic potential, Kleist used the topos of sucking wounds in a non-ironic, albeit pathetic sense in his unpublished introduction to the projected nationalist journal *Germania* (*KA* II 1145), which was composed approximately six months after the completion of *Die Hermannsschlacht*: the figure of Germania will "die Jungfrauen des Landes herbeirufen, wenn der Sieg erfochten ist, daß sie sich nieder beugen, über die, so gesunken sind, und ihnen das Blut aus der Wunde saugen" (376).

26. These dramas are *Hermanns Schlacht* (1768, published 1769; discussed by Hans Peter Herrmann 37-42), *Hermann und die Fürsten* (1784), and *Hermanns Tod* (1787), all of which are discussed in some detail in the second chapter of Bernd Fischer's 1995 monograph.

27. Kittler also may be creating a piece of writing which does not exist: "dem zerstückelten Körper Hallys folgt ein Schreiben Hermanns, in dem er die stumme Empörung des Volkes unter die Zeichen "Freiheit, Vaterland und Rache" stellt" ("Militärisches Kommando..." 64). Firstly, there is no mention of such a text ("Jetzt hab ich nichts mehr / An diesem Ort zu tun!" (1623-24). Secondly, one must take into account the limited political maturity of the "Volk" as it is portrayed. In view of III/2, in which Hermann deliberately and orally multiplies the extent of Roman atrocities, a

written letter would not be required. Hermann recognizes the propagandistic potential for the oral transmission of misinformation through rumour. The fixity of the written word, saved apparently for its effects on princes such as Marbod, Fust and Aristan, would limit the explosive possibility of rumours inflaming the general population. In this case of the body's message, it is the absence of a written text which is significant for the intended adressees within the drama.

28. Ilse Graham juxtaposes Hermann's noumenality (conception and concept as one) with Amphitryon's phenomenality (a reliance on sense data) (*Word into Flesh* 211), for Amphitryon's monologue, in which he envisages his sense organs locked in boxes, finds its objective analogy here (Graham, *Word into Flesh* 211).

Chapter Three

The Hero's Two Bodies: *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*

As argued in the previous chapter, the descending bow of *Penthesilea* accompanies the founding of the Amazonian state, symbolizing the tragedy's circular historical trajectory by falling once again from the hands of the queen. The nationalist underpinnings of *Die Hermannsschlacht* support an anticipatory conclusion of the drama, in that expelling the Roman invaders from the borders of Germania will eventually culminate in the extinction of the Roman empire at the hands of Hermann or his descendants. As with Hermann's act of containment and expulsion, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*'s form of dramatic closure has elements both anticipatory and open: on the one hand, the patriotic war cry anticipates the reinitiation of hostilities. On the other, the symbolic elements of the chain and the wreath -- and the real body of Natalie -- are parodically granted to the prince in a reenactment of the drama's opening scene, in an ambivalent (con)fusion of dream and reality and a possible continuation of the father-son conflict. These two aspects leave the resolution of the play "open", question historical progress, and may invoke instead a cyclical recurrence of the same history. However, an alternate reading would suggest that Homburg, an embodiment of the heart, and the Elector, a representative of the law, mutually transform each other. In this possibility of repetition lies the characterization of Kleist's last drama as a *Schauspiel* rather than as a *Trauerspiel*, the latter form terminating the course of events with the protagonist's death. *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* is not a play of mourning, a melancholy projection of mood, but rather a play of reported and on-stage *looking*, a presentation of spectatorship, which in turn entails interpretation. One conflict of the drama, between surrogate father and son, originates in Homburg's unconscious interpretation of the spectacle staged by Hohenzollern -- the dreaming prince simply misread the play within the play. The opening scene's structural allegory, in which a father-figure absents an object belonging to a sleeping man in a garden and bestows it on a woman, leaves little to the imagination of a spectator well-versed in the story of creation (Bennett 45).

Homburg subsequently suffers a fall from his horse, and receives a wound on his left hand. Yet the same wound occurs to vom Strahl of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*: while helping Kunigunde dismount from her horse, he too suffers a wound on his left hand. These wounds, presumably insignificant, serve no apparent motivational function in either drama, but nonetheless provide numerous possibilities for interpretation.

These two dramatic texts also have in common the genre designation of "Schauspiel", a term that emphasizes the relationship between the gaze of the onlooker and the playful impulse of acting. The first part of this chapter will examine the represented male and female bodies of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and their relationship to gender and power. This prominent concept, entailed by the polysemic character of the word "Gewalt" (violence, control and power), is the intersecting point at which the characters of vom Strahl, Käthchen and Kunigunde collide: the "Wendepunkt" which turns at, and turns around, the "wunde Punkt" of bodily vulnerability. The point of the wound forms the basis of comparison that binds vom Strahl and Homburg together. While *Prinz Friedrich vom Homburg* offers no less than a glorious rewrite of a Brandenburg history that had never existed, it has several elements in common that link it to the "großes historisches Ritterschauspiel" *Käthchen*. While the beginning and ending of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* centers on the title figure's fainting in the first and final acts, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* shares with this drama a similar circularity, in that the title hero collapses in the opening and closing scenes. Will and its subordination appears as a general theme at the conclusion of each drama, although Käthchen's and Homburg's collapse occur in different contexts. Vom Strahl and Homburg are linked by the wounded hand, while Käthchen and Homburg share a prophetic dream and the capacity to faint. Siegfried Streller proposes a link between these two dramas and their representation of individual will and its subjugation:

> Zugleich bezeichnet das *Käthchen von Heilbronn* einen Wendepunkt, denn die "gänzliche Hingebung", Unterordnung -- hier unter die selbstlose Liebe -- wird als Unterordnung der persönlichen Interessen unter die größere Idee des Vaterlandes und

> seiner Befreiung von der Fremdherrschaft in der *Hermannsschlacht* und *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* aufgenommen und weitergeführt" ("Thesen..." 5).

In this sense Klüger also confirms Streller's assumption, by examining in detail the final wedding tableau, verbally and gesturally analogous to *Amphitryon*'s resolution (Reeve, "*Amphitryon* 2" ...): "Nicht von ungefähr ähnelt dieser Auftritt der Hinrichtungsszene im *Prinzen vom Homburg*. Hier wie dort eine Ohnmacht im allgemeinen Freudentaumel" ("Die andere Hündin..." 115).

Vom Strahl's cry at the end of the drama ("Giftmischerin!") predates the fanatic command at the conclusion of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. But these juxtapositions of public triumph, a wedding and a stay of execution, with explosive outbursts of hatred directed at an enemy, characterize the emotional extremes of these dramas. Out of such exercises of power (the Elector's symbolic granting -- freely or under duress -- to Homburg all he desires and vom Strahl marrying the daughter of the Kaiser) springs the utter powerlessness of the plays' protagonists. As with the previous dramatic works, the confrontation between the body of male power and its collisions with the female, is mitigated and mediated by the signs of vulnerability which precede and provoke these collisions. Vom Strahl's and Homburg's bodily vulnerability, as well as the double aspects of these bodies in relation to the figures of Käthchen, Kunigunde and Natalie, will merit closer examination in the following.

Despite these lines of intersection, there is something vaguely incongruous, perhaps aesthetically questionable, in playing off what is generally seen as Kleist's masterpiece against what is often called his worst work. What was Kleist's purpose behind this piece of popular entertainment, which stands out among all his creations as especially difficult to classify or to take seriously? According to Streller, "Nach eigenem Geständnis ist Kleist mit den gehäuft auftretenden Anleihen beim Trivialstück dem Publikumsgeschmack entgegengekommen" ("Thesen..." 6)[1]. Although his writing this "popular" drama to achieve stage success caused numerous critics to downgrade the play to a mere spectacle, it is clear that it exerted a powerful attraction on the audiences of

the nineteenth century, becoming a "Lieblingsstück des 19. Jahrhunderts" (*KA* II 914) and enjoying, for example, a highly publicized Munich performance in September 1997. Despite its durable popularity, Hans Schwerte expresses the opinion of many twentieth century critics, citing it as "[d]ramaturgisch sein schlechtest gebautes Stück" (5).

One aspect of interpreting this work concerns the understanding of Kleist's "Ritterschauspiel" as a parody; Kleist's overtly elaborate use of subtitles indicates to Grolman, for example, "daß dem Dichter [Kleist] die knallprimitive, klirrende und bombastisch-moralisch daherredende Ritterromantik zuwider war, daß er es an der Zeit fand, diese ins Kraut geschossene Mode zu parodieren, damit sie endgültig lächerlich werde" (92)[2]. Grolman's suggestion does have a certain resonance when one takes into account that Kleist's "großes historisches Ritterschauspiel" is in the opinion of many critics (such as Gundolf) neither great nor particularly historical. Secondly, the stilted ecstasy of Ventidius' rhetoric of love (in *Die Hermannsschlacht*) and the bombast of Achilles are presented ironically in the mouths of Theobald and vom Strahl. Thirdly, neither the machinations of Kunigunde, the sadism of vom Strahl, nor the embarassment of the Kaiser shed a positive light on the aristocracy[3]. Perhaps captivated by Käthchen's subservient charm, most audiences failed to notice its potential for subversion, because this drama itself became an object of mockery in the numerous satirical versions[4].

A second issue concerns *Käthchen*'s lack of good taste and sense of proportion: Goethe reportedly consigned it to the flames, with the assertion that no reasonable person could accept such "verfluchte Unnatur" (*LS* 385), an accusation not dissimilar in his rejection of *Penthesilea*, while some of his contemporaries could not accept the suggestion that the unnamed Kaiser would cuckold an armourer and then be publicly embarassed by his fatherhood[5]. *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* also had its friends: E.T.A. Hoffmann, in a passage in letter to Hitzig, named it among the three plays that had the greatest effect on him: "Sie können denken wie mich das Käthchen begeistert hat; nur drei Stücke haben auf mich einen gleichen tiefen Eindruck gemacht -- das Käthchen -- die Andacht z[um] K[reuz] und Romeo und Julie -- sie versetzen mich in eine Art poetischen Somnambulismus in dem ich das Wesen der Romantik in mancherlei

herrlichen leuchtenden Gestaltungen deutlich wahrzunehmen und erkennen glaubte!" (Hoffmann qtd. in Müller 511). The previous citiation is but one example of the many Kleist contemporaries who saw in Kleist the generally admired creater of *Käthchen* (Schwerte 6) and gave him posthumous tribute as the play's author[6]. It is therefore not surprising that, characteristic of almost all Kleist reception, this drama enjoyed such varied critical responses that led to its inclusion or exclusion from the Kleist canon in particular and the broader literary canon in general. Ruth Angress (Klüger), in her 1977 discussion of *Penthesilea*, made perhaps the most perceptive remark on Kleist's use of effects that may also apply to this drama: "Perhaps the time has come when we can appreciate the boldness of a combination of classical and popular/sensational in serious literature rather than deplore it" ("Kleist's Nation of Amazons" 9).

The following analysis does not propose to engage in a canon debate that tends to invoke inevitably historically contigent criteria of literary value; despite its complicity with and critique of aesthetic and social categories, *Käthchen* resists reinvention as a "postmodern" text. Nor will the following restore and rehabilitate *Käthchen* as a "Kunstwerk", or critique it as a "Machwerk". *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* is one of Kleist's most chaotically interesting products, having engendered, for example, a cultural-political debate in the former DDR (cf. Grathoff's "Beerben oder Enterben..." (139) on the problems of a socialist engagement with the play) and exerting a durable fascination for both audience and critics.

How does a critic come to terms with "Streitobjekt" *Käthchen*? An understanding or performance of the drama, and I would have to agree with the points of both Streller and Grolman, should distinguish between the depth and the superficiality of the work; the wonderful should not be taken too seriously, but nor should it be reduced to farce (Streller, "Thesen..." 7). Grolman recognizes the flaws of a simplistic reading of the drama as a "heiteres Stück" and notes the issue of free will and consciousness in the play (93). The mixture of high pathos and low comedy, as well as several instances of psychological cruelty (in response to vom Strahl's interrogation in the *Vehmgericht*, Graf Otto remarks: "Ihr quält das Kind zu sehr" (530) and physical brutality (vom Strahl's

threat of a whipping) illustrate the the drama's shifting tones and erratic character development. Klüger takes note of vom Strahl's "merkwürdige[n] Sadismus..., der allen Kleistschen Machthabern eigentümlich ist" ("Die andere Hündin..." 106). On the other hand, Kunigunde's apparently one-dimensional character may be seen as displaying the psychological flatness of a fairy-tale witch. Yet Kunigunde's mastery of aesthetic effects give her character a complexity which defies simple categorization. Or, for example, in scenes in which the audience expects the hero to intervene, these expectations are not realized; Strahl allows "...dem Käthchen von Heilbronn, ins brennende Schloß zu laufen, während er von außen zuschaut" (Klüger, "Die andere Hündin..." 105). Perhaps one should take delight in the surface structures of the spectacle, in the "Schau-spiel", that term which evokes the activities of looking and playing. This playful aspect of revelation and concealment, as fundamental Kleist's dramatic practice, was recognized by Hermann Pauls:

> Mantel ist beinah alles im Kleistschen Drama. Zum Mantel, dem Drum und Dran gehört die Fehme mit Mummenschanz und heimlichen Schaudern, gehört die Fehde mit Raub, Gewitter und Überfall, gehört das brennende Schloß als ein gewaltiges Schauspiel...(7).

Here Pauls points towards an understanding of the drama that recognizes the deliberate superficiality of scene and plot. By the same token, Kunigunde's outer form represents the externalized, unintegrated body: there is nothing beyond her "Mantel", that is, when her exterior essence is subjected to a critically penetrating gaze (Freiburg's, Käthchen's or vom Strahl's), the result is terror. The clothing of Käthchen, as Pauls suggests (7), may range from the light shirt to vom Strahl's bridal wear, since her corporeal integrity remains constant.

The element of surface and depth at the bodily and material level forms my central conduit of approach to *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*. A drama constructed of such a variety of disparate generic, thematic, and aesthetic fragments has inspired numerous articles on such diverse themes as vom Strahl's development (Weigand), or the nature of psychological (Harlos) or social conflict (Reeve, *Heritage*). These studies invoking

psycho-social aspects tend in some cases to minimize the the physical component of *Käthchen*'s discourse and imagery centered on the body. For example, in using "Über das Marionettentheater" as model, Müller-Seidel suggests that Käthchen is "wirklich als die reinste Verkörperung der Grazie zu betrachten" (*Versehen und Erkennen* 213), despite her gravitational tendency to collapse and the ascription of grace to exclusively male figures in Kleist's dialogue. While recognizing the contributions of the first camp of criticism, which I shall for convenience's sake label the psychological mode, the following investigation of the manifestations of the body owes a great deal to the scholarship of Wolf Kittler (*Geburt;* "Bilderschrift und Blindenschrift"), Ruth Klüger ("Die andere Hündin..."), and Dorothea von Mücke and Chris Cullens, approaches which in general read the play through the prism of bodies, gender, and the discourse and exercise of power.

The three main characters -- vom Strahl, Käthchen and Kunigunde -- represent not only a triangular configuration of intersected desire, but also a constellation of bodies and forces: vom Strahl's armoured self, Käthchen's alleged invulnerability, and Kunigunde's artistry of dissimulation. In Wolf Kittler's view, vom Strahl is the surviving relative of Achilles. Pursued with determination by Käthchen, he uses his physical strength and armour to maintain his physical distance from her. In Käthchen, flawless in soul and body, and in Kunigunde, composed of prostheses and text, Kittler sees opposing aspects embodied in the one figure of Penthesilea. As with *Penthesilea*, this drama begins with the physical effects of a specular exchange, by which Käthchen and vom Strahl see each other for the first time. Similarly, the female perception of the male body enmeshed in shining steel is significant.

The figure of vom Strahl, as the main protagonist in a "Ritterschauspiel", comments ironically on the status of male identity in the drama. In fact, he embodies on the one hand the power of an enclosed and armoured patriarchy, but on the other represents the possibility of vulnerability. Ruth Klüger, who suggests that Strahl "bei aller die Schienen der Rüstung sprengenden Männlichkeit verletzbar, manipulierbar und abhängig ist" ("Die andere Hündin..." 107) touches upon his paradoxically armoured body that conceals his psychological weakness and relativizes his maleness. If, as Klüger

argues, Penthesilea is not entirely female, how are we to understand Käthchen and vom Strahl? After all, Heinrich von Kleist (H.v.K.) and his creation Käthchen von Heilbronn (K.v.H.) mirror each other through their initials (Klüger, "Die andere Hündin..." 107). Käthchen's interventions in the military arena (her arming of vom Strahl, her bringing the letter) and her heroic actions (the rescue of the picture and its sheath from the flames) raise the question as to the extent of Käthchen's male behaviour. For example, this particular confusion of gender typing can be seen in the act of crying: "Im *Käthchen* wird viel, oft ganz grundlos, geweint, vor allem von Männern, obwohl oder weil das Weinen eine weibische Angelegenheit ist" (Klüger, "Die andere Hündin..." 113).

Through the effectiveness of Kunigunde and the weakness of vom Strahl, the play also questions conventional views of male dominance and female subservience. Kittler's point, that vom Strahl almost never appears before Käthchen without armour, may suggest that Weigand has made a virtue of necessity. He states that vom Strahl has pure motives in his refusal to take advantage of Käthchen's pyschologically and socially subservient position: "Andererseits gereicht es dem Grafen zu besonderer Ehre, daß er der Versuchung nicht Raum gibt, die Reize Käthchens bloß als Verführer zu genießen" (328). On the other hand, the physical act of seduction would require vom Strahl to remove his armour: perhaps, rather than overcoming temptation, he is afraid of her. Only in the dream vision does he appear in "leichtes weißes linnenes Zeug" (669) before her. When he eventuallly wakes up and desires a real woman capable of loving/healing him, he demands his weapons.

Graf vom Strahl's body is encased in iron and is represented by numerous references to his armoured breast. The occasion for his first encounter with Käthchen is his visit to Theobald in order to repair his armour. According to Theobald's testimony of their initial dialogue cited below, the emotional exertion of vom Strahl (named as "der Erzgepanzerte" (144)), provoked by his eagerness to engage the Pfalzgraf in combat, produces the following result:

> ... die Lust, ihn [den Pfalzgrafen] zu treffen, sprengt mir [vom Strahl] die Schienen; nimm Eisen und Draht, ohne daß ich mich zu entkleiden brauche, und heft sie mir wieder zusammen. Herr!

sag ich [Theobald]: wenn Euch die Brust so die Rüstung zerschmeißt, so läßt der Pfalzgraf unsere Wälle ganz.

(149 - 154)

This passage highlights two images: wholeness and fragmentation, the integrity of the walls (the sphere of the loyal subject) and the intactness of his armour (the casing of the subject). Vom Strahl's emotional state, though described through metaphor, burst the restrictions of his armour, prevoiusly a sign of male self-enclosure and invulnerability. Julie Prandi suggests that Kleist meant to illustrate that Strahl was "deficient (i.e. in need of healing)" and "wounded in the heart" (38), a wound similar to Penthesilea's in that it is struck only after his meeting with Käthchen. This weakness, however, is only apparent, as demonstrated by Theobald's remark on vom Strahl's vitality. Once the armour has been repaired, he says: "...die Schiene ist eingerenkt, das Herz wird sie Euch [vom Strahl] nicht mehr zersprengen" (181-183). Should vom Strahl burst the boundaries of his militarized family history, so too could his heart break out of its armoured confines. In the *Phöbus* variant of lines 702-703 of this soliloquy (892), Strahl enunciates how he perceives his body of the fusion between organic and inorganic elements, pressed to the earth by gravity's pull, only to find himself dematerialized into song:

Wars nicht, als sie sich da, in ihrer lieblichen Unschuld, vor mir entfaltete, als ob ich, diese Verbindung von Eisen und Fleisch und Blut, die gegen die Erde drückt, gänzlich zu Gesang verwandelt worden wäre.

(**Variant**, 892)

Vom Strahl enunciates the impetus of anti-gravity, by which the eternally feminine elevates the male, or perhaps activates his sensuality through the erotic "unfolding" of Käthchen's innocence, translated as a blossoming flower (891). For vom Strahl, his fleshly body is inseparably connected to his second body, his suit of armour, while Käthchen's body is naturalized. Yet it is the power of her body which renders him weightless, elevating him. Käthchen explicitly associates the inside with the outside, juxtaposing the noble sheen of metal with the dullness of cloth, by describing vom Strahl's moral and physical build in these terms: "Rein, wie sein Harnisch ist sein Herz,

und eures / Verglichen ihm, und mein, wie eure Mäntel!" (398-399).

Yet the cohesive membrane protecting vom Strahl's self is not seamless. The chink in vom Strahl's armour becomes more apparent as a foreshadowing symbol when Käthchen testifies that he took her by the hand for the first time when vom Strahl visited her father Theobald's shop. Vom Strahl's susceptibility to her does not necessarily come into effect, as some critics may contend, following his confrontation with her in the "Vehmgericht" scene, but rather is demonstrated by the loose piece of armour that fails to cover his heart. Käthchen's height, after all, does reach to his "Brusthöhle" (185) (Harlos 102).

The argument for an earlier attraction between these two characters, based on vom Strahl's physical vulnerability and electromagnetic properties, can be supported by Herminio Schmidt's scientific understanding of the event in Theobald's smithy: the dynamics of attraction between von Strahl and Käthchen may depend on the forces of electricity (cf. Schmidt, *Elektrizität* 26-27). I would suggest that their attraction has a **super**natural quality. Vom Strahl and Käthchen's desire has an emotional basis metaphorized by Schmidt's account in terms of electrical impulses, by my account in terms of the emotional electricity that finds its conduit through the chink in vom Strahl's armour to his exposed chest. While Penthesilea, paralyzed by her gaze hitting and reflecting off Achilles' armour, and in turn inscribes her desire on his exposed arm, vom Strahl's inner wound positions him alongside Penthesilea. It is his temporarily exposed body that comes under attack by Amor's arrows, yet it is Käthchen who collapses at his sight and during the tribunal scene.

Vom Strahl's mournful complaint at the beginning of the second act, following the "Vehmgericht" scene, has received a great deal of critical attention. It illustrates the healing power of language, in that vom Strahl, evoking Penthesilea's ultimate bodily sovereignty, literally talks himself out of his emotionally damaged state. This collapse manifests itself through the physical act of falling down -- which gesturally parallels Käthchen fall when she sees him for the first time -- after which vom Strahl regains his balance once again. In this particular passage from the *Phöbus* fragment, excised from the published version of the play, Strahl reiterates an eroticized traditional woman-as-

flower metaphor and subsequently connects this image to a sensual, albeit transitory, experience:

> Du kleine Veilchen, das an der bemoosten Felswand, im Schatten wildrankender Brombeergebüsche, blühte, und bestimmt schien, mir, wenn ich dich jemals erblickte, einen Geruch zuzusenden, und dann vergessen zu werden: was hast du meiner Brust angetan?
>
> (**Variant**, 891)

In a sensual combination of sight and smell, the radiating male gaze elicits the female fragrance: Käthchen, as Kittler would say, speaks with her body, through a tactile discourse or "Körperschrift". The scent, at once material (perceivable by the senses) and immaterial (then forgotten), penetrates to his inner being in the same way that Achilles was to incorporate Penthesilea's features ("Fändst du mein Bild in dir wohl wieder aus?" (*Penthesilea* 1821)). The traces of the transitory remain internalized or inscribed on the body of the male percipient. In turn, the Kaiser reverses the direction of this "Strahl" to emphasize vom Strahl's aggressive act of penetrating Käthchen's heart: he states accusingly to vom Strahl that he has "In einer Törin Brust eingeschlagen" (2286).

In the context of the above discussion of embodied experience, elements of armourial and amorous imagery in this soliloquy take on greater symbolic significance: vom Strahl figuratively interrogates his "...geharnischten Väter, die [s]einen Rüstsaal bevölkern" (721) who would reject her, and suggests that had his ancestor Winfried "...sie an die stählerne Brust gedrückt" (733), she would prove herself acceptable. Those critics nonplussed by Penthesilea's iron embrace would also be uncomfortable with this formulation. These three terms -- "geharnischten", "Rüstsaal", and "stählerne" -- point out the figurative relationship between male patterns of inheritance and male (in)vulnerability, for vom Strahl, despite his literal and psychological attempt at self-armament, admits his need to protect himself from inner and outer wounding: "Ich weiß, daß ich mich fassen und diese Wunde vernarben werde: denn welche Wunde vernarbte nicht der Mensch?" (735-737). Despite the repairs to the outer armour of his second body, his inner wound remains. Vom Strahl's wound is the wound of Amor/Cupid, the blindfolded god, (Käthchen and vom Strahl, for example, were blindfolded after and

presumably before the "Vehmgericht" scene), whose victims have interpenetrated each other's vulnerable points of being. Käthchen's naked and beautiful soul (707) has entered vom Strahl through his missing piece of armour.

In Brigitte's narration of vom Strahl's illness preceding the dream, vom Strahl's submerged desire for self-protection against a predatory woman finds expression. The term "predatory" is deliberate, for throughout the drama vom Strahl alternates between extreme solicitude and extreme hostility to both his pursuers Käthchen and Kunigunde. He decides that he must see the unknown girl, as long as he is fully armed: "Den Helm! Den Harnisch! Das Schwert!" (1183-84). Reeve suggests that vom Strahl wishes to confront his dream vision equipped with the "tools of his profession" and "the support of his heritage" (*Heritage* 52) and Prandi suggests that he "puts on his fighting suit just for her" (39). Although Strahl's behaviour may be based on the tradition of the *Minnekrieg* -- which intersperses combat and seduction -- I would prefer to suggest that Strahl's armour exists to protect him from female pursuers. In contrast to the apparent ease with which Strahl disposes of his male enemies, Käthchen, as argued above, has penetrated to the core of his being and brought him down by sight, while Kunigunde, as argued below, manages unlike any of his male enemies to wound Strahl on the hand with both her words and her second armoured body.

Vom Strahl, however, in a moment of physical vulnerability during his psychosomatic dream, has lost his emotional center: "Es war so still darin [in seiner Brust], wie in einer leeren Kammer" (1191-92). The effect of his malaise brings about the clinical death of the sensual body and a subsequent regime of increasingly tortuous stimuli:

> Eine Feder ward ihm vorgehalten, seinen Atem zu prüfen; sie rührte sich nicht. Der Arzt meinte in der Tat, sein Geist habe ihn verlassen; rief ihm ängstlich seinen Namen ins Ohr; reizt' ihn, um ihn zu erwecken, mit Gerüchen; reizt' ihn mit Stiften und Nadeln, riß ihm ein Haar aus, daß sich das Blut zeigte; vergebens: er bewegte kein Glied und lag, wie tot.
>
> (1192-1199)

From testing his breath, the doctor engages in ever more drastic stimulation of the senses, from hearing, to smell, and finally to touch. This metaphorical death directly parallels and inverts vom Strahl's previously cited reanimation of II/1's variant, through sight, smell and touch (**Variant**, 891). Appearing to him as a visual image, Käthchen awakens him from his death-like state and brings about his recovery after her "Erscheinung" retreats. The recuperative powers of the word (seen in his recovery of II/1) and the **Bild** have a material impact on the body's wellbeing, even when vom Strahl's body is divided by his out-of-body experience. In contrast to these predestined lovers, who already possess or at least develop the embodied metaphor of the heart as a center of feeling, Freiburg's emotional sense of balance is dessicated, and his revenge against Kunigunde's rejection will be honey "für diese vom Durst der Rache zu Holz vertrocknete Brust" (916-17).

Vom Strahl is not the only vulnerable male figure of the play. Male armament, for example, protects neither Freiburg nor Theobald. During Kunigunde's rescue from a vengeful ex-suitor, the Burggraf's attempts to conceal his identity and protect his name by pulling down his visor are unsuccessful. Vom Strahl pulls off his helmet, "**haut ihn nieder**" and wounds his head to such a degree that the flowing blood fills his mouth and silences him: "Blut füllt, vom Scheitel quellend, ihm den Mund" (1096), while the variant fills this silence with a comic exchange[7]. Among all of Kleist's dramas, only *Die Familie Schroffenstein* contains a similar case of wounding in individual combat which brings about the silence of its victim: Jeronimous, deceived by Johann's suicidal gesture with the dagger at Agnes, wounds him seriously enough to render him unconcious and throw him into a feverish state, thus spreading further suspicion among the rival families. Freiburg, for example, is now incapable of informing vom Strahl as to Kunigunde's true nature in the final version. Kleist also retained the combat scene between vom Strahl and Theobald before the Kaiser, a scene which had been cut at the play's premier and seems to parody the high seriousness of Kleist's story *Der Zweikampf*. Vom Strahl und Theobald appear respectively "**im leichten Helm und Harnisch**" and "**von Kopf zu Fuß in voller Rüstung**". Following a bombastic and faintly comical rhetorical exchange,

during which vom Strahl claims he would split his opponent's head like a Swiss cheese (2315), while Theobald would bisect vom Strahl like a poisonous mushroom (2379), vom Strahl disarms himself by removing his helmet and demands that the world acts as his witness to the truth of his allegations (2387-88). In a gesture contrasting with Freiburg's refusal to lift his visor, vom Strahl insists on keeping his helmet off despite Theobald's demands that he arm himself. He forces Theobald to the ground, takes away his sword, and "**tritt über ihn und setzt ihm den Fuß auf die Brust**" (2390ff). He also completely disempowers Theobald as a man and as a father, and at the same time gesturally implicates the Kaiser and his potency as a procreator of Käthchen, in that "**er wirft das Schwert vor des Kaisers Thron**" (2392), a throwing down of the gauntlet and a transfer of paternal authority from Theobald to the Kaiser.

In relation to the question of armour, the constant exchange and discarding of weapons act as barometers to trace the fluctuation in gender roles. Käthchen, for example, arms vom Strahl by giving him his sword, shield and lance (III/9) and then receives two of these very weapons back from him moments later (III/11), while in his final rescue attempt with the ladder he is, in a manner of speaking, fully disarmed ("[er] **wirft sein Schwert weg**"). Vom Strahl's question as to why Gottschalk had not sent the boy indicates on the one hand his surprise at her presence, but on the other his surprise that not the boy servant, but rather a girl, had appeared with the weapons. Käthchen's interception of the letter, announcing the attack on Schloß Thurneck, allows her to arm him again, because through her warning she wishes to report the upcoming attack to everyone in order to drive them into their armour ("in die Harnische zu jagen" (1688)). Käthchen, as an assistant in his father's armourer's business and a messenger and adjutant of ambiguous gender for vom Strahl's campaigns, plays servant to a male military order.

While vom Strahl appears at no point in the drama without his armour, Käthchen's bodily presence is consistently mediated by degrees and kinds of dress. Her near nakedness in several scenes (for example, in the dream and during the elderberry scene) contrasts with the male practice of concealment, particularly emphasized by the "Vermummten" of the Vehmgericht, or the later disguise of the Kaiser and Theobald,

who conceal their identities under cloaks. Käthchen's conception cannot occur without disguise: the Kaiser impregnated Gertrude while in disguise in Jupiter-like fashion (Reeve, "*Amphitryon* 2" 285). Kunigunde, as the most developed participant in the male practice of disguise, will come under a separate discussion.

In view of the neck motif, Reeve notes how the third act, sixth scene, has a number of gestural components that center upon the scarf (Reeve, *Heritage* 138-140). Here vom Strahl wants to dress Käthchen, in contrast to Freiburg's projected revenge on Kunigunde: "Du nimmst dir gleich ein Tuch um, Katharina, / Und trinkst nicht eher, bis du dich abgekühlt" (1739-40), and symbolically exchanges with her his sash in return for the "Cuvert" containing the incriminating letter. He puts the whip away, disarming himself, throws the apron on the table and puts on his gloves, throws the whip out of the window, and then strokes her cheek, a final, sublimated act of whipping: vom Strahl does not remove his gloves. He then weeps. Strahl's throwing the whip out the window represents, as with the voluntary disarmament of Achilles, an acknowledgement of the temporary ascendancy of the woman opposite. She in turn tries to kiss his hand -- which is apparently still gloved -- and he turns away from her, wishing her a threefold good-bye. His renunciation of the symbol and instrument of domination through self-disarmament does not fully allow Käthchen to dominate him emotionally, as Penthesilea overcomes Achilles physically. Instead of bloodshed, his gesture of "Entrüstung" results in tears.

Käthchen returns to the scene of the blaze and recovers the document container with the important papers; she continues to follow vom Strahl further in the counterattack. In IV/1, when Strahl wants his lance again, Käthchen prevents Gottschalk, through her hesitation in undressing before fording the stream, from providing him with the weapon. This vulnerability, as exemplified in the elderberry scene ("Holunderbusch-szene"), manifests through her dreaming-waking state and the fact that she is far from fully dressed; as the stage directions, including a sugesstive "**usw.**", tell us: "**An den Zweigen sieht man ein Hemdchen und ein Paar Strümpfe usw. zum Trocknen aufgehängt**" (2018ff). Once again, although he "**legt seine beiden Arme sanft um ihren Leib**" (2053ff), he remains in armour, which rattles (2071ff). When he becomes aware

of the double dream's significance, he then pulls away her scarf (2135ff) in order to see the prophesied birthmark that identifies her as the daughter of the Kaiser. When Käthchen awakes from her somnambulistic state, she realizes her vulnerability, and "**setzt sich den Hut auf, und rückt sich das Tuch zurecht**" (2152ff). That vom Strahl is concerned about the propriety of being found alone with a half-undressed woman is exemplified in his demand that she adjust her scarf when Gottschalk calls out to her before entering the scene (Reeve, *Heritage* 81). However, the scarf no longer has a psychologically significant function as an indicator of modesty, but is now a semiotic barometer that measures the physical and emotional proximity of Strahl and Käthchen, much in the same way that Natalie's glove performs a mediating function between her and Homburg. For example, following his decision to take her into his castle (IV/3), Strahl "**nimmt ein Tuch vom Boden auf, und übergibt es ihr**" (2177ff), in contrast to his throwing his sash in the table (III/6). The "Tuch" also functions further as a pretext to bring Käthchen and Kunigunde alone together in the grotto, because Elenore "wollte [sich] ein Tuch von der Gräfin zum Trocknen holen" (2205-06) and lets her enter the grotto alone before Kunigunde.

Even in the bizarre ritual surrounding the wedding, through which Käthchen acts as a tool in the plot to humiliate Kunigunde, vom Strahl uses clothing as a vehicle for his revenge: "Du sollst, aus Lieb zu deinem Herrn, für morgen / Die Kleidung, die dich deckt, beiseite legen, / Und in ein reiches Schmuckgewand dich werfen... (2632-35). Kunigunde would also like to dress Käthchen metaphorically, but for an entirely different occasion: "Ich muß sie doch im Leichenkleid, noch sehen" (2499). Death, marriage or the convent are the three paths open to Käthchen; marriage is the option chosen for her by her "fathers" Theobald, the Kaiser and vom Strahl. The spectacle concludes with an attempt at costume-induced (en)closure. As compensation for her suffering, vom Strahl proposes to dress Käthchen's figural and literal wounds with clothing. Her now-flawed body, which had been once unmarked and unclothed, has now been socialized and brought into the symbolic order of clothing as representation:

> O Mädchen, wenn die Sonne wieder scheint,
> Will ich den Fuß in Gold und Seide legen,

Der einst auf meiner Spur wund gelaufen,
Ein Baldachin soll diese Scheitel schirmen,
Die einst der Mittag hinter mir versengt.
(2606-2610)

If vom Strahl can envelope Kätchchen literally from head ("diese Scheitel") to toe ("den Fuß"), then he can conceal and protect her traumatized body, much in the same way that Kunigunde was twice wrapped in either a "Mantel" (by Freiburg) or "Schleier" (by herself) as respective acts of imposed or deliberate concealment. Vom Strahl's protective and paternal enclosure of his child-bride comes before her prostration before the men of the wedding. Kunigunde and Käthchen initially oppose each other on the basis of clothing and concealment: "Käthchens Ziel -- obwohl unbewußt -- ist es, sich zu offenbaren, d.h. zu enthüllen; das der Kunigunde, sich zu verschleiern" (Borchardt 69). The extent to which Käthchen is dressed by vom Strahl is inversely proportional to the peeling away of Kunigunde's layers of deception. While at the beginning Käthchen appears in the dream almost naked, Kunigunde is seen naked near the end of the play by Käthchen, or by vom Strahl without her beauty aids. This process of revelation culminates in the bathing scene, whose horror may originate in Käthchen's recognition of her own flawed body mirrored by that of Kunigunde's. That Käthchen and Kunigunde, both of textually documented noble descent and whose damaged and potentially aging bodies are both dressed in bridal wear, closely resemble each other at the drama's climax is recognized by only a few critics. Since rehabilitating Kunigunde would appear dramatically implausible, it seems that Käthchen's superficial resemblance to Kunigunde renders the ending ambivalent, especially in view of her collapse. However, the restoration of her true name and rightful identity implies an appropriately noble garment as natural and suitable as her natural body was to her previous identity.

For Streller, one of the fairy-tale elements in the drama is Käthchen's almost superhuman "Unverletzbarkeit" ("Thesen..." 6). In the subsequent interrogation of Käthchen, Graf Otto asks her why she follows vom Strahl immediately following her recovery, "...da kaum dein Bein vernarbt," (439). Although she bears the scars of her fall, Käthchen, unlike the stigmatized Adam (with his injured leg, which he is bandaging,

and his battered skull) and the broken jug (irrevocably shattered by its second fall), continues unwaveringly on her quest unaffected by her injuries. Käthchen must be rendered as a human being capable of suffering so that the audience may pity her; as a heroine, she must exhibit strength of body and character, so that the audience may also admire her. She is at once vulnerable and indestructible. Käthchen's alleged invulnerability is on the one hand not borne out by her collapses and injuries, yet on the other, some critics project a level of violence onto the text which is not justified by a close reading. Kittler, who reads traces of vom Strahl's ill treatment into the text, adds to vom Strahl's cruelty a physical dimension: although not noted in any stage directions or dialogue -- Käthchen asks "Peitsch mich nur nicht, bis ich mit Gottschalk sprach. --" (1671) and converses with Gottschalk, after which vom Strahl "**legt die Peitsche weg**" (1707ff), Wolf Kittler reads the scene in the following way: the "...Peitschenhiebe können ja nicht ganz spurlos an ihr vorübergehen" (Kittler, *Geburt* 192). Had vom Strahl whipped Käthchen, such trauma would be visible. What is important is that he does not, and that their bodies do not make unmediated contact. Regardless of how ethically or textually justified a critique of vom Strahl may seem, Käthchen's bodily injuries (her broken legs, her wounded feet, her sunbeaten head) originate in her actions, and Kunigunde remains the only person who attacks her physically (1910ff): "**indem sie ihr** [Käthchen] **einen Streich auf die Backen gibt**" after she salvages the portrait instead of the case. The intermediary function of the material world which governs bodily contact is apparent: the iron sheathing vom Strahl's skin, the scarf and whip which juxtapose modesty and dominance, his weaponry, and the papers and documents which are surrogates for bodily authenticity.

It is characteristic of some critical approaches to *Käthchen von Heilbronn*, including Gert Ueding's, to read the conclusion of the drama as entirely positive, while ignoring its background of outright physical and psychological violence. For example: "...ihr [Kunigunde] gegenüber treten die unverletzten, zum Zielbild ihrer selbst gelangten Traumfiguren: Käthchen und der mit ihrer Hilfe zu seiner eigenen Bedeutung zurückgekehrte Graf Wetter vom Strahl" (Ueding 181). Both Käthchen and vom Strahl have been psychologically and physically wounded at this point, and Käthchen sinks to

the ground and lies prostrate at the feet of vom Strahl. In Gerhard Kluge's view, Käthchen's cry for help is against vom Strahl's act of objectification; the wedding is a symbolic killing of her, in that he indirectly does to Käthchen what Kunigunde fails to do ("Die verdinglichte Schönheit..." 28).

In addition to their fire/water association and opposition[8], Käthchen and Kunigunde oppose each other in their rivalry for vom Strahl, the dramatic suspense centering on his recognition of the proper female "nature", a nature which Achilles ultimately fails to understand. In his famous algebraic formulation expressed to his correspondent Marie von Kleist, Kleist saw Käthchen ("Hingebung") and Penthesilea ("Handeln") as plus and minus symbols of a human equation (797), which Kittler characterizes as "die totale Liebe und ihre Kehrseite: den totalen Krieg" (*Geburt* 204). Despite this comparison between Penthesilea and Käthchen, which many critics use as a cue to treat the plays as companion pieces, the motif of the body double, as it occurs between Käthchen and Kunigunde, her "opposite within the play itself" (Cullen and von Mücke 484), is contained already within the character constellation of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* and will be central to the following analysis. Wolf Kittler asserts that: "Wie nahe sich die beiden Frauen [Kunigunde and Käthchen] stehen, zeigt nicht nur das Faktum, daß die Resultate von all den Verletzungen, die das Käthchen im Verlauf des Stückes erleidet, am Körper ihrer Gegenspielerin in Erscheinung treten" (*Geburt* 196). Kittler correctly points out the plus-minus character of the Kunigunde-Käthchen relationship, but fails to specify the nature of these injuries, or how precisely these injuries appear on the body of Kunigunde. Kunigunde represents a pastiche of the international style (the products creating her beauty coming from Munich, Sweden, Hungary, and France), a degraded machine and machinator of a fragmented aristocracy. Streller suggests that Kunigunde represents "alle Negativseiten einer Anpassung an die Feudalgesellschaft" ("Thesen..." 6)[9] and an allegory of civilization (*Das dramatische Werk* 134).

Reeve and Streller, using a fairytale model, have convincingly juxtaposed Käthchen and Kunigunde respectively as the true and false princess brides (*Heritage* 23;

"Thesen..." 6), while other critics may emphasize other apsects of their oppositional status[10]. Kunigunde is, in a manner of speaking, a thoroughly "modern" woman, appropriating whatever visual and textual means necessary to achieve her effects. While Käthchen's inner authenticity is confirmed by her unconscious actions, her physical attributes connect her moral perfection to her physical beauty. Kunigunde's colonized construction underpins her denatured beauty and bring her into the configuration of the Empress Livia of the *Hermannschlacht*, who would use the hair and teeth of German women as ornamentation (Kennedy 24). Much in the same way, Thusnelda is impressed by Roman fashions, and is in Kleist's words reported by Bülow, "...brav, aber ein wenig einfältig und eitel, wie heute die Mädchen sind, denen die Franzosen imponieren" (943-944).

Our first notion of Kunigunde's bodily construction comes through the words of one of her ex-suitors. Freiburg defines her as a

> "...mosaische Arbeit, aus allen drei Reichen der Natur zusammengesetzt. Ihre Zähne gehören einem Mädchen aus München, ihre Haare sind aus Frankreich verschrieben, ihrer Wangen Gesundheit kommt aus den Bergwerken in Ungarn, und den Wuchs, den ihr an ihr bewundert, hat einem Hemde zu danken, das ihr der Schmidt, aus schwedischem Eisen, verfertigt hat. -"
>
> (2500-2507)

Peter Dettmering finds it notable "daß sie [Kunigunde] ihren Reiz so weitgehend der Kunst männlicher Handwerker verdankt" (39). As with the exchange between Adam, Licht and Walter's servant, the doctor for the hand is mistaken for the "Schmidt" for the wagon's shaft; hence Kunigunde's body is fitted with the non-living metal by a craftsman. The origin of her parts supports the notion of Kunigunde literally as a male construct. According to Freiburg, vom Strahl should visit her by surprise, "wenn ihre Reize auf den Stühlen liegen" (2458-59) and view for himself how her self is separated from her appearance, and how such components are alienable from her body. Kunigunde's iron carapace makes her more the equal of vom Strahl, because, with the

notable exception of the bathing scene, she only confronts Käthchen when likewise armoured. She allows no weakness, after her kidnapping by Freiburg, for although she is "von Kopf zu Fuß in einem Mantel eingewickelt" (852-53) she still retains her iron corset. Freiburg's projected revenge would consist of publicly removing her scarf: "Ich bringe sie nach der Steinburg zum Rheingrafen zurück, wo ich nichts tun will, als ihr das Halstuch abnehmen: das soll meine ganze Rache sein!" (937-39). Once he has seen the nothingness behind Kunigunde's face/facade, there is nothing for Freiburg beyond the truth of the body: "Der Mensch ist, nach Platon, ein zweibeinigtes, ungefiedertes Tier" (948-49).

In one sense, Kunigunde plays Käthchen's double through her very opposition. Her second body (her wig, teeth, corset, and false teeth, as well as her makeup and clothes) reduplicates this doubleness, by doubling Käthchen's double. Vom Strahl's words, after seeing the true and false Kunigunde, voice this concept most succinctly: "Was! Sind die Hexen doppelt?" (2486). The motif of doubling is an obvious part of the "Doppeltraum", which in turn allows vom Strahl to double himself in body and spirit: "Nun steht mir bei, ihr Götter: ich bin doppelt! / Ein Geist bin ich und wandle in der Nacht!" (2144-45). The substantiality of Käthchen's body bound by gravity is codified by her falls and association with the stone, while Kunigunde is linked to the weightlessness and insubstantiality of the "Feder" (feather and pen), which locates itself at the other end of the spectrum of mobility. Between the extremes of Kunigunde's inanimate second body and Käthchen's vitality resides the incomplete and distorted nakedness of Kunigunde's body.

Kunigunde's synthetic combination of metal, flesh and humanoid prostheses aligns her with vom Strahl's self-description in the variant of the first scene of the second act: "...diese Verbindung von Eisen und Fleisch und Blut" (**Variant**, 892). Aside from their reliance on textual evidence for symbolic exchanges of words and (property) deeds, Kunigunde and vom Strahl encase their bodies in protective armour. When Kunigunde assembles the material at her disposal appropriately and effectively, she achieves the desired effect on her viewer by producing the desired meaning. By instrumentalizing her artifice, Kunigunde gives birth to the power of allegory. The variant of the tenth scene

has a particularly interesting dialogue between Rosalie an Kunigunde, who freely reveals her mastery of effects and delivers a lesson on the "Semiotik der Mode" (*KA* II 965):

> Die Kunst, die du an meinem Putztisch übst,
> Ist mehr, als bloß ein sinnereizendes
> Verbinden von Gestalten und Farben.
> Das unsichtbare Ding, das Seele heißt,
> Möcht ich an allem gern erscheinen machen,
> Dem Toten selbst, das mir verbunden ist.
> Nichts schätz ich so gering an mir, daß es
> Entblößt von jeglicher Bedeutung wäre.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Ein Kleid, das aufgeschürzt ist, oder nicht,
> Sind Züg an mir, die reden, die versammelt
> Das Bild von einem innern Zustand geben.
> Hier diese Feder, sieh, die du mir stolz
> Hast aufgepflanzt, die andern überragend:
> Du wirst nicht leugnen, daß sie etwas sagt.
> Zu meinem Zweck heut beug ich sie danieder:
> Sie sagt nun, dünkt mich, ganz was anderes[11].
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Nun erst, nun drück ich aus, was ich empfinde,
> Und lehr ihn so empfinden, wie er [vom Strahl] soll.
>
> (**Variant**, 901-902)

The above passage is interesting in its calculated sobriety, an element of the dramatic dialogue which is largely absent in the final version. What is also fascinating is the terminology of aesthetics applied to the theater of cosmetics, a "Kunst" which depends on the interplay of form ("Gestalten"), colour ("Farben") and sensual cognition ("sinnereizendes"). Since she creates meaning ("Bedeutung") and effect, and as with the one-to-one relationship between tenor and vehicle in the allegory, she causes her

perceiver to develop his own meaning in accord with the desired effect. She expresses ("drück ... aus") her impressions ("was ich empfinde") and initiates the same series of responses in her male counterpart. According to Allan, Kunigunde understands, by her conscious depiction of the "natural", her society much better than her male admirers (183). Projecting the illusion of inner beauty simply involves a rearrangement of her costume (Allan 185).

In addition to these signifying practices, Kunigunde also enjoys and masters a further mode of representation. What brings her even further from her body is her explicit allegiance to the world of writing. Not only is she the only figure equipped with a "Putztisch", she is also the only one with a "Schreibtisch". Both are sites of semiotic production. Since Kunigunde, associated with the inaminate materials of paper, cloth, chalk, ink, and metal, represents on the one hand the artificial values of the old aristocracy, she may also portray a poetic movement, towards allegory. Ueding points out Kunigunde's poetic function within the drama's constellation, but moves into the realm of Kleist's intentions: "...sie ist eine poetologische Figur, an der Kleist sowohl sein Verfahren wie auch die Zweideutigkeit des Produkts demaskiert" (174). I would go further than this claim and suggest that Kunigunde is a female **bricoleuse**, a poet of assemblage and pastiche. She constellates a series of disparate materials and constructs her own identity of paper and ink. She has, as Cullen and von Mücke remark in their perceptive article, "at her disposal a virtuositic command of pathetic rhetoric ... and she is identified, as is no other character in the play, with the slippery, dangerous, deceptive ambiguity of language" (484)[12]. Dettmering's psychoanalytical approach combines mythology with psychology: "Kunigunde ist die prägenitale, in der Phantasie phallisch erscheinende Mutter-Sphinx, verstellt dem Protagonisten die Realität und hindert ihn ... an der Erkenntnis seiner Selbst und der wahren Natur der Dinge" (41). Not only is the ambiguity of language at her disposal, but it also describes and characterizes the linguistic confusion surrounding her presence. In II/10, which for example depicts documents as bait, she asks:

KUNIGUNDE **gedankenvoll.**

Gib mir doch -

ROSALIE. Was, mein Fräulein? Die Papiere?

KUNIGUNDE **lacht und schlägt sie.**

Schelmin! - Die Hirse will ich, die dort steht.

(1261-1262)

A further example of this form of confusion, as well as a demonstration of Kleist's frequent technique of doubling incidents, can be found in the following scene (III/15), in which Käthchen has just rescued the picture, but not the container, from the flames:

DER GRAF VOM STRAHL.

Nicht? Ists das Bild nicht? Freilich!

DIE TANTEN. Wunderbar!

FLAMMBERG.

Wer gab dir es? Sag an!

KUNIGUNDE **indem sie ihr mit der Rolle einen Streich auf die Backen gibt.**

Die dumme Trine!

Hatt ich nicht gesagt, das Futteral?

(1909-1911)

In each of these scenes Kunigunde strikes another woman -- with varying degrees of seriousness and intent to harm -- who misreads her instructions relating to some form of text or image. Kunigunde is an artist and forger much in the same way that Felix Krull seduces his way through his life by wearing a series of appropriated masks. Vom Strahl's cry of "Giftmischerin" refers literally to Kunigunde's attempt to have her rival poisoned, but may also allude to Kunigunde's application of a mixture of poisonous effects.

Nowhere is the link between Kunigunde's body and her capacity for signification more apparent than in the "Futteral" espisode, which allegorizes and enfolds the bodily constellation of the play. The picture container with Strahl's image is an objective correlative for Kunigunde herself, since she too is packaged and wrapped by an iron breastplate, a veil, or a half-complete "**romantischen Anzug**". That documents are inserted into a "Scheide" (a sheath: another meaning of "Futteral") renders explicit Kunigunde's predatory sexual power, since vom Strahl associates her with the "Scheide".

Cloaked in the written form of his name, Kunigunde has enwrapped and entrapped vom Strahl's portrait in her covering. The portrait is also enclosed with the documents which are of such importance to her claims. Käthchen liberates vom Strahl's **Bild** from Kunigunde's grasp, leaving the documents and their protective case to the flames. Incredibly, it survives the blaze, "als wärs Stein" (1990), only to be brought to vom Strahl by Käthchen. Thus vom Strahl's name, text and image are restored to him in the proper symbolic order of things. The struggle between word and image is played out with Käthchen as intermediary: Käthchen tears the letter out of Prior Hatto's hand in the same way Kunigunde snatches vom Strahl's portrait out of hers (Gerrekens 122; 125).

The written form of vom Strahl's desires connects writing and sexual exchange by way of the same image. Vom Strahl will accept Kunigunde's feudal claims if she accepts his hand in marriage: "da findet sie [Kunigunde] schon auf der Decke liegen; das Dokument, versteht mich, in ein Briefchen des verliebten Grafen eingewickelt" (1574-1577). The document, enveloped and authorized by vom Strahl's letter, is placed onto the bed. Kunigunde, who possesses a key to the drawers of her writing desk, can and will decode this message. The key, significantly attached to the frame of her self-reflecting mirror, illustrates Kunigunde's mastery of language games. Her use of the word is instrumental, a mere means to an end (Gerrekens 118).

Although vom Strahl's treatment of Käthchen as dog and servant has received due critical attention, perhaps one should place some emphasis on the male pattern of Kunigunde's objectification. Many critics readily assume her status as a monstrous being, while failing to note that she is presented in the mouths of her male allies/enemies as a configuration of body parts before the revelations of her duplicity. Indeed, as opposed to the male verbal violence under discussion below, Käthchen is struck dumb by the truth of Kunigunde, and can only speak vaguely of the "Greuel" (2246). With regard to male violence, Cullen and von Mücke cite "the singular violence and ugliness of the response she arouses in the knights" (485). "Gefesselt, geknebelt und verschnürt, verpackt wie eine Ware", writes Gerhard Kluge, "wird sie [Kunigunde] auch behandelt wie eine Sache, wie ein leb- und wesenloses Ding und nicht wie eine Person" ("Die verdinglichte Schönheit" 35).

For example, upon hearing of her attempts to set a feud in motion over land claims, vom Strahl labels her a "rasende Megäre!" ((766), a label applied to Penthesilea by the Greeks (393)), and comments on her "roten Wangen" (785), "weißen Hals" (790) and "kleines verwünschtes Gesicht". He also recognizes the power of her chosen weaponry: "die Waffen ihres kleinen schelmischen Angesichts" (805-806). Vom Strahl also crudely suggests that he will teach her a lesson that she will not forget: "so würd ich ihr einen Possen zu spielen wissen, daß sie es ewig in einer Scheide tragen sollte" (806-07). Weigand cites vom Strahl's "Sittenreinheit" (332) in order to dismantle the rather obvious crudity of this expression, by implying that the adverb "ewig" reduces the image to a "knabenhafter Gewaltsausdruck" (332). I would argue that the "Hyperbolisierung" (Weigand 332), the extremity of language, nonetheless leads to an extremity in bodily harm inflicted upon Kunigunde and Käthchen. Reeve supports Weigand's understanding of the expression, and, by way of Voltaire's *Candide*, points out that the name Kunigunde may punningly refer to the French slang for a vagina (*Heritage* 120). One should acknowledge the "playful parodic potential" (Reeve *Heritage* 122) of such sexually charged names as vom Strahl and Kunigunde and accept the possibility that Kleist could be vulgar. Though hardly as subtle as the other symbolic reductions of women's sex and sexuality, Kunigunde's ascription to the vaginal parallels Thusnelda's definition through her hair, or Eve and Alkmene's object-centered affiliation to the broken pitcher and the inscribed diadem.

The pattern of violence escalates from the verbal to the physical: as Kunigunde's second protector/predator, Freiburg fulfils vom Strahl's verbal aggression by physically kidnapping Kunigunde and then adding to the torrent of verbal abuse: after she collapses, Freiburg allows his followers to hit her, but to avoid her "Scheitel, belegt mit Kreide" (812). When she remains "wie tot" (821) on the ground[13], he claims that she merely does so "...um ihre falschen Zähne nicht zu verlieren" (822): he has already, in a degrading image of rationalized dismemberment, itemized and accounted for her real ones. His encounter with her teeth has left its bitter, emasculating traces.

That Freiburg's verbal and physical cruelty, a mode of behaviour consistently attributed to vom Strahl with regard to Käthchen, continues in this subsequent scene may

give the reader pause. The Rheingraf, her final ally/enemy, expressing his fanatical hatred, denounces her "treulose Brust" (1537) and wishes to install her "Gerippe, als das Monument einer Erzbuhlerin" (1548-49) in the walls of his castle, a male fantasy based only in part on the Eurydice myth: destroy the woman and instrumentalize her as a monumental work of art, or in this case, architecture. This possibility reflects ironically on Käthchen's planned retreat to a convent. Kunigunde, under the male gaze, is nothing more than a compendium of external, visual characteristics progressively escalating in separation into discrete components and complete degradation: face, cheeks, neck, hair, teeth, breast, vagina, carcass. There is surely some irony in the "sudden" recognition that Kunigunde's beauty is of her own and other mens' construction, when she had already existed as an objectified male construct. Although Käthchen in relation to Penthesilea is seen by Klüger as "die andere Hündin", Kunigunde does not escape this label: she communicates when bound and gagged "wie ein kluger Hund" (993), a degrading term that nonetheless illustrates that she does have bark **and** bite. In relationship to the obvious patterns of objectification through description, there exists a grammatical sense of Kunigunde's reduction to an object. In II/13, vom Strahl says to his mother: "So wahr ich ein Mann bin, die begehr ich zur Frau!" (1372). Along with the use of the word "Begehren", there is the repeated use of "die" and "diese" as demonstrative pronouns (1372, 1375: "Doch die nicht? Diese nicht? Die nicht?"), and "sie" as a personal pronoun (1376, 1378, 1379) to refer to Kunigunde. She remains an unnnamed thing: "Laß uns die Sach ein wenig überlegen" (1381).

Those critics conditioned to view Kunigunde as aggressor fail to negotiate the explicit association in the text between power, protection, and property. However, any sympathy for Kunigunde ought to be modulated by the recognition that she is both player and pawn in the social game, a "Täuscherin" and "Tauschobjekt". Kunigunde's reversion to intrigue and documentation evoke a claim to authentic ownership in a patriarchal society; when the male protector fails to produce the goods, she seeks another, using the power of the phallus, embodied by her extra rib (Klüger, "Die andere Hündin..." 110) and her mastery of writing. Indeed, one could argue that a potential of subtext of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* is the attempt to prevent Kunigunde (through feuds and

litigation) and Käthchen (through the Kaiser's denial of his paternity) from acquiring property. Cullen and von Mücke also note how "...Kunigunde represents the woman who understands and exploits the system of exchange for her own benefit" (484). Of course, when Käthchen is recognized as a princess of Swabia, she does get her castle -- which presumably reverts to her husband: when vom Strahl acquires the documents certifying the Kaiser's identity as Käthchen's true father, one such document clearly mentions a "Schloß zu Schwabach" (2252)

In this play, one of the only bases of exchange open to women is through the granting of bodily favours -- in Kunigunde's case, the additional transmission of a sexual disease through sex -- and in Käthchen's case the placing of her body at risk, and eventually at the disposal of vom Strahl as his bride. In fact, Kunigunde, who attempts to retain power and privilege in a male society, clearly represents the paradigm of the victim who becomes victimizer. When vom Strahl takes her into his possession and brings her to Schloß Thurneck, he makes the following remark concerning his wound:

> Wenns Freiburg war, dem ich im Kampf um Euch,
> Dies Blut gezahlt, so kann ich wirklich sagen:
> Schlecht war der Preis, um den er Euch verkauft.
>
> (1290-1293)

The economic imagery ("gezahlt", "der Preis", "verkauft"), which associates blood and money, also connects combat and commerce, with the woman's body as a unit of currency.

In his use of verbal and monetary means of exchange, vom Strahl apparently moves from one system of understanding the world to another, and, according to Pfeffer, "des eigenen Traumes unverstandene prophetische Deutung lesen lernt" (Pfeffer 1924). In other words, the drama not only portrays the triumph of the soul over the intellect (Pfeffer), but a semiotic shift for Strahl, who turns to the symbolic and "reads" the signs. Aside from the play's external trappings of a romanticized middle ages, *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* also represents a cumulative portrait of Romantic language, the higher modes of understanding enunciated by the deployment of dream, the unconscious, and the gesture laden with meaning. I am not fully supporting Weigand's notion of Strahl's

apparent and central development (1967), but I would support Cullen and von Mücke's argument that vom Strahl unlearns his reading skills and returns to a symbolic order of experience: "[vom Strahl] will gradually become educated in that vocabulary of *Bilder* with which the play is constructed, and hence realize that the felicitous logic of the dream or the phantasma takes precedence over the grammatical logic of organized plot and sentence structure" (491). Hence the development of vom Strahl, seen largely as a recognition of Käthchen's true value and the overcoming of class barriers, may additionally be seen as the education of a semiotician, who learns to read the surfaces and signs around him. Strahl, as remarked by Flammberg, would transfix himself into "seine eigne Bildsäule" (2513) not through Kunigunde's Medusa-like gaze, but because he (the perceiving subject) has looked at her. He does in fact stand as if he were struck by lightning: "**wie von Donner gerührt**" at the opening of V/5, a Kleistian metaphor that denotes a moment of recognition (cf. *Homburg*: Homburg "**steht, einen Augenblick, wie vom Blitz getroffen**" (321ff)).

Käthchen, speaking the discourse of the body in the immediacy of speech -- unlike vom Strahl and Kunigunde, she does not actually write letters, but delivers them -- may be seen as the symbol made manifest. As with her allegiance to the **Bild**, Käthchen, as vom Strahl states, cannot know the value of the representational: "Wie konntest du den Wert der Pappe kennen?" (1928). She also cannot read (2540). Käthchen, "makellos [...] an Leib und Seele" (713) is medium and message, form and content.

Although often viewed one-dimensionally by audiences and critics conditioned by the play's fairytale constellation, Kunigunde represents the undecidable cipher for both male and female counterparts, since her visual and rhetorical effects defy unitary readings. She also represents a physical threat. I would therefore agree with Klüger's characterization of Kunigunde as representative of "der männlichen Phobie vor der Spinnenfrau, dem berechnenden kastrierenden Weib, das in der körperlichen Vereinigung dem Mann Wunden schlägt und das sich heimlich das männlich besetzte Metall, Stahl und Eisen, angeeignet hat" ("Die andere Hündin..." 109). If we accept the premiss that Kunigunde (through her name and the "Scheide" imagery in the text) is associated with the vagina, we could also read the scene of vom Strahl's wounding as her manifestation

as the vagina dentata, as "auf [der] Stufe der oral-verschlingenden Mutter" (Dettmering 43). The tenth scene in the second act also supports this reading. In addition to the scene's allusion to entrapment, Kunigunde's extra rib manifests itself not as a writing instrument (symbolized by her attachment to the "Schreibtisch") but rather as a phallus (Klüger, "Die andere Hündin..." 110) in the form of the "Leimrute". On the other hand, this lure, posted at the window of a locked chamber, brings about the emasculation of the prey: "Seht nur dies Federchen. Das ließ er stecken!" (1260). The bird's loss of one of its feathers strikes an obvious parallel to vom Strahl's earlier wound to the hand (Reeve, *Heritage* 54), an injury to which Kunigunde had contributed.

That Kunigunde can inflict harm is seen in the fact that vom Strahl's numerous combats with men leave his body intact. His wound, similar to Homburg's, is sustained on the hand and is directly connected to contact with a woman who threatens established male order. Kittler ignores this incident in outlining his scheme of male wholeness and female fragmentation, which he sees as fundamental to the objectification of the female body: "Umgekehrt fehlt den Frauen, was sie den Männern geben, nämlich das Wissen und der ganze unversehrte Körper" (*Geburt* 195). Kittler correctly points out that vom Strahl, unlike Achilles, faces Käthchen only when armed, and seems subconsciously aware of this danger: when vom Strahl enters Theobald's workshop, he insists that the armourer repair his suit of armour without requiring its temporary removal. However, his wound sustained before approaching Kunigunde's castle has numerous possible implications, revealed in the following exchange concerning the circumstances of this injury. Kunigunde asks vom Strahl:

> Wie stehts mit Eurer linken Hand, Graf Friedrich?
> DER GRAF VOM STRAHL.
> Mit meiner Hand? Mein Fräulein! Diese Frage,
> Ist mir empfindlicher als ihre Wunde!
> Der Sattel wars, sonst nichts, and dem ich mich
> Unachtsam stieß, Euch hier vom Pferde hebend.
> GRÄFIN. Ward sie verwundet? - Davon weiß ich nichts.
> KUNIGUNDE. Es fand sich, als wir dieses Schloß erreichten,

Das ihr, in hellen Tropfen, Blut entfloß.
DER GRAF VOM STRAHL.
Die Hand selbst, seht ihr, hat es schon vergessen.
Wenns Freiburg war, dem ich im Kampf um Euch,
Dies Blut gezahlt, so kann ich wirklich sagen:
Schlecht war der Preis, um den er Euch verkauft.
(1281-1292)

Vom Strahl overstates his modesty, when he claims to feel her concern more than he senses his wound, but also associates the power of speech with the body's sensitivity to stimuli. Indeed, Kunigunde's question, even if such remarks belong to the language of gallantry, wounds him a second time. While Vom Strahl minimizes his injury, purportedly incurred while hefting Kunigunde from her horse, his mother inquires further; at this point Kunigunde brings to her attention the flowing drops of blood, discovered only after reaching the castle. Perhaps this flow of blood may be seen as a portent, a kind of reactivated stigma, which manifests itself in the act of crossing of a threshold, in this case his touching her armoured breastplate with his bare hand. He does stroke Käthchen's cheek while wearing his gauntlets, perhaps having learned his lesson from the mis-take ("Mißgriff") of Kunigunde. Although it seems that vom Strahl protests too much, there is enough textual evidence for Schmidt's proposal that "Strahl sich auch daran [on the breastplate] hätte verwunden können" (Schmidt, *Elektrizität* 26), a point supported by Klüger, in that "Es war nicht der Sattel, sondern die Frau selbst, die ihn beim Kontakt verwundetete" ("Die andere Hündin..." 109). It is clear that the wound sustained by vom Strahl relates closely to the act of physically touching Kunigunde, but it might directly cause of his injury in a way that he could be aware of, if only for the reason that he should not find out about her iron breastplate so early in the drama. For unlike Achilles, Adam, or Hermann, but similar to Homburg, vom Strahl actually injures himself. Although, as he states, his hand has forgotten the wound, vom Strahl seems to wish upon it a more worthy origin. What is interesting in this particular context is that vom Strahl wore his gloves in the castle when receiving Käthchen, and shed tears after discarding the whip; when acting as host to Kunigunde, he sustains a wound on the hand,

and sheds not tears, but blood. Vom Strahl's bodily emissions (light, blood, and tears) are specifically related to confrontations with certain characters.

In his materialist understanding of Kleistian gender relations, Kittler presents some convincing arguments on male power within the military context. When he asserts the following, however, he leaves his point open to an ambiguous reading: "Aus dem verstümmelten und geknechteten Körper der Frauen geht triumphal ein ganzer Mann, nämlich ein Held hervor" (197). Neither vom Strahl and Freiburg, nor Achilles, remains "ganz" after an indirect or direct encounter with Kunigunde and Penthesilea respectively. A second reservation concerning this reading comes to light: Klüger points out that the crassest sexual reference of the entire drama, in which Freiburg compares Kunigunde to a diseased hen, indicates that the source of his hatred of her stems from a sexual disease. If we include the variant scene, then Kunigunde's role as **femme fatale** (literally: a fatal woman) becomes explicit. Freiburg, who dies in the variant to II/9, states to Waldstätten: "...ihm [vom Strahl] wäre besser/ Wenn er sich einen Erben will erzielen - [...] In einem Beinhaus freit' er eine Braut". This passage in the variant, in combination with the hen image ("vom Aussatz zerfressen" from behind (934)), suggests that Freiburg expected to suffer through his sexual contact with Kunigunde; nor does his defeat at the hands of vom Strahl, who severely wounds him, classify him as a "Held". Even if Kittler's statement applies only to vom Strahl, my adjustment of his main point does not intend to lessen the impact and value of his ideas regarding the exploitation and instrumentalization of the female body: that the name Kunigunde, a crude sexual pun given to a woman of not one but of many parts, objectifies her as a body part has been noted by Reeve (*Heritage* 120). However, the corollary to the male fantasy of the uninhibited exercise of power (towards Käthchen, for example) is the male fear of the powerful woman who may do him and his property bodily harm (Kunigunde's wounding of Freiburg and vom Strahl, her hitting and then attempting to poison Käthchen). It is also this exercise of female power, coupled with its capacity to wound a male hero, which receives its unique treatment in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*.

With these points of intersection between these "Schauspiele" in mind, to which a powerful father-figure and a prophetic dream could be added, one should take into

account the similar situation of their sonambulistic protagonists. As a "Schauspiel" with comical elements (Frye 230) or a "Parabelstück" (Mayer 70), this play's presentation of the body as metaphor has more in common with *Käthchen von Heilbronn* than with any other play by Kleist. Käthchen and Homburg under the impression of a prophetic dream, and *Homburg*'s feminized title hero shares with Käthchen a "traumwandlerische Wahrheit des Unbewußten" (von Wiese 336). This psychological aspect of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, whose monumentally simple structure concerning loss and restoration has, as with *Amphitryon*, generated a tremendously complex body of secondary literature. While the war between family branches (*Die Familie Schroffenstein*), societies and sexes (*Penthesilea* and *Die Hermannsschlacht*) places the body squarely at the center of the gender and military conflict, the individual opponents in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* are affiliated by a family relationship and a shared political cause. The Swedes, as opposed to the Greeks and Amazons, Romans and Germans, are configured as a depersonalized abstract entity, a general enemy collectively and individually absent from the stage. In all his war dramas, the combat scenes between armies and individuals occur on stage or are reported by messenger or teichoscopically narrated. In *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, such events as the dream encounter occur on stage and are subsequently narrated, only to be reenacted in the finale. It is this form of post-event narration that is put into question in this "Schauspiel", for both the Elector and Homburg are simultaneously under the false impression that the other was either dead or incapacitated during the battle. The incidents of significant bodily crisis, Homburg's wounding and Froben's death, are banished to the offstage arena, only to have the bandaged wound and the encased corpse reappear. Enclosed by bandages and the coffin, these bodily trauma are present and absent, visible by virtue of their concealment. Even with regard to a drama enacting the opposition between the emotional categories of reason and feeling, or the materiality of dream and reality, one cannot speak of the effacement of the body. From the very first lines of the stage directions, the body is the site where these oppositions play against each other. Homburg, for example, shares with vom Strahl a similar "Traum" and "Trauma". In terms of the chapter heading on the hero's two

bodies, vom Strahl's and Kunigunde's natural and socialized bodies, as flesh fused to armour, find their counterpart in the natural and political bodies of Homburg and the Elector.

The terms "natural" and "political" body are taken from Ernst Kantorowicz's 1957 work *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, which includes an analysis of Shakespeare's *Richard II* as a tragedy of the King's two bodies. Although his monograph examines the two-bodied king as a legal fiction of the English Tudor period, by which the sovereign assumes an impersonal, invisble and immortal body, while retaining the "body natural" of a man, subject to infimity and old age (Kantorowicz 9), this model provides a useful point of departure for looking at *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. For example, Kantorowicz cites a legal document which makes a number of important distinctions: firstly, the king has a body natural and a body politic, the latter whose members are his subjects. Secondly, the king is incorporated with his subjects, with him as head and sole governor. Thirdly, the death of the king does not occur, but his demise, that is his political body lives on separate from the body natural. The two bodies united in one person separate, and the body politic is then conveyed to another natural body (Kantorowicz 13). What was grounded in the theology of the medieval period finds expression in the political arena of Brandenburg. The Elector, as "one person, two bodies" (Kantorowicz 17), represents this particular twinning of two bodies, as do the "royal duplications" of Richard II (Kantorowicz 26). The problem in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* is more complex. Not only does the Elector have a double body, but also he is confronted by a body double, his subordinate, son and rival Homburg, who attempts to claim the sovereign's prerogative of the body politic. This conflict between the political and natural bodies of Homburg and the Elector, between their ascendancy and descent, pervades the spatial and physical constellation of the drama. This conflict is set in motion by Homburg's out-of-body experience in the first scene.

As with vom Strahl's emotional vulnerability symbolized by his separated piece of armour, Homburg's likewise significant encounter with Natalie occurs under similar

conditions of bodily vulnerability. In this case, however, unlike vom Strahl's dream portending a real encounter, Homburg's confrontation with Natalie is a real meeting occurring under conditions of physical presence and psychological absence, of his dreaming and waking. The theatricality of this opening scene, with its lighting, staging and pantomime, has been noted by many critics. Since this scene returns to complete the circular structure of the drama, it outlines the conflict and represents in condensed form what is to come: a "Probe" in both senses of the German, a test and rehearsal (*KA* II 1250). This scene encapsulates the themes of drama, which interlace and recur in converging fields of association.

Before the characters speak, Kleist visually illustrates Homburg's bodily vulnerability. The audience first views Homburg, weaving a wreath, who "**sitzt mit bloßem Haupt und offner Brust, halb wachend halb schlafend**". Carol Jacobs sees his uncovered head and exposed chest as symbolizing the receptivity and vulnerability of the male hero, whose body may be assaulted through the head and heart. As for the wearing of headgear, the injuries of both Freiburg of *Käthchen* and Adam of *Der zerbrochne Krug* could testify to the physical dangers of losing one's helmet or wig; Homburg's "**offne**[...] **Brust**", however, alludes to his emotional susceptibility and openness to suggestion. The stage direction implies that "...the premise on which the text is founded is not the either/or of rationality and heart ("bare head" *or* "open breast"), reality and fantasy, but their inextricability" (Jacobs 117). In other words, the double exposure at the play's very beginning may acknowledge the vulnerability or penetrability of both reason and feeling, embodied by head and heart. On a more concrete level, perhaps the Elector senses in Homburg his desire to equip himself with the symbols of power: a wreath for his uncovered head and the chain of office to cover his exposed chest. The Elector's question: "...Doch, was gilts, ich weiß, / Was dieses jungen Toren Brust bewegt?" (53-54) indicates not only his curiosity as to the potential motives for Homburg's transgressive behaviour, but also emphasizes Kleist's deployment of physical images of the body to form connections with apparently unknowable psychological or emotional states. In a fashion similar to the Elector's query cited above, the Emperor of

Käthchen concretizes vom Strahl's alleged social transgression by means of a corporeal image: vom Strahl has "[i]n einer Torin Busen eingeschlagen" (2286). The pantomine, staged by the Elector, follows: the Elector confiscates Homburg's wreath, who then stands up. When the Elector passes the wreath and chain to Natalie, the prince seizes her glove, causing the party to leave the scene in confusion.

It is, however, not the **Bild** which penetrates Homburg's being and lames him, but the sound of his true name. The bullet of language brings him down in yet another fall, a collapse of the body which begins so many of Kleist's dramas. Hohenzollern's naming of "Arthur", a restoration of Homburg's identity, also disrupts "das ganze Bild" (73). Similar to vom Strahl's inability to recognize Käthchen after his vision, the identity of the third person ("die - dritte, / - Wie heißt sie schon?" (146-147)) seemingly escapes Homburg upon awakening. Now fully aware, Homburg may be unconsciously repressing the woman's identity in order to protect himself as a kind of psychological armament. His touching of Natalie and his naming her his bride have brought him into a taboo zone. Similar to vom Strahl, he demands his weapons ("Rasch! Meinen Helm! Die Rüstung!" (101)) once he becomes fully conscious. Vom Strahl does so because he either wishes to impress his future bride or retain his bodily integrity, or both. For Homburg it is too late. Pursuing the desired objects borne by Natalie in his dream, his exposed head and chest leave him receptive to the emotional codification of symbols. It is not surprising that his focus on the absent military equipment, concrete manifestations of a male trade, immediately shifts to the female glove (105), which he throws away (108f), only to pick it up again (139f) and embark on a partial narration of the dream. When Homburg reappears on stage "**den Handschuh im Kollett**" in the fifth scene of act one, the glove attached to the front of his coat or cloak visually describes how Natalie has metaphorically touched his heart.

Homburg bears the trace of his encounter with a desired woman. However, this opening tableau, structured around bodies, consciousness and desired objects, has subtle implications for Homburg's relationship with the Elector. Firstly, Homburg's waking-dreaming state occurs in the presence of his double and surrogate father, who shares Homburg's name and parallel actions concerning horses in the second act. The spatial

proximity of these two bodies is somewhat mitigated by Homburg's psychological absence, thereby preventing a direct confrontation on equal terms. Only in the Elector's absence and following the enunciation of his given name does Homburg "come to himself" and reenter his body. In terms of a symbolic exchange, Homburg retains the token of the glove; the Elector the wreath.

In the semiotic system of body interrelationships, there are a number of explicit associations in this drama between gendered parts of the body. In the first instance, related to Homburg's exposed chest and the touching of Natalie, there exists a link between the chest, the hand and the heart. This constellation of contact becomes apparent as a barometer of intimacy between Homburg and Natalie, for Natalie's glove attached to Homburg's coat simultaneously postpones and foreshadows the tactility of the last act. There the direction of the desire and the immediacy of contact is intensified, as Natalie cites Homburg's gesture of placing her hand on his heart from II/6 (Patterson 135). Natalie takes Homburg's hand and presses it to her heart, a tactile gesture physically unmediated by clothing and psychologically encoded by the dream format.

Kleist continually brings this white glove the spectators' attention. Analogous to Achilles' wound and its bandaging in *Penthesilea*, this white object intervenes in the discussion of military strategy as a trace of a physical encounter. Like Achilles' gaze on Penthesilea, Homburg, "**Stift und Tafel in der Hand, fixiert die Damen**" (247f). In the words of Hohenzollern, initiator of the game in the first place, the white glove "zerstört zugleich und kräftigt seinen Glauben" (1670) when he realizes to whom it belongs. Homburg's astonishment results from his confrontation with a physical manifestation of Natalie, who previously had appeared in his memory as an unidentifiable dream-image. Dream and reality intersect in the glove. If we examine the glove's symbolic meaning, it takes on the association of a fetish, a tangible object-symbol laden with signifying power, such as Othello's gift to Desdemona of a handkerchief. That the glove, although visibly stuffed in Homburg's coat, must be secretly placed in the floor by way of a handkerchief and not by hand seems to validate its sanctity. The concreteness of the white glove, which Homburg relinquishes, is juxtaposed by the abstractness of the orders read aloud. Thus a second confrontation between the Elector and Homburg, characterized

by the Elector's command "regier dich wohl" (350), is affected by Homburg's absent-mindedness. Homburg does not, for example, reply to the Elector's order and acknowledges his self-division to Hohenzollern: he was "Zerstreut - geteilt; ich weiß nicht, was mir fehlte" (420). While the first act links the hand and the glove, a close reading of the circumstances surrounding Homburg's fall and hand-wound in the second act will extend these connections.

The link between the glove-bandage and Homburg's fall and subsequent injury opens the text to a variety of possible interpretations. The glove is evidence of his dream, his bandage the proof of his fall (*KA* II 1262). Although the wound is also employed metaphorically to describe a psychological state, such as the inner wounds of *Penthesilea*, what characterizes Homburg and vom Strahl's superficial wounds is the importance attributed to them in the text.

Although Hohenzollern's assertion that Homburg's wound is "Nichts von Bedeutung!" (379) suggests to his listeners on stage, and perhaps as well to Kleist's audience, that this particular wound has no particular physical import or symbolic value, the following textual instances indicate a pattern of self-reference and continuity shared with *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*. "Nothing of significance" can also be read as a nothing, a nothingness (a "Nichts"), full of meaning ("von Bedeutung"). A wound, however insignificant, is something of import when its location on the body is taken into account. Rather than describing the hand in the works of Kleist solely as an "agent of non-verbal communication" or as a "key to the psyche" (Davidson 229,232) which in one way or another acts as an indicator of defective character or as a dramatic portent, one could instead also examine the significance of the physical interaction depicted through the protagonists' hands within the context of the drama.

The events of Homburg's dream and his subsequent narration of it are described by Hohenzollern and Homburg respectively as a "Vorfall" (1660) and a "wunderlicher Vorfall" (427), a term which signifies literally an event or occurrence; taken in its literal sense, a **Vor-fall** signifies a "pre-fall" preceding the "Sündenfall der Insubordination" (*KA* II 1272-1273). Despite the fall's capacity to portend later events, Lawrence Frye's

reading of this "curiously emphasized accident" (290) offers an alternative account. While the Elector is reportedly shot off his horse, Homburg's fall brings him within the circle of Natalie and the Electress, as they suffer a carriage mishap. These coincidental events seem to undermine the Elector's notion of an ideal victory, in that such a "Vorfall" colluded with a "Zufall" antithetical to his orders (Frye 240). Homburg's numerous bodily crises are expressed by his tendency to collapse: he collapses at the sound of his name uttered by Hohenzollern; he slides off his horse before the battle; he ultimately faints in the finale.

Homburg's fall before the battle occurs when his horse shies at a windmill. He slightly hurts himself in a minor fall whose insignificance Homburg himself acknowledges: "Die Hand hier.../ Verdient nicht, daß du [the Elector] sie verwundet taufst" (745f). In Hohenzollern's words, Homburg slides off his horse, "...leichthin zur Seite niedergleitend" (381), and this description suggests an almost unconscious, though controlled descent from his horse. His fall and injury, according to Hohenzollern, are "Nichts von Bedeutung!" (379), and although appearing initially superficial and insignificant, his wound may be seen as a dramatic foreshadowing or warning as to Homburg's coming predicament, a function similarly apparent in Graf Wetter vom Strahl's superficially hurting his left hand during his approach on horseback to Kunigunde's castle in *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* (Davidson 236).

His wound is perhaps an unconsciously inflicted mark of kinship with Natalie, a way of indirectly appropriating the glove as a trophy or keepsake in a socially sanctioned manner. For example, Kanzog sees Homburg's unconscious seizure of the glove as a collection of victory trophies, with the glove as a "Pfand" (*Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* 110). The black bandage (he enters "**mit einem schwarzen Band um die linke Hand**" (II/2) may be suggestive of mourning and as a substitute for the surrendered white glove. The wound itself may be regarded as a possible mark of penance for his breaking social convention - the touching of the Elector's "property". The wound, as with vom Strahl's first meeting with Käthchen, may also represent the entry point of Natalie into Homburg's innermost being. The sequence by which Homburg snatches the glove from her left hand, returns it, and then injures his own left hand and has it bound in black is

representative of loss and attempted substitution as compensation for the absence of a desired object. The glove, dramaturgically speaking, effectively disappears as a motif by the end of the first act. It is replaced as an embodiment of the dream by the black bandage in II/2. The bandage covers the wound and inhibits his sense of touch, while in V/10 the blindfold extends his sensory deprivation. The sensory nature of the dream is realized in its full circle: in the miniature "Schau-Spiel" he can look at Natalie but can only seize her glove; in the concluding tableau he is at first blind, then "seeing" and finally touching her. It is interesting to note that Kleist, a master of detailed theatrical gesture, did not specify the removal of Homburg's blindfold. Stranz's remark ("Die Augen bloß will ich dir wieder öffnen" (1848)) possesses both literal and metaphorical implications, the latter of which do not require Homburg to "see" the spectacle around him, but to sense through touch and hearing the fulfilment of the dream.

Before his dream can be fulfilled, Homburg must undergo a transformation mediated by the Elector. At the end of the first act, Homburg recuperates from the shock of recognizing Natalie and attempts, by leading the premature charge, to validate his token of victory. However, his sovereignty over the body natural and political oversteps its parameters when he disobeys orders (the Elector's invisible presence) and leads the charge. By confiscating the sword of of an officer who dares to question Homburg's own subordination ("Führt ihn gefangen ab, ins Hauptquartier" (491)), he assumes the powers of the Elector. Such a connection is clarified by the Elector's echo of Homburg's words when he places Homburg under arrest: "Bringt ihn nach Fehrbellin, ins Hauptquartier" (789). When Homburg does appear to be the victor of Fehrbellin, his ascendancy is mirrored by his psychological integrity and gestural grace.

Following the mistaken report of the father figure's death (and by extension the end of paternal prohibition), Homburg and Natalie suggestively interract on the one level through the rhetoric of bodily sensation, and on a second visual level of physical touching, as expressed by the stage directions. This scene (II/6) expresses more than any other in the drama the topoi of embodied interpenetrability. Firstly, Homburg "**legt ihre Hand gerührt an sein Herz**" upon the news of the Elector's death, and makes the following hyperbolic promise: "Könnt ich mit Blut, aus diesem treuen Herzen, / Das

seinige zurück ins Dasein rufen!" (568-569). However, Natalie, who presciently takes into account the importance of the Elector's natural death, asks for the physical proof: "Hat man denn schon die Leiche aufgefunden?" (570). Homburg once again takes her hand; she withdraws it. When Homburg crosses the boundaries of this conventionalized discourse and actually kisses her, she tears herself away and "**wendet sich wieder zur Kurfürstin zurück**".

This momentary distancing effect is compounded in the next two scenes, in which reports of the Elector's death turn out to be exaggerated. Natalie "**stürzt vor der Kurfürstin nieder und umfaßt ihren Leib**" and clearly aligns herself with the Elector's family circle by literally supporting the Electress. In the eighth scene of the second act the Elector is not only reported alive, but significantly is seen by Graf Sparren issuing orders concerning the disposal of bodies (627-629). While the Elector, surrounded by his command, issues orders for the burial of the dead, Homburg, in contrast, pursues Natalie within the Elector's own family circle. Natalie's response is to further retreat to the realm of maternal authority and to submerge herself metaphorically in the womb: "**sie drückt ihr Gesicht in der Tante Schoß**" and finally "**stellt sich an die Seite der Kurfürstin**", literally taking her adoptive mother's side. Since the dominance of the father/Elector has been restored, Natalie continues to reside in Homburg's innermost being ("In ihres Herzens Kern" (608)) while renouncing him in the visible world. Homburg's response to the reversion to the status quo through the restoration of his leader's natural and political body is ambivalent: the word of the messenger "...fällt schwer wie Gold in meine Brust" (638). It is the gravity of the words which bring Homburg, who had seen himself as an angel with a flaming sword (582-583), down to earth. To use the distinction outlined by Kantorowicz, neither the King has experienced his demise, nor has the king died (13). In response to Homburg's second attempt to embrace her, Natalie removes herself from Homburg's proximity and demands, in a curious moment of misunderstanding, a scarf she is already wearing from one of her ladies in waiting (705-707). By Reeve's account, she has emotionally exposed herself and offended propriety (Reeve, ""Mit dem Hals..." 251).

The reporting of his wound, however, does have direct implications for the relationship between Homburg and the Elector. His fall, in the mistaken report of Graf Truchß, becomes serious wounds "an Haupt und Schenkel" (727) which would have prevented him from leading the premature charge[14]. Homburg is not the only character mistakenly attributed serious wounds: the man who shares his name, Friedrich the Elector, is apparently mowed down by enemy fire (537-548). The doubleness of these false reports typify the role of Homburg and the Elector as body doubles, whose actions and reactions mirror each other. Psychologically speaking, their conflict has been clearly outlined by numerous critics, who see in this work a confrontation between Goethe and Kleist (cf. Mommsen), youth and age (cf. Ellis), or the command of the heart versus obedience (cf. Kittler, *Geburt*). In terms of Homburg and the Elector's mirroring through actions, John Ellis points out the coincidental relationships between the acts of mounting and dismounting horses before the battle: the Elector, persuaded by his servant, dismounts from his white horse[15] and gives it to Froben, while Homburg, on his way to the battle on his black horse ("Goldfuchs"), involuntarily dismounts (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 98). Homburg's horse shies at a windmill; the Elector's horse ("Schimmel"), in Froben's opinion, is "scheu". Froben, mistakenly seen by the Swedish troops as the Elector, dies in a hail of gunfire ("Mordblei" (675)). Thus when each assumes the incapacity or death of the other's natural body, both Homburg and the Elector take on a political body. Acting within his power, the Elector pronounces sentence on whoever led the premature charge, while Homburg claims the role of executor of the Elector's last will. It is the natural body of Froben which must pay the price.

The figure of Froben, the "Stallmeister" in charge of these linked horses, mediates between Homburg and the Elector. Froben represents not only the Elector's body double, but through his death and the physical presence of his corpse, he is a surrogate for the reportedly dead Elector and seriously injured Homburg. All three are linked to horses, and Homburg explains his absence before the battle in this way: "Ich - war in der Kapelle, / Die aus des Dörfchens stillen Büschen blinkte. / Man läutete, da wir vorüberzogen, / Zur Andacht eben ein; da triebs mich an, / Am Altar auch mich betend hinzuwerfen" (408-412). Yet Froben as a stage character exists only in the

narrative of Count Sparren and as a body brought on stage, lowered "**auf einen prächtigen Katafalk**" (II/9) in the church. This scene, as with Homburg's visit to the chapel, is accompanied by "**Glockenklang**" announcing prayers and a prostrated body at the altar.

The confrontation in the "Lustgarten" between the Elector and Homburg, each of whom believed -- or even subconsciously wished -- the other incapacitated, takes place in the presence of the body, "ein Opfer seiner Treue" (676; Homburg in Natalie's words "die Treue selbst" (1101)), illuminated in the church. As with the opening scene, in which Homburg is excluded from entering the brilliantly illuminated castle as a foreign body in the Elector's garden, the Elector and his officers exit into the brightly lit church. The tenth scene of the second act presents the first brief confrontation between Elector and Homburg at comparable levels of psychological equilibrium, even if the Elector initially "**stutzt**" (739ff) and appears "**betroffen**" (741ff). Homburg's arrival as victor, with his engagement of Natalie secured and the war trophies in his hand, confronts the Elector with the real physical presence of an apparently intact body which he had believed to have been incapacitated. Since Homburg's dream has been fulfilled, it is not surprising that the Elector reenacts the "Probe" of the first act. He accepts the trophies (analogous to the glove Homburg relinquishes and a "Beweis" (749) of his victory) and confiscates his sword (analogous to the wreath). The Elector's command to arrest Homburg and absent his body from the scene is followed by latter's silence during fifteen lines of dialogue. When he speaks once again, he does so in order to question his presence of mind: "Träum ich? Wach ich? Leb ich? Bin ich bei Sinnen?" (765). As a shock to Homburg from which he recovers, his arrest precedes the notorious "Todesfurchtszene".

As in the first scene of the play, the Elector confiscates something from Homburg: the wreath in the first instance, and then the trophy banners and his sword in the second. It is characteristic of this drama that the Elector's departure from the stage following his removal of an object from Homburg provokes a soliloquy from the latter (I/5 and II/10). But the Elector makes a critical move in judging Homburg. Froben's destroyed natural body serves as a lesson to those who literally and figuratively want to

take the Elector's place. By arresting him for a crime punishable by death, the Elector is putting Homburg not only in his place, but also in Froben's place[16]. However, Homburg is not confined to a coffin, but to a prison. When Homburg wishes to speak to the Electress concerning Natalie, the materiality of language, expressed by the weight of the news on Homburg's chest, resurfaces. "Dein Wort", states the guard to Homburg, "ist eine Fessel auch" (947); Hohenzollern also remarks that "Die Fessel folgt dem Prinzen auf dem Fuße!" (949).

Weighed down by the burden of his word, Homburg begins his notorious and scandalous descent to the grave, an out-of-body experience defined by the question of the Electress: "Du bist ganz außer dir! Was ist geschehen?" (980). Beside himself, Homburg responds, describing the motivation and metaphors of his physical breakdown. They bear full citation:

> Ach! Auf dem Wege, der mich zu dir führte,
> Sah ich das Grab, beim Schein der Fackeln, öffnen,
> Das morgen mein Gebein empfangen soll.
> Sieh, diese Augen, Tante, die dich anschaun,
> Will man mit Nacht umschatten, diesen Busen
> Mit mörderischen Kugeln mir durchbohren.
>
> (981-986)

Homburg confronts the reverse image of the lighted doorway leading upwards to the "Menschen, die mein Busen liebt" (145); the loving lap of night (120-124) which had embraced him in the first act becomes "jenen schwarzen Schatten" (997) overshadowing his eyes (984-985). This passage looks back to act one and forward to act five. Firstly, Homburg's wounded hand enclosed in a black bandage, which contrasts with and stands in for Natalie's hand enclosed in the white glove, finds its correlative in the opening and closing portals in opposition to the open grave. His wound, "Nichts von Bedeutung" (379), reinforces and deepens the threefold "Nichts" invoked by the Elector in the first act: "Ins Nichts mit dir zurück, Herr Prinz von Homburg, / Ins Nichts, ins Nichts!" (74-75). While his minor wound may remind him of his physicality, the mouth of the grave shocks him with its unreflected realness. As "die krasseste Erkenntnis der Wirklichkeit"

(Nehring 182), the sight of the grave reduces him to a broken natural body. This significant nothingness is the most extreme form of a "Nichts von Bedeutung". "Der Mensch," according to Max Kommerell's analysis of this scene, "besiegt den Tod durch die Bilder, die er sich vom Tode macht" (203). These images mediate between the individual and his or her death, banishing death's pure annihilation. Death confronts Homburg "bildlos" and is ultimately "das eigentlich Undarstellbare" (Kommerell 204). In its forward-looking function, the above passage's reference to dimming eyes and murderous bullets delineates the format of the mock execution. This encounter with the grave robs Homburg of the potential to deploy his political body, in that he renounces all social and political roles. In this way, the absolute power of the Elector reduces Homburg to nothing. Elias Canetti's anthropological formulation of the processes of power (a sequence of acquisition, consumption and excretion[17]) finds its political correlative in Homburg's "burial"; the "mouth" of the grave threatens to consume and annihilate Homburg's body. For Kommerell, the grave represents the lowest point of Homburg's "sterbliche Ich", a confrontation which is simultaneously "eine Bedingung für das Reifen des tragischen Ich" (204). This spatial and psychological low point for Homburg (in that he kneels before the Electress in III/5) nonetheless points the way to Homburg's recovery: the Electress demands the Homburg face his fate "mit Fassung" (994) and that he regain control of himself ("Fasse dich!" (1006)).

The Elector, despite his "Stirn des Zeus" (158), is not entirely invulnerable. Homburg had misconstrued the Elector's tolerance and became exposed himself, by refusing to accept the possibility of the Elector authorizing his execution. In a reversal of the image he used to describe his willingness to sacrifice his blood to revive the father (568-569), Homburg states:

> Doch eh er solch ein Urteil läßt vollstrecken,
> Eh er dieses Herz hier, das getreu ihn liebt,
> Auf eines Tuches Wink, der Kugel preis gibt,
> Eh sieh, eh öffnet er die eigne Brust sich,
> Und sprützt sein Blut selbst tropfenweis in Staub.
>
> (872-876)

Here Homburg explicitly associates the power of the Elector's command to execute him, a command that would have to be written by the military court and signed by the Elector, with the spillage his own and the Elector's blood. Homburg's assumption of their bond, by which he conflates the Elector's execution order with a form of suicide, echoes Achilles' assurance that Penthesilea would sooner hurt herself than him. But it is Homburg who is openly and intentionally made to suffer (Frye 241). Homburg mistakenly constructs an image of the Elector's vulnerability, by projecting the exposed chest onto the Elector which ultimately characterizes himself. When Natalie assumes an intermediary role on his behalf, Homburg asks "Wo ruhte denn der Köcher dir die Rede?" (1065), to which she replies: "Gott wird die Pfeile mir, die treffen, reichen! - " (1069). The gestural symbolism at the end of act three suggests this possibility, only to be refuted: the Elector's initial appearance at the opening of the fifth act parallels Homburg's vulnerability of the first, only this time it is the Elector who is "**halbentkleidet**". Surprised by the appearance of Kottwitz's squadrons "unbeordert" (1433) in the town, the Elector dispatches orders and "**legt seinen fürstlichen Schmuck an**" (1427f). His sartorial rearmament has the desired effect, as he "arms himself with the garb of power" (Frye 243) and covers his natural body with the raiment of the body political. Against all arrows (a metaphor for words) he is armoured: "Er ist", in the words of the Field Marshall, "jedwedem Pfeil gepanzert" (1473). The rhetorically effective defences undertaken by Kottwitz ("Es besticht dein Wort / Mich, mit arglistger Rednerkunst gesetzt" (1610-1611)) and Hohenzollern lend weight to their arguments for clemency. Hohenzollern notes the weakening defences of the Elector, who feels the weight of words like his "son" Homburg: "...Ich bin sicher, / Mein Wort fiel, ein Gewicht, in deine Brust!" (1721-1722).

In contrast to vom Strahl's literally talking himself out of an emotional crisis, the bullet of language, which is modernized from the word-dagger in *Penthesilea*, affects its victim physiologically by provoking a collapse (Homburg) or even death (Penthesilea). The bodily associations between blood and bullets, hands and heart, is complemented by the play's sequence of organic imagery.

While Kleist opposed the elements of fire (Käthchen) and water (Kunigunde) in

Käthchen, or built Penthesilea's body around the structures of her inner architecture, his *Prinz Freidrich von Homburg* offers a series of plant and body images. The organicist imagery, a fundamental aspect of this work, has been outlined and brilliantly explicated by John Ellis (*A Critical Study* 58-64), and further discussed by Ilse Graham: "the prince is repeatedly, and centrally, associated with the imagery of plant life" (*Word into Flesh* 183-185). There is little to add to Ellis' interpretation, which thoroughly documents the role of the Elector as gardener, the Prince as plant or flower, and the parallel scenes of plant misidentification beginning and ending the play. The Elector has adopted and raised two children, who are "in a sense "fremd," i.e. Natalie and the Prince, especially since the latter is twice referred to metaphorically as a plant raised by the Elector" (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 63). The crisis ensues when these children/plants grow out of their gardener's control.

Following the mistaken report of the Elector's death, Homburg expresses his desire for greater emotional entwinement and offers his protection:

> Schlingt Eure Zweige hier um diese Brust,
> Um sie, die schon seit Jahren, einsam blühend,
> Nach eurer Glocken holden Duft sich sehnt!
> (602-605)

This passage, whose imagery is redolent of the "Geruch" that transfixes vom Strahl (**Variant,** 892), delineates how Homburg attempts to enclose himself and the desired object within a metaphorical framework of the garden. When Natalie seems to take up his invitation ("Wenn ich ins innre Mark wachsen darf" (607)) and "**legt sich an seine Brust**", the process of supplanting the Elector's territory ("Mark Brandenburg") with the "innre Mark" of their joined bodies is complete[18]. Referring back to the first scene, in which the Elector uses the posssessive (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 62), one should note that he asks about the foreign plant: "Wo fand er den [Lorbeer] in meinem märkchen Sand?" (50). The "Mark" Brandenburg is supplanted by the interlocking marrow of Homburg and Natalie, who are metaphorically cultivating their own garden in the absence of the Elector.

The radical interiority of such an implanting gesture can be found in Homburg's twofold repetition of "Kern" (607, 608), an image which also expresses the action of blossoming outwards. This planting activity juxtaposes with the mowing down of the Elector's troops, who harvest the fruits of victory: both his casualties and the trophies are described as a "Saat" (533, 754) (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 60). When the Elector takes up his role again, Homburg renounces his planting activities, no longer weaving the wreath nor offering support to Natalie. His self characterization as a prematurely blooming flower to be stomped in the dust (846-849)[19] is furthered and altered by Natalie, who compares him to a "selbständig, frei und unabhängig" flower (1088-1089) which should be left to grow on its own. Ellis understands the pastoral imagery of Homburg's retreat, by which the "sower and reaper" withdraws from military life and marital happiness, as an attempt "to get out of the Elector's way by going to **his own garden**" (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 60). The penultimate scene, in which Homburg and not the Elector mistakenly identifies the flowers and is corrected, reemphaszies the foreigness of the flowers, only in this case the flowers are transplanted by a "Mädchen" and not a male "Gärtner" (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 63). However, the concluding scene does take place in the Elector's garden, with an implied change in the idea of gardening. Rather than existing or dying under the control exerted by the Elector, these independent flowers are to be appreciated for their beauty (Ellis, *A Critical Study* 63). However, Ellis downplays the undercurrent of violence in the plant imagery of the opening and closing scenes. Regardless of whether or not one sees them as male/female symbols for the Elector and Natalie or instrumentalized as a human artifact (the wreath) or permitted an independent existence, the laurel and the flowers were transplanted into foreign soil. Homburg, in order to craft his wreath (at the play's beginning) or to put the flowers in water (at the play's conclusion), must uproot these living plants, ultimately killing them. Natalie's cry "-Ach welch ein Heldenherz hast du geknickt!" (1155) expresses through its association with Homburg's body this problem of transplantation and transformation. Homburg's heart, however, has not been broken like the stem of a flower, but has been bent in a way evocative of Amphitryon's bending his helmet plumage[20].

Supported by the play's organic imagery, the visual effects of physical gesture and permissible and prohibited touching convey the body language necessary for communication. The performance of communicative acts occurs through the medium of written discourse, a medium which in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* plays a crucial role in "bending" and shaping Homburg's actions.

Nowhere does Kleist better demonstrate his sense of the theatrical than in the fourth scene of the fourth act, a scene of writing and self-composition whose striking "gestic action" Michael Patterson has thoroughly summarized and elucidated (134). Structurally and symbolically speaking, the fifth scene from the third act in *Käthchen* and IV/9 in this play represent parallels. While Natalie is attempting to keep information from Homburg, or at least filter the letter's contents, Käthchen attempts to deliver the information against vom Strahl's wishes. Both scenes center on a contested piece of writing, and the male protagonists are playing with the signifying power embodied by vom Strahl's whip and Homburg's pen, two instruments of power and extensions of will. Vom Strahl and Homburg's initial disorientation, followed by a decision to react, represent their disassociation of bodies that characterizes Kleist's male figures. It is symptomatic of Homburg's unconscious will that "Diktieren in die Feder macht [ihn] irr" (421), that he is unwilling or unable to control physically his response to the spoken word, be it the Law of the Father embodied in the Elector's orders or the mysterious power his own name (Arthur) has on him in his sonambulistic state. When Natalie, in a parallel assertion to the pre-battle scene demands: "Ich will es Euch diktieren" (1323), she provokes his sense of pride: Homburg follows the internalized orders of his own heart. In a second instance, in this case in reverse relation to the glove of the opening dream sequence, Natalie "**reißt ihm den Brief aus der Hand**", while Homburg "**erhascht ihn**", and reads it once again. The letter with the "Zeichen" (1318) of the father signifies the relationship between the white glove and white paper on which his challenge to the son-figure is inscribed. If the sleepwalking Homburg failed to read the signs the first time as a challenge rather than as a harbinger of good fortune, the Elector's written challenge received in a waking state cannot and does not escape his attention. The Elector's offer to allow Homburg to judge himself allows him to reenter

the structures of military discipline; conditional mercy, notes Kommerell, is no mercy at all (205). The commentary of the *Klassikerausgabe* notes the double meanings of the verb "sich fassen", which are "to express oneself" or "to regain one's balance". Homburg's disfunctional relationship to writing is abated following his "Selbstgewinnung" and the production of the final "Fassung" of his reply to the Elector (*KA* II 1291). At this point Homburg reenters his natural and political body: he realizes how to control and express himself ("sich fassen") through the act of writing and by accepting the death sentence and the force of law, he acquires a sovereignty over his self and body.

As with *Käthchen von Heilbronn* and *Die Hermannsschlacht*, the exchange of letters and the role of written communication are deployed and qualified by gender. Neither Thusnelda, Eve or Käthchen seem able to read the male letters which fall into their hands without accepting the authority of a male reader. In her writing practice, Natalie shares characteristics of both Käthchen (messenger) and writer (Kunigunde). Between the parallel scenes (IV/1 and IV/2), in which Natalie convinces the Elector and Homburg to address each other by letter, she herself pens the orders bringing Kottwitz's regiment into Fehrbellin. She is the only female dramatic figure of Kleist directly depicted on stage in the act of writing. When Homburg's letter rejects the Elector's call to judge his own actions, she releases her own letter: "...wenn du deinem Herzen folgst, / Ists mir erlaubt, dem meinigen zu folgen" (1389-1390). With these words, Natalie assumes Homburg's role; he who had demanded if Kottwitz had received the order "vom Herzen" (475) will benefit form the intercession of a woman issuing orders from her heart. Natalie and Homburg both subvert the Elector's authority: "Just as Homburg usurped the position of the Elector by issuing the command to sound the trumpets, so Natalie usurps the position of the Elector by issuing orders in his name and without his knowledge" (Ward, "An Irresolute Resolution..." 147).

Nowhere in the drama is Homburg as self-assured as in the seventh scene of the final act, in which he addresses the Elector directly and without distraction. Homburg also cites his self-abasement before the Electress by kneeling before the Elector ("Dir leg ich tiefbewegt zu Füßen mich!" (1767)), with the crucial difference that he acquires a

moral ascendancy over his ruler. After facing his death, Homburg is ready to die, and the Elector, who symbolically **"erhebt ihn"** (1793ff), seemingly brings him back to life: "...jetzt schenktest du das Leben mir!" (1794). Homburg is unaware that his words precisely express the Elector's plans. Elias Canetti notes that sudden pardon, and not the granting of the deathwish, embodies the supreme manifestation of power and has the appearance of new life:

> In ihrer höchsten Steigerung erscheint die Macht dort, wo die Begnadigung im letzten möglichen Augenblick erfolgt. Wenn der Tod, den man verhängt hat, eben vollstreckt werden soll ... erscheint die Begnadigung wie ein neues Leben (354).

It is immaterial whether or not Homburg wants to die; it is within the Elector's power to decide either way. The Elector returns to Homburg in the play's ambivalent conclusion those desired objects which had dominated the opening scene: the wreath, the chain of office, and Natalie's hand. The Elector, confronted by Homburg's "unbeugsamer Wille" (1749) to die, allows Homburg in the garden once again. When he returns the wreath to him and permits Natalie to touch him, he changes the direction, but not the shape of Homburg's plant-like growth. This mock execution is also a transformation, which provokes -- as is the case of many of Kleist's works -- completely incompatible interpretations. Such incommensurability of perspective already exists within the play itself. Not only is the opening scene doubled by the conclusion, but the opening scene itself is doubled. As Kommerell notes, the opening dream sequence enacts the conflict not between true and false understanding, but between two realities: "Zwei Wirklichkeiten streiten, welche wirklicher ist" (189); the event occurs twice, in the Elector's and Homburg's radically different interpretations of it (Kommerell 190). The reader is left with the same opposition concerning the ending, the oscillation or interrelationship between dream and reality.

To support an interpretation which views the ending as separating dream from reality, Kottwitz's remark, which effectively encapsulates the Elector's intentions, has received comparatively little attention:

> Du könntest an Verderbens Abgrund stehen,

Daß er, um dir zu helfen, dich zu retten,

Auch nicht das Schwert mehr zückte, ungerufen!

(1826-1828)

Kottwitz enunciates the principle of absolute command. Instead of Homburg poised over the abyss, Kottwitz places the Elector in this position. Homburg cannot nor would not save him without feeling what Canetti names the "Befehlsstachel" (371). Instead of a reconciliation of the opposing impulses of feeling and the law, my reading of this ending views Homburg as thrown back into a sonambulistic, yet absolutely obedient, state. Thus Kottwitz's response to Homburg's question ("Ein Traum, was sonst?" (1856)) is accurate, for the imposition of this dreaming state simultaneously both destroys and fulfils Homburg.

The Elector, by pushing Homburg to the very limits of dreaming and reality, demonstrates his ultimate mastery over Homburg's natural and political body. At the point at which Homburg has shed the accoutrements of the natural body, asserted his political body by deciding to die, and has begun the winged journey to the heavens uninhibited by any "Fehltritt", the Elector brings him to earth. It is almost as if Homburg cannot withstand the far from weightless symbolism of the Elector's chain of office, the wreath, and the presence of Natalie. For immortality is not, as Homburg had hoped, "ganz mein" (1830) but the property and the prerogative of the sovereign's political body. Homburg's natural body remains useful to the state and must feel the sting of the command, a command which must be passed on: "**ALLE.** In Staub mit allen Feinden Brandenburgs!"

However, another reading counters the possibility of a strict division between dream and reality. Homburg's question regarding his dream may originate in his beleif that such fulfillment can only be obtained in the world of dreaming; secondly, Kottwitz's response is literally true, with the important addition that Homburg's present experience is a dream, but a fulfilled one, "der Wandel von Traum zu (traumhafter) Wirklichkeit" (Nehring 174). Thus the prospect of the opening scene, confirmed and vindicated by its public reenactment, unites the opposing impulses of the law of the state and the order of the heart and allows dream and reality to commingle in a paradox. The state becomes

something more, yet something less: "Das Schicksal dieses Staats, gehalten durch eine kaum tragbare Spannung und bereichert um etwas, was weniger und mehr ist als jeder Staat, wird wachsen an dem Einverständnis" between the Elector and Homburg (Kommerell 209). "Der Ring," in the words of Müller-Seidel, "schließt sich: Traum wird zur Wirklichkeit und Wirklichkeit wird zum Traum" ("*Prinz Friedrich...*" 409). The site of this reconciliation is the natural body of Homburg, which in turn leaves its imprint on the body politic of Brandenburg.

Kleist restored to Prinz Friedrich von Hessen-Homburg that which was missing from his historical body: a missing leg replaced by a silver prosthesis (Hölter 355). It is perhaps ironic that in view of Kleist's army of incomplete and damaged bodies in his invented fictions would be rendered whole in the person of Homburg in his historical drama. He was, in the words of Hölter which play on *Amphitryon*, "entinvalidisiert" (354). It is a semantic irony of the English language that the soldier, whose shattered body is traumatized by war becomes as "invalid" as the truth claims of Kleist's series of anecdotes *Unwahrscheinliche Wahrhaftigkeiten*. This narrative sequence involving a narrator and his skeptical interlocutors, published one month before *Über das Marionnnettentheater* in the *Berliner Abendblätter*, is the technological companion piece to his essay on the puppet theater (cf. Chase). While the latter centers on the natural "Schwerpunkt" of the human body and its coordination, the former centers on the collisions between animate and inaminate "Körper" (280), between steel and flesh, stone and water. A soldier's body, seemingly penetrated from front to back by a bullet, suffers merely a flesh wound ("Fleischwunde" (278)), because the bullet's trajectory took it under the soldier's skin, around the body's frame, and exited from his back. The audience reponds: "Die Kugel? Um den ganzen Leib herum? Im Kreise?", barely able to contain its laughter (278). When a massive stone block falls on one bank of the Elbe in the second account, the resulting air pressure ("Druck der Luft" (279)) tosses a ship onto the opposite bank. This theme of physical displacement, governed by the "deflection of force" (Chase 148) recurs in the third anecdote, when an officer is blown bodily across the Schelde river by the force of an explosion, "...ohne daß ihm das mindeste auf

dieser Reise zugestoßen" (280). *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* is therefore literally a "Parabelstück" through its spectacular depiction of a body's trajectory (parabola), characterized by Homburg's oscillating motion of descent or ascent. Homburg represents the third case of the flying officer, as the Elector deflects his power in order to blast Homburg to the other side of the dream through cannon fire. These vulnerable bodies face interventions from external forces, surviving their traumas by miraculous means. In "Über das Marionettentheater", the graceful movement of the body and its limbs, not its displaced trajectory of the whole body, concerns the narrator and his skeptical listener. The wounded body, however, equipped with its prosthesis, returns to haunt Kleist's essay in the extension/conclusion to this thesis.

Endnotes

1. Streller supports his argument with the following oft-cited passage from a letter to Marie von Kleist from the summer of 1811: "Das Urteil der Menschen hat mich bisher viel zu sehr beherrscht; besonders das Käthchen von Heilbronn ist voll Spuren davon. Es war von Anfang herein eine ganz treffliche Erfindung, und nur die Absicht, es für die Bühne passend zu machen, hat mich zu Mißgriffen verführt, die ich jetzt beweinen möchte" (874).

2. Kleist's earlier contempt for popular chivalric fiction is expressed in a letter to Wilhelmine von Zenge written from September 13th to 18th, 1800, in which he describes his experience at a Würzburg library. He begins with the theory that "Nirgends kann man den Grad der Kultur einer Stadt und überhaupt den Geist ihres herrschenden Geschmacks schneller und doch zugleich richtiger kennen lernen als -- in den Lesebibliotheken". To demonstrate his argument, Kleist visits one such library in Würzburg, in order to find "ein paar gute Bücher", works by Wieland, Goethe or Schiller, none of which is permitted in the library. The books available on the shelves are: "**Rittergeschichten, lauter Rittergeschichten, rechts die Rittergeschichten mit Gespenstern, links ohne Gespenster, nach Belieben**" (562-563). This letter is also cited by the *Klassikerausgabe*, with the suggestion that his own play, with the ghostly figure of Kunigunde, would have belonged on the right side of the wall (*KA* II 871-872).

3. Theobald, in approving of the match between vom Strahl and Käthchen, states to his emperor and cuckolder: "Was Gott fügt, heißt es, soll der Mensch nicht scheiden" (2575). His "heißt es" may be meant to disassociate himself from believing in these remarks, since the Kaiser had already broken the sacred union between him and Käthchen's mother.

4. For example, Franz Ignaz von Holbein, who also adapted *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, enjoyed a great deal of success with multiple versions of a bowdlerized *Käthchen*, which was "am meisten gespielt und am meisten gescholten" (*KA* II 913). The *Klassikerausgabe* also cites at least four parodies, which already testifies to its popularity

(*KA* II 903).

5. In fact, the stage manuscript apparently underwent numerous changes for the premier performance at the Theater an der Wien (March 10th, 1810): according to Richard Smekal, who based his assumptions on the theater programme, the Kaiser was demoted to a "Herzog von Schwaben" (5), while Gottfried Friedeborn, Jakob Pech, the Archbishop, the aunts and the men of Thurneck were cut from the cast of characters. Kunigunde was rewarded for her efforts with the dungeon. The Burggraf, who is wounded by vom Strahl in combat during the rescue of Kunigunde, dies on stage -- as he does in the variant -- only in this performance to reappear again at the end of the drama (Smekal 6).

6. Contemporary public and private responses to his murder-suicide with Henriette Vogel refer to him as "Verf. des zerbrochenen Krugs und des Schauspiels Käthchen von Heilbronn (Rellstab in *NR* 10), the latter of which demonstrates his talent as "einen herrlichen, echt-dichterischen Geist" (Eberhard in *NR* 25). Friedrich Weisser of the *Morgenblatt* presents a contrasting opinion: the mere title of his "aberwitiziges Produkt" was a "platte Geschmacklosigkeit" (*NR* 26a). Adolf Wagner of *Die Musen* suggests that Kleist shows "die unergründliche Tiefe der Liebe, des Gehorsams und der Treue in kecker, tiefer, freudeglühender Dichtung" (*NR* 29).

7. In the variant (899) the Burggraf von Freiburg dies before he can explain the origins of his quarrel with Kunigunde. One reason for Kleist's editing and shortening of this scene can found in the nearly absurdist dialogue below, which seems to parody the theatrical convention of a postponed, yet inevitable death:

GEORG VON WALDSTAETTEN

...

Wodurch hat sie so grimmig dich gereizt,
Daß du solch eine Tat ihr angetan?

BURGGRAF VON FREIBURG

O Georg! Wenn ich das sagen könnte -

GEORG VON WALDSTAETTEN Sag es.

BURGGRAF VON FREIBURG

Den Atem meiner ganzen Jugend gäb ich,

Um nur die sieben Worte auszusprechen.

GEORG VON WALDSTAETTEN

Du hast jetzt eben dreizehn schon gesagt. -

BURGGRAF VON FREIBURG

Ist sie hinweg mit ihm?

8. Kunigunde and Käthchen, though doubles, also present an elemental contrast between fire and water: "Das Feuer- und Wassermotiv rückt es [the play] in den Bereich des Mythos. Diese Urbilder der Schöpfung und Zerstörung unterstützen als bildliche Motive Bewegung und Gegenbewegung der Handlung, die mit Käthchen und Kunigunde verbunden sind" (Borchardt 77-78). It is not unexpected that in a play subtitled "Die Feuerprobe", which alludes to Käthchen's miraculous escape in the third act, the element of fire would figure so prominently. Kleist deploys the elements of fire and water to contrast figuratively Kunigunde and Käthchen, as well as to allude parodically to Mozart and Schikander's *Die Zauberflöte* (1791) (Schwerte 7; *KA* II 791). Against Ueding's suggestion that Käthchen belongs to the constellation of the fairy or undine tradition, one could argue for fire, not water, as Käthchen's symbolic environmental element. The unusual scene involving her failure to cross the stream, whose focal motivation does not necessarily have to be modesty, may point the way to an alternative understanding of Käthchen's motivation and supplement the standard basis of comparison between Käthchen and Kunigunde, which critics have traditionally seen as an opposition between art and artifice, truth and falsehood, nature and civilization, or youth and age. The following apparently undermotivated exchange raises the issue of her apparent fear of water:

GOTTSCHALK. Du mußt dich ein wenig schürzen.

KÄTHCHEN. Nein, bei Leibe, schürzen nicht!

Sie steht still.

GOTTSCHALK. Bis an den Zwickel nur, Käthchen!

KÄTHCHEN. Nein! lieber such ich mir einen Steg!

Sie kehrt um.

GOTTSCHALK. **hält sie.** Bis an den Knöchel nur, Kind! bis an die äußerste, unterste Kante der Sohle!

KÄTHCHEN. Nein, nein, nein, nein; ich bin gleich wieder bei dir!

Sie macht sich los und läuft weg.

(2001-2007ff)

The suggested reason for her failure of the "Wasserprobe", that Käthchen's alleged modesty prevents her from raising her skirt, seems to reflect a desired image of the eroticized child-woman, who alternately conceals and reveals her body to the male viewer, rather than an engagement with other scenes contradicting this hypothesis.

What is clear is that her vulnerability to water, both physical and mental, has a further basis in her confrontation with Kunigunde in the bath. Similarly, Ueding reads Käthchen as following "...dem Muster der verbreiteten Undinen- und Feenmärchen" (182). It is true that Käthchen's character partially shares these qualities, but the text tends to dispute this interpretation and in fact suggests the very opposite. In one minor and one major scene, Käthchen experiences "die "Wasserprobe" am Bach und in der Badegrotte" (Schwerte 8). In the second, central instance, she has her confrontation with Kunigunde in the bath. Water, indeed, is not her element. Kunigunde, whom Ueding names "das personifizierte Bild des zersetzten Seins" (181), seems to possess undine-like characteristics, a soullessness and an explicit, elemental association with water. Firstly, upon her rescue by vom Strahl, she demands: "Ich bitt um Wasser!" (1077), and secondly, her false sentiments and crocodile tears (an emblematic image for faked emotion) are described thus: "Sie sei so gerührt, daß ihre Augen, wie zwei Quellen, niederträufelten, und ihre Schrift ertränkten" (1590-91). Thirdly, upon her rescue in the "Köhlerhütte" scene, it becomes apparent that Kunigunde "...fears direct exposure to light, a symbol of, among other things, truth" (Reeve, *Heritage* 49). It should also be noted that the sources of such light are the flames of the requested torches (1078). If these Kleistian characters exist in what Ueding calls a "zweideutige[n] Bilderwelt" then

a totalized or unifying interpretation based on binary oppositions should be avoided, especially since the production of a double meaning in no way specifies precisely which two meanings are opposed to each other; the term "zweideutig" implies a multiplicity of meanings. Vom Strahl's question as to "...warum sie hinter mir herschreitet ... durch Feuer und Wasser" should therefore be taken poetically, rather than literally, since it seems that Kleist had no intention of allowing Käthchen to cross the stream, nor does she do so in the course of the drama. Käthchen's character remains to a certain extent unreadable, for the above arguments associating her with the element of fire are not intended to replace one preexisting series of binary oppositions with another. Käthchen, as Edith Borchardt reminds us, through her attribute "von Heilbronn", may also for example embody a healing, water-borne archetype. While Kunigunde predominantly retains to a certain extent those aspects associated with water, she nonetheless appears before the grotto scene wrapped in a flame-coloured red veil (IV/4: "**in einem feuerfarbnen Schleier**"). It is characteristic of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* that these attributes of fire and water fail to dovetail into a conclusive scheme of opposition between Käthchen and Kunigunde.

9. From one particularly nationalistic point of view, the drama may have a politically prophetic dimension. Although Mirjam's politicized work ***Das Käthchen von Heilbronn. Eine Prophezeiung auf das deutsche Reich*** (1908) practically disqualifies itself as meaningful scholarship, it makes a comparison between Käthchen and Kunigunde that has some validity. Firstly, and example of how this work is an interpretive retrofit: that is, the author assumes that Käthchen is "die Verkörperung des Reichsgedankens", and her much admired beauty on the part of the *Volk* is read in the following way: "Gerade dieser letzte Beweis der Unwiderstehlichkeit des Käthchens von Heilbronn ist, in dem Gedanken an die Machtstellung, die Deutschland nach dem Jahre 1870 gewonnen, einfach köstlich" (7); Kleist, rather than the author, was apparently guided by God (21) to act as a prophet of the new *Reich*. Despite the obvious flaws in Mirjam's reading the play prophetically, of which the one example above should suffice, he seems to recognize Kleist as a political writer -- the nationalist contours of the drama are visible in the link

between Kunigunde and Thusnelda -- while simultaneously ignoring the historical context in which Kleist wrote. When Mirjam sees Käthchen as embodying the new, second empire, and vom Strahl as "die Verkörperung der Wehrkraft des deutschen Volkes" (although Kleist had little use for the masses as a political force), then Kunigunde, according to his scheme, must therefore represent the "old empire" (9), that is the "unnational, wie das römische Reich deutscher Nation" (14) preceding Germany's unity of 1870. The implicit contrast between Käthchen and Kunigunde exists on the level of (national) unity and disunity among political bodies.

10. Although Kunigunde and Käthchen may be seen to represent opposites, the contrast between them is neither absolute nor completely consistent. I cannot agree with Harlos' assertion that "Kunigunde besitzt kein Gefühl, Käthchen keine Vernunft" (93), since Käthchen's presence of mind in the letters episode or her arming of vom Strahl shows a reasoning, "masculine" component to her behaviour. Gerrekens situates their opposition on the basis of imagery from the Old (Kunigunde) and New (Käthchen) Testament (81). Sean Allan puts forward the provocative view that they are not absolute opposites at all, but are simply projections of male desire, reflecting "non-natural man-made images of femininity" (184). They are both clichées: Käthchen is as much of the "wesenlose Bild" as Kunigunde.

11. The gesture of bending that which is erect has been discussed by W.C. Reeve. In his article "Feathers, Sex...", he points out that Amphitryon's bent plumage also provides a "Bild" of an "inneren Zustand", an unconscious acknowledgement that Jupiter stands taller than he. This motif runs through the plays of Kleist, from the "eingeknickter Federbusch" of Meroe's captive Greek in *Penthesilea*, to the bent or lamed wings of Achilles or Varus (*Die Hermannsschlacht*). In this context, Kleist translates this metaphor of male weakness to a deliberate expression of pretended female humility. Kunigunde's image, constructed for vom Strahl, would not benefit from the erect feather, signifying her ability to write and to command the authority of the written word.

12. Eginhardt sees her artifice and facility with words in the following way: Kunigunde addresses to vom Strahl "...einen Brief voll doppelsinniger Fratzen, der, wie der

Schillertaft, zwei Farben spielt, und weder ja sagt, noch nein" (1595-1597). However, the following passage suggests that Kunigunde can also achieve desired effects in the gestural and visual medium; when attempting to free herself she communicates with the "Köhlerjungen": "[Sie] wimmert' und druckt' mir die Hand und blinzelte, und sprach so vernehmlich, wie ein kluger Hund: mach mich los, lieb Bübel, mach mich los! daß ichs mit Augen hört und mit den Fingern verstand" (992-995).

13. This scene evokes a cycle of death and resurrection cycle that involves all three main characters: Kunigunde's apparent "death" and rebirth, in which she lies on the ground "wie tot" and then "can rise up ... and announce herself to the immediately dazzled Strahl" (Cullen and von Mücke 487). Strahl, for example, invokes the cycle of life (grave as cradle) and emerges from his death-dream, a psychic event that "bear[s] a similarity to the primitive rituals of rebirth (Hubbs,"The Plus and Minus..." 193). Finally, Käthchen's faked death and concealment in a cave further compounds the theme of "Auferstehung": she is reborn, by the insertion of the Permagentrolle/phallus into the cave/womb, as the Princess of Swabia. This process of apparent death as applied to Kunigunde and Käthchen is linked to the legitimacy of identity: not necessarily who these women are, but to whom do these women belong is the issue: is Kunigunde Freiburg's bride or is Käthchen Theobald's daughter ("Wes ist das Kind?" (169) is vom Strahl's first question). The proof lies in Käthchen's bodily marking (the mole) and the "Schaustück" that she inherited from her mother, while Kunigunde's documentation confirms her lineage. With respect to attributing truth value to the written or the material, vom Strahl's development remains in doubt, because the Kaiser's letter brings him to his knees and conclusively convinces him of Käthchen's identity, and not the birthmark.

14. This mistaken report, a result of an actual fall and wound, does influence the plot to the extent that the Elector initially confirms Homburg's innocence before passing judgment on the responsible commander, convinced that Homburg could not have been the guilty party. When the information comes to light that Homburg did in fact lead the charge, the Elector is faced with the *fait accompli* of his previous public pronouncement.

15. Kleist deliberately emphasizes the equestrian image and its association with power in the words of the Elector to Kottwitz: "Mit welchem Recht, du Tor, erhoffst du das,/ Wenn auf dem Schlachtenwagen, eigenmächtig,/ Mir in die Zügel jeder greifen darf" (1561-1563). Homburg, his adoptive son, seizes the reins of power, while his adoptive daughter seizes the pen and issues orders in his name.

16. This point concerning Homburg and Froben was made by Hellmuth Kaiser, in footnote from a 1930 article which was in turn cited in a note by John Ellis (*A Critical Study* 118): "Die innere Zusammengehörigkeit des Prinzen ... und ... Froben ist leicht zu sehen. Einerseits identifiziert sich der Prinz mit dem Stallmeister, wenn er sagt: 'Wenn ich zehn Leben hätte, könnt' ich sie besser brauchen nicht als so.' Andererseits tritt Froben, genau wie der Prinz es beabsichtigt, an die Stelle des Kurfürsten, indem er dessen Pferd besteigt und 'büsst', wie jener es sollte, diese Tat mit dem Tod". Kaiser also points out that Froben's seizing the reins is precisely the crime of Homburg (qtd. in Ellis, *A Critical Study* 118).

17. In his section on "die Eingeweide der Macht", Canetti outlines the following sequence: "Der konstante Druck, unter dem die Speise gewordene Beute steht, während der ganzen langen Weile, die sie durch den Leib wandert, ihre Auflösung und die innige Verbindung, die sie mit dem Verdauenden eingeht, das vollkommene und endgültige Verschwinden erst aller Funktionen, dann aller Formen, die einmal ihre eigene Existenz ausgemacht haben, die Angleichung oder Assimilation an das, was vom Verdauenden als Leib bereits vorhanden ist - all das läßt sich sehr wohl als der zentralste, wenn auch verborgenste Vorgang der Macht sehen" (246).

18. As cited in the *Klassikerausgabe* commentary, Katharina Mommsen suggests an allusion to the myth of Diana, who, pursued by the love of Apollo, became a laurel tree. According to the Elector, the laurel does not belong in the Mark Brandenburg, but it grows from Natalie's hand into the marrow ("Mark") of the Prince. "Die Kontrastierung der Homonyme unterstreicht die Verinnerlichung und Vertiefung der im Lorbeerkranz symbolisierten poetischen Initiation. In solchem versteckten Geflecht der mythologischen Bilder tritt an die Stelle des Staates, in dem die Dichter Fremdlinge bleiben müssen, als

Dichtermuse Natalie, die dem im Innersten getroffenen Prinzen am Ende wirklich den Lorbeerkranz aufsetzt" (*KA* II 1269). This homonym also implies the internalization of the state within the (loyal) subject, that the "Mark Brandenburg" leaves its mark.

19. Homburg's prophetic and self-descriptive metaphors in his conversation with Hohenzollern (III/1) are linked by their reference to "Staub", a word which in Kleist's usage (cf. *Penthesilea* or *Die Hermannsschlacht*) frequently evokes humiliation and defeat. In the second instance, he states with certainty that the Elector would rather allow his own blood to spill into the dust than allow his execution order to be carried out (872-876). Secondly, as an expression of rising doubt, he asks rhetorically if the Elector would "Um eines Fehls, der Brille kaum bemerkbar, / In dem Demanten, den er jüngst empfing, / In Staub den Geber treten?" (899-901). The play ends, while Homburg is prostrated before the Elector, with the cry "In Staub mit allen Feinden Brandenburgs!" (1858).

20. While Amphitryon may feel as if he has lost his head ("Ich fühle mich den Kopf benommen" (925)), Homburg's vulnerable head is exposed from the very beginning, as he sits in the garden "**mit bloßem Haupt**". "Ich nehm's auf meine Kappe" are Homburg's penultimate words before the premature charge, and the Elector ensures that he take full responsibility. Although Homburg's physical danger is minimized by his compatriot Hohenzollern, it is interesting to note that his remark "Es wird den Hals nicht kosten" (776) coincides with his act of distancing himself from Homburg (Reeve, *Pursuit of Power* 125-126). Homburg himself revolts at his potential decapitation: "Bei Gott, in mir nicht findet er den Sohn, / Der, unterm Beil des Henkers, ihn bewundre" (782-783). After the "Todesangstszene" (III/4) and before the scene in which Homburg confronts the power of the Elector's letter (IV/4), he has seemingly accepted his fate. Scene three of act four is a turning point: "Ich will auf halbem Weg mich niederlassen!" (1289). In the words of Homburg, everybody's or every body's head must fall: "Wer heut sein Haupt noch auf der Schulter trägt, / Hängt es schon morgen zitternd auf den Leib, / Und übermorgen liegt's bei seiner Ferse" (1290-1292). Yet for Kottwitz this situation would pose little difficulty, because his head, according to the oath he had sworn, no longer

belongs to him, but to the Elector: "Und nichts Dir gäb ich, was nicht Dein gehöre!" (1608). Despite the castrative associations of losing one's head in *Amphitryon*, the context of this play does not tend to support this meaning. It is an issue of control. Firstly, the Elector takes away Homburg's sword -- with all that this weapon entails -- and in the end never returns it. Secondly, the head imagery remains a metaphorical reference to the (historically authentic) possibility of execution, which in actual practice is carried out by firing squad.

Conclusion

"Aus so krummem Holze, als woraus der Mensch gemacht ist,
kann nichts ganz gerades gezimmert werden".
(Kant, "Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte..." 41)

The wounded body inhabits Kleist's "Literatur des Krieges" (Carrière), in which his figures find themselves at the very extremity of their physical and psychological existence. War is the embodied exercise of power and violence, a practice of catastrophe. Since "[i]n Kleists Szenarios ist der Ausnahmezustand der Normalfall", throughout the chronological order of his works, the body is manipulated, organized, mobilized and materialized in a permanent state of emergency: "Zum Normalfall einer "allgemeinen Not der Welt" aber pflegt in Kleists Texten unversehens der Ausnahmefall einer besonderen Katastrophe hinzuzutreten" (Hörisch 158). His first drama *Die Familie Schroffenstein* portrays two branches of the same family at war within itself, while in *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, "ein großes ritterliches Schauspiel", the noble classes feud over property rights. Even Kleist's two comedies, *Der zerbrochne Krug* and *Amphitryon*, evoke a military crisis: in the former drama, Ruprecht's allegedly imminent conscription and Adam's perfidy in the matter bring the judge and Eve into the same complicitous constellation and thereby brings about the fall of the jug. Amphitryon, "ein großer Feldherr", returns from a victorious military campaign -- and finds himself cuckolded. There remain, of course, the war dramas and their combatants: *Penthesilea* (Amazons against the Greeks), *Die Hermannsschlacht* (the tribes of Germania against the Romans), and finally *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* (Prussia against Sweden). These wars provide a backdrop for a number of other conflicts occurring within the plot: for example, although *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* ends with the patriotic cry: "Nieder in den Staub mit den Feinden Brandenburgs!" (1858), the dramatic tension between Homburg and the Elector, between young and old, and the clash of values between "Gefühl und Gesetz" (Müller-Seidel, *Versehen und Erkennen* 179), also represent personal, generational, and psychological sites of conflict. Although a state of war provides an instance of large-scale conflict, Kleist places his characters to yet another level of extremity. *Die Familie*

Schroffenstein, for example, depicts a blood feud between two branches of the same family -- a tragic theme bordering on conventionality -- whose patriarchs kill each other's offspring. A war between the Greeks and the Trojans, notes Hörisch (158) is disrupted by the third party of the Amazons, who fight them both. Achilles is not merely killed, but devoured. The Romans are not merely defeated, but are exterminated.

War, as a totalization of all aspects of social formations, causes truth to be its first casualty. The truth of an event or state of emergency remains as a trace written on the body, a wounded body which may be obliterated; the wound of Achilles corporealizes Penthesilea, who in turn incorporates him. Kleist's body is a sign of absolute desire, an instance in *Penthesilea* in which total love and total war are played out to their ultimate conclusion. The body is also for Kleist the point beyond all equivocation, and is for judge Adam his final downfall: when Licht jams the wig on Adam's head, there is no longer any doubt regarding his guilt or innocence. His lies are betrayed by his uncovered body, which is not erased, but exiled. As *Der zerbrochne Krug* plays with the dialectic of bodily concealment and exposure, so too do other works depict alternating states of vulnerability ("Verwundbarkeit": the capacity to be wounded) and invulnerability.

In contrast to the militaristic focus on armour and vulnerability in his later dramas, Kleist's first works juxtapose nakedness and concealment by focussing on characters' clothing. As with Natalie's glove, Johann of *Die Familie Schroffenstein* fetishizes Agne's veil, which staunched his wound. Ottokar and Agnes' clothing exchange fails to protect them. This exchange does not bring about the tragedy, for Rupert and Sylvester were equally determined to kill the other's child; the potential horror of this concluding tableau lies in the fact that either dead child will do, their interchangeable clothing merely ironizing their unalterbale roles as victims. The external appearance of Jupiter and Amphitryon, Mercury and Sosias belies the mortals' justifiable obsession with bodily disintegration and fragmentation. The invasion of their domestic spaces is represented by the servant's marked back and -- perhaps due to his rank -- by Amphitryon's self-inflicted metaphorically bent helmet plumage. Amphitryon and Ruprecht share the same trauma of imagined bad faith and react by disassociating their senses from their organs of perception. They cannot believe what they see: in Ruprecht's

words, "Was ich mit Händen greife kann, glaub ich gern" (1176). While each play marches towards its resolution, the gradual assembly of the judge's clothes and accessories of office in *Der zerbrochne Krug* also marks the passage of time. Alkmene's chaste diadem, altered and marked like the fragmented body of Amphitryon's imagination, is never worn by her. Adam's wig, which does not complete the assemblage of props that symbolize Adam's authority, achieves its rightful place only towards the comic resolution, which threatens to become a revolution. Bootless and without his mantle of authority, Adam endures a second beating from Ruprecht, who beats his coat, while his wig whips his back. Doubleness is a theme common to these dramas, a unity disrupted by the trauma of bodily harm or the physical props and extensions that are to stand in for these absent limbs.

The terror of and towards the unprotected body takes on an extreme dimension in *Penthesilea* and *Die Hermannsschlacht*. To see Achilles is to misperceive him as an image, whose mirror-like armour reflects Penthesilea's gaze back to herself. When she truly recognizes him without his reflecting skin of armour, she rends him to pieces. As Chaouli argues, the drama centers on the collapse of aesthetic distance, in which Penthesilea's sense of sight -- which strikes her first inner wound -- gives way to her literal sense of taste. "The deadly metaphor" of *Penthesilea* is reinscribed on the body of Hally in the *Hermannsschlacht*. She is dis-membered so that the tribes of Germania can re-member, while Penthesilea's act of cannibalism is transferred to the bear of Cheruska, Thusnelda's surrogate, which devours Ventidius. To use the phrasing of Barbara Kennedy, the campaign is fought over the woman's body as a battleground.

While sharing the motif of the fall in all its meanings, the wound as consequences of these collisions with other bodies yields an apparent hierarchy of the body. When viewed as a single unity, as the Body of Kleist as opposed to the unique and gendered bodies of Kleist, the disparate hands and arms populating his dramas indicate an ordering principle. The hand, as already noted and in conjunction with the neck, is an important bodily symbol for Kleist, and mediates between other bodies and other consciousnesses. Thus the wounded hands of vom Strahl and Homburg, in the two plays that juxtapose most strongly the power of prophetic dreams and the desire for a woman, characterize

the problematic relationship between the male and female protagonists. The militaristic posturing of vom Strahl, with his "Arm/ stahlgeschient", finds its equivalent in the warfare between Achilles and Penthesilea and Hermann and the Romans. Not only does the initial appearance of Achilles on stage as a bleeding, sweating and distracted man relativize his status as a Homeric hero, but also his arm wound, inflicted by Penthesilea, serves as a portent. The irony of Hermann's wound, sustained during single combat with Fust, also accentuates his role as a soldier, only to undermine such heroism by its context. Perhaps as a gentle satire on Amphitryon's impotence and authority -- or perhaps because Molière's work did not include it -- this soldier sustains no other wound except to his ego, and the towering headgear of Achilles or vom Strahl contrasts with Amphitryon's crooked helmet plumage. Adam, with the name that could symbolize both the highest and lowest human drives for reasoning or carnal knowledge, is injured on the head and the foot, the latter bringing contact not with others, but with the earth from which all humans, according to the Bible, have sprung.

To compensate for the body's mutilation, or to alleviate its absence, Kleist manufactures prosthetic media which intervene between bodies. In his dramas, the prosthesis is embodied by the pen, the sword, the letter, the word, or the wig, all of which extend and replace an incomplete or absent body. It is intriguing that the extensive devices in Kleist's dramas mediate between bodies and are connected to the body. The most notable prosthesis is the bow of the Amazons, whose replacement of their left breast with a military weapon fulfils a number of functions. Firstly, the bow of Tanais heralds the foundation of a state founded not only on specific rituals (such as the "Rosenfest") but also on bodily characteristics. Secondly, the fusion of the inorganic (the bow) with the organic (the body) institutes an efficient fusion of human and machine. Since Penthesilea emphasizes that the Amazons, despite this apparent lack of the "Sitz der Gefühle", still have feelings, the bow replaces nothing, but extends the bearer's communicative reach and gestural vocabulary. Achilles understands this prosthetic language: "Brautwerber schickt sie mir, gefiederte, / Genug in Lüften zu, die ihre Wünsche / Mit Todgeflüster in das Ohr mir raunen" (596-598). Her winged messengers will meet his armed response of "Küssen heiß von Erz" (606). When the prosthetic

structure of their communication breaks down, the end of mediation ensues: her fleshly incorporation of his body.

In a second instance of prosthetic imagery, the glove, the crucial embodiment of Homburg's dream as he lies "mit offener Brust", is the object seized instead of Natalie's hand. This fetish, a keepsake to Homburg, who significantly tucks the glove into his "Kollett", returns it to its owner by placing it on the floor. Yet Homburg's hand sustains a wound, and the white glove of Natalie is replaced in a symbolic exchange by the black bandage. The play's resolution reinvokes the symbolism of its beginning -- the wreath and the chain -- without the mediation of the glove. If the glove hinders the sensual stimulation of touch, Homburg's blindfold, which has replaced both glove and bandage, effectively blinds him. When Natalie, in fulfilling Homburg's dream experience, grants him the wreath and the chain of office and "**drückt seine Hand an ihr Herz**" (1851ff), she enunciates through their unmediated bodily contact an end to a prosthetic relationship. "Die Freude," notes Natalie upon his collapse, "tötet ihn!" (1852). On a more parodic note, vom Strahl never confronts Käthchen without his armour, a fact emphasized frequently in the stage directions; he retains his gloves in III/6, for example, when he strokes Käthchen's cheeks (1748). The awkwardness of such a gesture becomes comically exacerbated when she tries to kiss his (still gloved) hand (1751ff). At the concluding wedding scene, it is not clear from the stage directions whether or not vom Strahl is wearing his armour. What is clear is that Käthchen, "**im kaiserlichen Brautschmuck**" (2663ff), collapses when vom Strahl "**umfaßt**" her. As with *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, this traumatic physicality concludes a symbolic exchange: the Kaiser asks her to exchange a ring, a "Rundung" of Freudian dimensions, while Theobald asks her: "Willst du dem Grafen deine Hand geben?" (2674). As discussed in the previous chapter, vom Strahl's own hand bears the trace of his encounter with the prosthetic body of Kunigunde. Their fetishized armour, simultaneously inaminate extensions and duplicates of their biological selves, delineates vulnerability by its very absence. In his touching of Kunigunde's armoured breast, vom Strahl's unarmoured hand bleeds from its wound. What was a physical trace for vom Strahl is a psychological shock for Käthchen, who suffers speechless amazement at Kunigunde's self-revelation

of her true and unadorned body. Homburg's "offene Brust" and vom Strahl's chink in his armour betoken a vulnerable receptivity seen in their respective falls and faints.

What characterizes several instances of bodily harm is their spatial situation: Adam, Walter, Achilles, Homburg, and vom Strahl are all injured offstage, and the incident is subsequently reported. Adam's fall and Achilles' wounding occur analytically before the beginning of the drama, thus placing their body trauma outside of temporal boundaries. In these unseen instances of bodily breakdown, a second aspect becomes apparent. Each figure suffers some form of injury between locations, or in a spatial threshold. Homburg falls from his horse while riding from headquarters to Fehrbellin, vom Strahl injures himself by touching Kunigunde or his saddle before accompanying her into his castle, while Walter's carriage breaks down while underway from Holla to Huisum. The siting of these incidents at in-between points of crossing seem to allude to a character's act of transgression, a breaking of norms embodied by the crossing of a threshold into a forbidden space. It is therefore not surprising, as Jacobs notes, that Homburg's transgression takes place at Fehrbellin, "the border between the homeland and the foreign" (Jacobs 115), while his dream took place within the Elector's garden.

Aside from this mode of location, male bodily trauma is metaphorically connected to contact with women, as the domestic sphere becomes a further site of transgression and retribution. In relation to the ominous bird and bait imagery of II/10 in *Käthchen*, Adam's presence in Eve's chamber and his flight from the window correlate our understanding of how internal womanly spaces represent in Kleist's dramas a primal scene of male anxieties. Adam falls from a window, a transition point between inside and outside, but also at which he and Eve and the jug have their encounter. When Kunigunde's servant Rosalie's remarks "Seht nur dieses Federchen. Das ließ er stecken" (1260), vom Strahl has been not only partially emasculated, but also brought into Kunigunde's sphere of influence. Licht notes that Adam has also left something behind, as his wig is found in the following condition:

> ...Sie hing gespießt,
> Gleich einem Nest, im Kreuzgeflecht des Weinstocks,
> Dicht unterm Fenster, wo die Jungfer schläft.

(1266-1269)

Three elements are brought into play in the passage cited above: the imagery of the nest, the window, the term "gespießt", all of which can be associated with the bird imagery, the window, and the term "stecken" found in the parallel scene of *Käthchen*. Kunigunde holds the "Leimrute", Rupert the dangerous door handle. Similar to vom Strahl, Adam bears the physical traces of his encounter, but he will not have to pay the price demanded of Achilles or Ventidius, the latter whose rape of Thusnelda's lock costs him dearly.

With the exception of *Penthesilea*, these violent collisions between bodies seemingly leave the female body as victim of male violence either abject, absent or as a metaphor. Starting with *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, Agnes is murdered not as a woman, but as Ottokar, and by her own father. Eve and Alkmene, both victims of male sexual aggression -- Eve is blackmailed and Alkmene is raped -- are viewed as property by their respective male protectors who in turn verbally abuse them. In the *Hermannsschlacht*, the woman's body stands for the violated territory of a nation, and the ritual mutilation of Hally, murdered by her father, instrumentalizes her corpse in order to unify the German body politic. Thusnelda, whose lock had been stolen by Ventidius, kills him vicariously, once the she was made aware of the Roman threat -- real or imagined -- to German womens' bodily integrity. Käthchen's bodily traumas, although she follows vom Strahl under the threat of his whip and her own fainting impulses, are self-inflicted, while Kunigunde's aging body and acute intelligence with regard to language and writing contrasts with the title heroine's seeming invulnerability and simple-mindedness, the latter of which borders on the parodic. Natalie, of *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, presents an interesting case, as she not only intervenes in state affairs but also falsifies written orders, an act of insubordination which results in neither physical nor legal sanctions. What Thusnelds carries out vicariously, Penthesilea does literally. Only in *Penthesilea*, whose main protagonists alternate gender roles to the point of their interchangeability, does Kleist present a heroine who inflicts as much harm as she receives -- and then expires. Through Penthesilea's wounded neck and battered armoured body, Kleist introduces a heroine who can be wounded to the innermost and

outermost point of her being.

As the brief summary above on female bodily depiction demonstrates, unlike the recurring patterns of male falling and wounding, there exists no consistent mode of categorizing women's bodies across Kleist's dramatic works. Even when *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, *Amphitryon*, and *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* conclude with a tableau that points towards a newly reified male power, exemplified by the prostrated figures of their heroines, *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*, for example, seems to offer the possibility of a role for women in the state, while it is Eve's words which conclusively unseat judge Adam. However, Natalie's subversion in the end tends to work within the framework of the Elector's improvised plans, and she acts as one of the desired objects along with the significantly circular chain and wreath; Eve exchanges Adam's influence for that of Walter (which is sealed with a kiss), whose money buys Ruprecht's body back from the state. These ambivalences of gender and power find their most complex voice in the "body drama" *Penthesilea*. On the one hand, her physical tendency to collapse and suffer wounding aligns the title heroine with other Kleist protagonists, such as Homburg or Käthchen. On the other, her sovereignty over her self and body is expressed by her material understanding of language and its relationship to the body. Yet a discussion of the body of Kleist, in its war-torn and wounded form, must take into account his piece "Über das Marionettentheater", even when it erases and effaces the female body in the same way Penthesilea dis-figures (ie. destroys the metaphor) of Achilles' body. Kleist effaces the woman's body altogether and ascribes the quality of "Anmut" to the male body (Hart 92) in his treatment of grace of movement and mutilation. In this prose piece, the wounded men and invalidated soldiers of his dramas are reenlisted in Kleist's war.

According to John Ellis' skeptical view, what often characterizes certain examples of Kleist criticism is the tendency to seek a key text or narrative, which in turn provides a prism through which one could view Kleist's entire oeuvre. "Über das Marionettentheater", for example, while being understood as both a poetics and/or a form of anthropology, has nonetheless been seen as an interpretive device for understanding Kleist's characters, in that critics specifically find in the essay a way of explaining the dramatic representation of stages of consciousness, linking the question of the puppet's

grace to Adam's fallen state or Käthchen and Homburg's sonambulism[1]. Ilse Graham's study, for example, sees Genesis 3, as retold through the essay, as "nothing less than the fountain-head of his poetic world" (*World into Flesh* 14). Where this essay becomes relevant for this study is through its dominant topic, described by Helmut Schneider as the human body and its representation through language (210-211), a topic common to the genre of drama. The divisions in Kleist scholarship on his dramas, based largely on the extent to which one relies on metaphysics and philosophy as interpretive models, are also apparent in the scholarly reception of the essay: it has been read "for generations as a[n] exposition of the classical topic of grace in the context of the idealist philosophy of history" (Schneider 209). However, "the idea ... of a teleological and apocalyptic history of consciousness is, of course, one of the most seductive, powerful, and deluded topoi of the idealist and romantic period" (de Man 267). The essay is notable for its stand outside traditional aesthetic writings of the classical period, for its silences and ambivalences.

We have, according to Kleist's version of the myth, no other way but forward to the second eating from the tree of knowledge. When we approach Paradise from the outside, the door is locked from the inside, "inwendig / Verriegelt" (2630-2631) in Johann's words from Kleist's first literary work. There were in human mythology two falls, from Paradise and from Babel, a phenomenon not entirely unfamiliar to judge Adam, whose remark: "Zwei Fälle gibt's..." embodies the play's "zweideutige Lehre" on the carnality of the fallen body and the play of fallen language. In the act of making a play on words (and the *Zerbrochne Krug* as a "semantische Komödie" (Hörisch) is a "play" on or about words) Adam joins the cases and the falls in the double meaning of the "Fall". Those who make the circuit of the "ringförmige Welt" may achieve some kind of grace, but perhaps at a cost. Both Adam and the youth are "Täter und ... Richter seiner Tat" (Reh 105). They are the reader and the read, a condition exemplified and overcome by the fencing bear, whose "reading" of his opponent resists his own textualized marking by the point of Herr C...'s rapier. This resistance to being pinned down is enacted by this piece itself: "Es geht um alles" is Gerhard Kurz's brief formulation of its interpretive surplus (264).

Some traditional forms of interpretation generally avoid situating this essay chronologically within Kleist's brief period of literary production. A relatively late work, "Über das Marionettentheater" was published in December, 1810, after Kleist had already begun his last plays. It is tempting with regard to the myth of creation and the Fall to view *Der zerbrochne Krug* through the prism of the essay, even when the play's central focus had already been established in 1803. The interpretive move suggested here does take into account the importance of the essay for Kleist's dramas, but simply reverses the implicit and questionable cause and effect relationship. "Über das Marionettentheater" should not be understood as a theory of consciousness and loss that propels the plays, but rather as a culmination of Kleist's dramatic practice. As a hybrid text, a prose piece that incorporates dialogue (the fundamental prerequisite for drama), "Über das Marionettentheater" is the product of the plays, rather than the other way around. This "narrated dialogue" (Helmut Schneider 224), or "Protokoll" (Mayer 66) additionally "operates like a theatrical piece and the unfolding of the argument is pure performance" (Hart 91).

In the following section, one such relationship between *Der zerbrochne Krug* and the essay will come under scrutiny. For example, while Adam looks in the mirror in the play's first scene in order to examine his ruined face, the youth of the essay also looks in the mirror, only to note how his living pose imitates a work of art. Kleist's fictional portrait of the youth's ruin, in terms of empirical chronology of textual production, occurs long after Adam's fall. Instead of of following the narrative of biological aging and suggesting that the youth somehow represents the young Adam (ruined from within) who is later also ruined from without (as the "old" Adam, the stigmatized judge), I would argue that the textual echo is flowing from the opposite direction. In the associations among knowledge, artifice, or nakedness (the youth is naked, the judge partially so, without wig, vest, boots), the old Adam gives way to the new one, whose fall is initiated by another form of consciousness, or artifice; the literal becomes symbolic, part of Kleist's threefold game with the literal fall, the "Rechtsfall" and the "Sündenfall". Adam's "geschundner Fuß" and battered skull embody what would become the inner wound of the posing youth, who unconsciously imitates another figure

contemplating his foot, the statue of the "Dornauszieher". Thus the progress of reflection is more refined: the youth confronts "not himself, but his resemblance to another ... [which] is not another subject but a work of art" (de Man 278).

The wound inscribes the fallen state of a modern subject, in which self-recognition comes as a consequence of a fall from grace. The beautiful and graceful youth, while imagining himself pulling the thorn out of his foot, recognizes in his own mirror image his life's imitation of art. His self-conscious objectification in the mirror and his awareness of the moment eventually cause him to lose his grace. What brings the youth to awareness is the narrator's mocking response to his "Entdeckung": "...ich lachte und erwiderte -- er sähe wohl Geister!" (343); when the youth fails to recreate the action, absurdly attempting to do so "wohl doch zehnmal" (343), the author has difficulty "das Gelächter zurückzuhalten" (344). Ruth Angress and William Reeve have demonstrated respectively that vom Strahl and Hohenzollern either laugh or cry at conventionally inappropriate moments; even Hermann, after losing a single combat, laughs in this instance. The laughing subject may be purged and cured; the object of laughter, be it the comic Adam or the youth before the mirror, is condemned to exile.

Knowledge of oneself or of the external world, it would seem in Kleist's fictional worlds, must come at the expense of the body. Following his failure to repeat the gesture consciously, an "eisernes Netz" (334) encloses the gracefulness of the youth's movements, and the physical traces of his obsession take their toll. The analogy between Käthchen's near-perfection (the identifying mole on her neck), Kunigunde's own "net of iron" (her "eisernes Hemd") and the youth becomes more prominent when they act out their respective psychological impulses: Käthchen jumps from a window and breaks her legs, Kunigunde is consistently linked to the mirror, much in the same way the youth spends days before the mirror, losing his "Lieblichkeit" (344). More than simply representative opposites of idealized and corrupted femininity, Käthchen and Kunigunde are perhaps to be seen through the prism of "Über das Marionettentheater" as starting and endpoints of self-consciousness. Käthchen, whose mole is analogous to the youth's allusion to the splinter, shares with him a bodily uniqueness (better expressed by the German "Einmaligkeit") of appearance. This one-time and random citation of the statue

becomes graceless due to the youth's conscious attempts to re-cite the gesture. Kunigunde, by way of discursive dissimulation and her second body, endlessly reproduces her self and body. Unlike some of Kleist's prominent female characters (Eve, Thusnelda, and Käthchen), who are specifically shown to be illiterate, Kunigunde shares with Natalie (in *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*) the ability to read and write and thereby to threaten to disrupt the male order. Yet the thorn in the statue's foot is merely the first step into the external world. What ultimately costs him his grace is his encounter with artifice. Sean Allan, seeing the figure of the youth as a representative of a class of artists imprisoned by convention, suggests that the youth undergoes not only a physical trauma, but also an aesthetic experience. When the youth notes how his pose resembles that of a statue, he attempts to imitate the pose in the same way artists are captive to an aesthetic theory or tradition, vainly attempting to recreate the past (Allan 50-51). The irony in the youth's attempts to reproduce the pose is exacerbated by the statue's own status as a reproduction ("...der Abguß ... ist bekannt und befindet sich in den meisten deutschen Sammlungen" (343)) and a static form. A second source of irony, in de Man's view, is to be found in the questionable beauty of the statue itself, whose action of removing a splinter (juxtaposed with the youth's drying off his foot) requires a great deal of idealization to be seen as graceful (279). This idealization had already taken place: once symbolizing original sin in the medieval era, the "Dornauszieher" became in Winckelmann's treatment the embodiment of grace (Kurz 270).

The contrast between motion and immobility, originality and imitation and the inanimate and animate, also lies at the core of the youth's encounter with his mirrored image, which is doubly reflected in the figure of the youth (seen by himself in the mirror) and the coincidental representation of the statue. The circularity of reading "Über das Marionettentheater" as a commentary on Kleist's dramatic themes brings us to where the youth had begun, and where many of Kleist's plays begin, with the "Fehltritt", the necessary mis-step forward.

What kind of foot will take this step? Although writings on Kleist's essay on the marionette theater have put forward a number of challenging and intriguing attempts to reconcile this text with his other works, I would prefer to leave the already thoroughly

examined relationship between grace, consciousness and the Fall, and look at the fusion of the organic body to the inorganic, a joining common to this text and to his dramas. Although critics generally divide up the essay into three main figures and their stories (the puppets contrasted with human dancers, the "Dornauszieher" episode, the fencing bear), a significant minority of critics has attached significance to another figure in the narrative: the amputee equipped with a prosthesis, "der würd'ge Holzgebein" (470) limping in the background of *Der zerbrochne Krug*. As with the fallen youth, the implications of the link between grace and mutilation is, in the view of Cynthia Chase, one possible reason why "...respondents to Kleist's "Marionette Theater" universally avoid this particular explanatory device invoked by this fluent dancer" (146). As with the essay's unstable and complex tensions between masculinism and feminism (Bohm 207), this abrupt insertion of the wounded body (a living being with artificial "Glieder") disrupts the assumed binary relationship between the inanimate "Gliedermann" (man of limbs) and the infinitely conscious "Gott". The dancing invalids synthesize both living and non-living elements, located between the professional dancer Herr C... and the dead members (341-342) of the dancing marionnettes.

The framing of the momentary digression directs the reader's attention away from this passage (appropriately described as an appendage or prosthesis (Chase 146)), because both the narrator and Herr C... turn their respective gazes away from each other. Herr C..., for example, begins his question, "da ich den Blick schweigend zur Erde schlug" (341), while the close of the topic is signified by Herr C...'s redirection of his gaze: "da er seinerseits ein wenig betreten zur Erde sah" (341). As someone who is "betreten", Herr C... has gotten, so to speak, underfoot. He has perhaps touched a sore spot on his partner's body, by gazing at his legs.

While discusing the gracefulness of a projected dancing puppet prototype, Herr C... confronts the narrator with the following question:

> Haben Sie, fragte er, da ich den Blick schweigend zur Erde schlug: haben Sie von jenen mechanischen Beinen gehört, welche englische Künstler für Unglückliche verfertigen, die ihre Schenkel verloren haben? (341)

As Cixous notes, Kleist "constantly writes of legs" (55), whose amputation evokes in her view a male fear of castration. This sexual and/or physical lack, however, seems incredibly to bear relatively minor consequences. Herr C... asserts that such unfortunates can dance, but with "...einer Ruhe, Leichtigkeit und Anmut, die jedes denkende Gemüt in Erstaunen setzen" (341). The narrator of this ironic dialogue may be more or less pulling the reader's leg, since the counter-intuitive argument seems to suggest that "anyone can easily be replaced by a prosthesis" (Cixous 34). "The interlocutors", notes Helmut Schneider, "talk about their own replaceability" (223). However, such a possibility of replacement is never total, but only partial. What were nearly disastrous encounters with the forces of the material world in his "Unwahrscheinliche Wahrhaftigkeiten" -- the bullet encircling the soldier's body and the blast which carries another across a river -- seem in the artificial leg's attachment to the organic body of its bearer to enact a more fortunate fusion. "Wer Gliedmaßen vergessen kann," writes Hölter, "tanzt besser, wer sie verliert, vielleicht am besten" (354). Thus the two developmental stages of human consciousness, be it the grace found "in dem Gliedermann oder in dem Gott" (345)), may be mediated through the intervention of the non-human into the human in the form of an imposed absence. This absence, or loss, may be represented by a wound or compensated by a prosthesis. The statue of the "Dornauszieher" may represent the kind of grace achieved through a micro-prosthesis, the inserted wooden "Splitter" which evokes "Zersplitterung, Zerbrechen" (Kurz 271) coupled with an act of "imaginary healing" (Helmut Schneider 221). Thus grace seems possible after the Fall. When we view the essay through the significant falls and wounds of Homburg and vom Strahl, "the enabling condition of perfect grace" becomes the "condition of mutilation" (Chase 146).

The medical prosthesis that replaces a bodily absence (as in Götz's iron hand) animates the bodily metaphors visible in a number of Kleist's dramas: Adam's impaled wig and coat and Amphitryon's "geknickter Federbusch" are but two examples of metonymy which came under discussion in previous chapters. As prosthetic devices, they stand in for and reproduce mutilated bodies. Such a prosthetic display represents Kunigunde's practice of effects. What Käthchen lacks is the doubleness of a second body,

a body which for Kunigunde manifests itself in the materiality of language (represented by her "wounding" questioning of Strahl) or her suit of armour (or other prosthetic tools as extensions of her body: the pen): these elements fuse to wound vom Strahl. What is generally overlooked in discussions of this hybrid essay is the interaction between the "Maschinist" and the marionettes he manipulates. The deliberate focus on the components of the "Glieder-mann" tends to divert the reader's attention away from the source of the puppet's motion, its human operator. Thus the marionette performs two functions. Driven by the movements of its operator, it mimics the operator's motions. Coupled with this mimetic function is the marionette's reproducibility as a body double. The doubling of the body is visible in the youth's gaze in the mirror and in the gaze of his onlooker, in the reciprocal gestures of the fencer and the bear, and finally in the fallen gaze of the two conversation partners, who look alternately at each other and then at the ground.

This essay is not only about grace and motion, but also about loss -- the loss of that internal sense of balance ("Schwerpunkt") in the case of the youth, or the loss of the fencing match with bear. Both scenes have the sense of sight at their center, in the youth's looking at himself in a moment of stillness that causes him to lose his looks, and in the eyes of the bear seeing into the soul of his frantically feinting oppponent. The amputee suffers the physical loss of the his leg, a loss that is somewhat paradoxically compensated by the artificial limb; he becomes something more and something less. The particular virtue of the prosthesis is its facility to allow the wearer to dance with an astonishing artfulness, the only anecdotal demonstration of the device's effectiveness that Herr C... shares with his dialogue partner. The mechanical and mundane prosthetic device, issued to its user as a result of a trauma, shows its application not as a healing measure, but rather as a prop in the aesthetic realm of the dance. While perhaps more an aesthetic essay than a poetics, "Über das Marionettentheater" hinges on the distinction between art and artifice, the organic and the inorganic, and produces a synthesis between the two in the figure of the amputee, who is a conscious "Glieder-mann". Aside from the motion of the puppets, the invalid is the only figure in the piece whose movements are described positively. This essay on disjointedness (Bohm 207) expresses far more -- or less -- than the desire for the "utopia of a non-body" (Helmut Schneider 218).

For Kleist, writing was a compulsion and a necessity, embodied by the moving paradox of a prosthesis metaphor: it replaces that which is missing or absent by partially performing some of the functions of these missing elements, yet the prosthesis intervenes between the bearer's natural body and other bodies. This mutation embodies a form of mutilation. If we return to Kleist's original authorial activity, the sometimes highly stylized letters to his female correspondents, one can see how this paradox functions at the level of writing, the cutting and etching of the word on the page. Nowhere was Kleist more emotionally close to his finacée Wilhelmine than when he was geographically distant from her. This paradox, in which his expressed passion was seemingly inversely proportional to his proximity to the addressee, reflects the mediating role of written artifice. Kleist saw the letter as a substitute and extension of his body, as an extension, for example, when ink mingled with tears or the blood written across the bodies of Achilles and Penthesilea.

Kleist ended his writing career on the shores of the Wannsee, his last performance and final act of punctuation. Punctuation, the act of inscribing the point of a thought or a bullet, plays a role in the play with which he most identified. Achilles, learning the name of his lover and killer, prefigures Kleist's swan song: "Mein Schwan singt noch im Tod: Penthesilea" (1829). Death : Penthesilea, a sign of congruence found in the twin bullet holes in Henriette Vogel's breast and in his mouth. Before Kleist shot himself in the head, he had shot Henriette Vogel in the heart: a drama of the plus and minus, reason and emotion, man and woman (Hoverland, "Visions..." 82), and perhaps his final commentary on the opening and concluding scene of his penultimate work *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. He directed and performed his final work on November 21st, 1811, ending his drama not with a shout, but a shot which canonizes those who speak like Penthesilea with and through their bodies the higher language of the wordless gesture. "Homburgs Traum", writes Hans Mayer, "der eigentlich ein Künstlertraum ist, geht auf der Bühne in Erfüllung, aber Kleist stirbt" (52). Although he had lived to see only three of his dramas staged in his lifetime, Kleist nonetheless knew how to "perform" and "stage" a suicide, charging the pistols with enough powder to kill, but not to disfigure. If we accept the basis of all drama as dialogue, then we must also comprehend

the basis for his last theatrical mission, the quest for someone to accompany him on the day of his death. In the words of another playwright, for him the "gebrechliche Einrichtung der Welt" was "Bedingung einer Existenz als Autor ... und zuletzt der Grund, sich als Person auszulöschen" (Müller 15).

One is never finished with Kleist. His works are an open wound, yet his words, like Penthesilea's arrows or the fencing bear, can turn on us and strike wounds. For Christa Wolf: "dieses Stück [*Penthesilea*] ... entspringt ... dem Schmerz über eine zuckende niemals heilende Wunde: daß er nicht, wie er es braucht, geliebt wird, daß er nicht lieben kann" (165). The unrequited lover Johann, from *Die Familie Schroffenstein* (844-846), provides the last words of this thesis and an inscription or epitaph for the body of Kleist:

Denn in die Brust schneid ich mir eine Wunde,
Die reiz ich stets mit Nadeln, halte stets
Sie offen, daß es mir recht sinnlich bleibe.

Endnotes

1. Of particular interest here is the division between English-speaking and German-speaking approaches to the relationship between this essay and Kleist's prose and plays. While American, Australian and British Germanists such as John Ellis, Anthony Stephens and Sean Allan to various degrees express a skeptical view of "Über das Marionettentheater"'s value as an analytical tool, German Germanisten, such as Walter Müller-Seidel, Benno von Wiese, and Gerhard Kurz, seem to retain the work's privileged status. Ilse Graham represents an exception on the Anglo-Saxon side, while Klaus Kanzog doubts that the essay should be read as a poetics at all: perhaps readable as an "Anweisung für Schauspieler" (358) concentrating "konkret auf Phänomene der Körperlichkeit des Menschen" (354), this essay "entspricht in keinem Punkt den Normen des traditionellen poetologischen Diskurses: weder Theorie und Technik der Dichtkunst noch das "Dichterische" selbst kommen zur Sprache" ("...wirklich eine Poetik?" 361). There is a further constellation of writers on the essay represented by English-speaking scholars of Romanticism (Paul de Man, Cynthia Chase, Carol Jacobs and Helmut Schneider), who carefully dismantle the essay's theoretical coherence and illustrate its "problematization of reading" (de Man 273). For a summary in German of recent approaches, see Gerhard Neumann's "Das Stocken der Sprache und das Straucheln des Körpers...", which views this work as part of an anthropological framework (cf. Kanzog, "...wirklich eine Poetik?"), while William Ray's "Suspended in the Mirror: Language and the Self in Kleist's "Über das Marionettentheater" (*Studies in Romanticism* 18.4 (1979): 521-546) offers an English overwiew of recent scholarship.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Goethe, J.W. *Die Natürliche Tochter. Goethes Werke.* vol. 5. Ed. Josef Kunz. Hamburg: Wegner, 1952.

Kleist, Heinrich von. *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe.* Ed. Helmut Sembdner. 9th ed. 2 vols. Munich: Hanser, 1993.

---. *Werke und Briefe in vier Bänden.* Ed. Siegfried Streller. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel,1986.

---. *Dramen 1802 - 1807.* Ed. Ilse-Marie Barth and Hinrich Seeba. Vol. 1 of *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe in vier Bänden.* Ed. Ilse-Marie Barth, Klaus Müller-Salget, Stefan Ormanns and Hinrich Seeba. Frankfurt a.M.: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1991.

---. *Dramen 1808 - 1811.* Ed. Ilse-Marie Barth and Hinrich Seeba. Vol. 2 of *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe in vier Bänden.* Ed. Ilse-Marie Barth, Klaus Müller-Salget, Stefan Ormanns and Hinrich Seeba. Frankfurt: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1987.

---. *Die Familie Ghonorez / Die Familie Schroffenstein. Eine textkritische Ausgabe.* Ed. Christine Edel and Klaus Kanzog. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994.

---. *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg. Text, Kontexte, Kommentar.* Ed. Klaus Kanzog. Munich: Hanser, 1977.

Klopstock, Friedrich. *Hermanns Tod. Ausgewählte Werke.* Ed. Karl August Schleiden. Munich: Hanser, 1962. 802 - 872.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet. The Contemporary Shakespeare Series.* Vol.

1. Ed. A.L. Rowse. London and Lanham, MD: The University Press of America, 1984. 459 - 585.

Secondary Sources

Allan, Sean. *The Plays of Kleist. Ideals and Illusions*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Arnold, H.L., ed. *Heinrich von Kleist*. edition text + kritik. Munich, 1993.

Arntzen, Helmut. *Die ernste Komödie. Das deutsche Lustspiel von Lessing bis Kleist*. Munich: Nymphenburger, 1968.

---. "*Prinz Friedrich von Homburg* - Drama der Bewußtseinsstufen." Walter Hinderer 213 - 238.

Aust, Hugo. "Bewährung und Erkenntnis. Heinrich von Kleist: *Der zerbrochne Krug*." *Deutsche Komödien. Vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart*. Ed. Winfried Freund. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1988. 65 - 81.

Bathe, Johannes. *Die Bewegungen und Haltungen des menschlichen Körpers in Heinrich von Kleists Erzählungen*. Tübingen: Laupp, 1917.

Beil, Ulrich. "Der rasende Gott. Kleists *Penthesilea* und die Rolle des Anderen in der Mythenrezeption um 1800." *Begegnung mit dem "Fremden"*. Akte des VIII. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Tokyo 1990. Ed. Schichiji and Yoshinori. Vol. 9. München: iudicium, 1991. 293 - 299.

Bennett, Benjamin. *Modern Drama and German Classicism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1979.

Biedermann, Flodard Frhr. von et al., ed. *Goethes Gespräche*. Vol. 1 (1754 bis Oktober 1808). Leipzig: F.W. Biedermann, 1909.

Bohm, Arnd. "Androgynous Realism in Heinrich von Kleist's "Die Heilige Cäcilie oder die Gewalt der Musik (eine Legende)". *Gender and Narrativity*. TADAC Papers/Cahiers TADAC II. Ed. Barry Rutland. Centre for Textual Analysis, Discourse and Culture. Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1997. 199 - 219.

Borchardt, Edith. *Mythische Strukturen im Werk Heinrich von Kleists*. New York, Bern, Frankfurt a.M., Paris: Peter Lang, 1987.

Brown, Hilda. *Kleist and the Tragic Ideal. A Study of Penthesilea and its Relationship to Kleist's Personal and Literary Development 1806-1808*. Bern, Frankfurt a.M., Las Vegas: Peter Lang, 1977.

Browning, Robert. "Kleist's Käthchen and the Monomyth." *Studies in the German Drama. A Festschrift in Honor of Walter Silz*. Ed. Donald Crosby and George Schoolfield. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974. 115 - 123.

Brüggemann, Diethelm. *Drei Mystifikationen Heinrich von Kleists*. New York, Bern, Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1984.

---. "Kleists *Der zerbrochne Krug*: Ein Satyrspiel zu Goethes *Faust*". *Faust-Blätter* 37 (1979): 1549 - 1563.

Burckhardt, Sigurd. "Kleist's *Hermannsschlacht*: The Lock and the Key". *The Drama of Language. Essays on Goethe and Kleist*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1970. 116 - 162.

Calhoon, Kenneth. "Sacrifice and the Semiotics of Power in *Der zerbrochene Krug*."

Comparative Literature 41.3 (Summer 1989): 230 - 251.

Canetti, Elias. *Masse und Macht*. Munich: Hanser, 1993.

Carrière, Mathieu. *Für eine Literatur des Krieges, Kleist*. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1990.

Catholy, Eckehard. *Das deutsche Lustspiel. Von der Aufklärung bis zur Romantik*. Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz: W. Kohlhammer, 1982.

Chaouli, Michel. "Devouring Metpahor: Disgust and Taste in Kleist's *Penthesilea*." *German Quarterly* 69.2 (1996): 125 - 143.

Chase, Cynthia. "Mechanical Doll, Exploding Machine. Kleist's Models of Narrative." *Decomposing Figures. Rhetorical Readings in the Romantic Tradition*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press. 141 - 156.

Cixous, H. *Readings. The Poetics of Blanchot, Joyce, Kafka, Kleist*. trans. Verena Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Cullens, Chris and von Mücke, Dorothea. "Love in Kleist's *Penthesilea* and *Käthchen von Heilbronn*". *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistegeschichte* 63.3 (1989): 461 - 493.

Davidson, Margaret. "The Hand in the Works of Heinrich von Kleist." *Colloquia Germanica* 19 (1986): 228 - 241.

Delbrück, Hansgerd. *Kleists Weg zur Komödie. Untersuchungen zur Stellung des Zerbrochnen Krugs in einer Typologie des Lustspiels*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1974.

de Man, Paul. "Aesthetic Formalization: Kleist's *Über das Marionettentheater.*" *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1984. 263 - 290.

Dettmering, Peter. *Heinrich von Kleist. Zur Psychodynamik in seiner Dichtung.* Munich: Nymphenburger, 1975.

Dörner, Andreas. "Die Inszenierung politischer Mythen. Ein Beitrag zur Funktion der symbolischen Formen in der Politik am Beispiel des Hermannsmythos in Deutschland". *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 34.2 (1993): 199 - 218.

Eagleton, Terry. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. Oxford and Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Ellis, John. *Kleist's **Prinz Friedrich von Homburg**. A Critical Study*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1970.

---. *Heinrich von Kleist. Studies in the Character and Meaning of his Writings*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Emmel, Felix. *Das ekstatische Theater.* Prien: Kampmann und Schnabel Verlag, 1924.

Fischer, Bernd. *Das Eigene und das Eigentliche: Klopstock, Herder, Fichte, Kleist. Episoden aus der Konstruktionsgeschichte nationaler Intentionalitäten*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1995.

Fontane, Theodor. "Kleist - *Die Hermannsschlacht.*" *Aufsätze, Kritiken, Errinerungen.* Vol. 2. Ed. Siegmar Gerndt. Munich: Hanser Verlag, 1969. 200 - 204.

Fricke, Gerhard. "*Penthesilea*". Benno von Wiese 367-389.

Frye, Lawrence. "Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*. A Comedic Lighting of Political Icons." *Colloquia Germanica* 25.3/4 (1992): 229 - 254.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "Der Gott des innersten Gefühls". *Die neue Rundschau* 2 (1961). Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1961. 340 - 349.

Gallas, Helga. "Kleists *Penthesilea* und Lacans vier Diskurse". *Kontroverse, alte und neue.* Akte des VII. Internationalen Germanistenkongresses Göttingen. Ed. Inge Stephan and Carl Piefzcker. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1986. 203 - 212.

---. "Antikenrezeption bei Goethe und Kleist: Penthesilea -- eine Anti-Iphigenie". *Momentum dramaticum. Festschrift for Eckehard Catholy.* Ed. Linda Dietrick and David G. John. Waterloo: University of Waterloo Press, 1990. 209 - 220.

Gerrekens, Louis. *Nun bist du ein verschloßner Brief. Wörtlichkeit und Bildlichkeit in Heinrich von Kleists* ***Käthchen von Heilbronn*** *und* ***Familie Schroffenstein.*** Frankfurt a.M., Bern, New York, Paris: Lang, 1988.

Goldammer, Peter. "Heinrich von Kleists *Penthesilea*. Kritik der Rezeptionsgeschichte als Beitrag zur Interpretation". *Impulse. Aufsätze, Quellen, Berichte zur deutschen Klassik und Romantik.* Ed. Peter Goldammer and Walter Dietze. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau Verlag, 1978. 200 - 231.

Gönner, Gerhard. *Von "zerspaltenen Herzen" und der "gebrechlichen Einrichting der Welt". Versuch einer Phänomenologie der Gewalt bei Kleist.* Stuttgart: Metzler, 1989.

Graham, Ilse. "The Broken Pitcher: Hero of Kleist's Comedy." *Modern Language Quarterly* 16.2 (1955): 99 - 113.

---. *Heinrich von Kleist. The Word into Flesh. A Poet's Quest for the Symbol.* Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1977.

Grathoff, Dirk. "Beerben oder Enterben? Probleme der gegenwärtigen Aneignung von Kleists *Käthchen von Heilbronn.*" *Der alte Kanon neu: Zur Revision des literarischen Kanons in Wissenschaft und Unterricht.* Ed. Walter Raitz and Eduard Schütz. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1976. 136 - 175.

---. "Der Fall des Krugs. Zum geschichtlichen Gehalt von Kleists Lustspiel". *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1981-82. 290 - 313.

---, ed. *Heinrich von Kleist. Studien zu Werk und Wirkung.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988.

---. *Kleists Geheimnisse. Unbekannte Seiten seiner Biographie.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch.* Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1984.

Grumach, Renate, ed. *Goethe. Begegnungen und Gespräche.* Vol. 5 (1800-1805). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.

Hahn, Karl-Heinz, ed. *Briefe an Goethe. Gesamtausgabe in Regestform.* Vol. 4 (1802-1804). Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1988.

Hart Nibbrig, Christriaan L. *Die Auferstehung des Körpers im Text.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1985.

Harlos, Dieter. *Die Gestaltung psychischer Konflikte einiger Frauengestalten im Werk*

Heinrich von Kleists: Alkmene, Die Marquise von O..., Penthesilea, Käthchen von Heilbronn.Frankfurt a.M., Bern, New York, Nancy: Lang, 1984.

Harms, Ingeborg. *Zwei Spiele Kleists um Trauer und Lust. Die Familie Schroffenstein. Der zerbrochne Krug.* Munich: Fink, 1990.

Hart, Gail. *Tragedy in Paradise. Family and Gender Politics in German Bourgeois Tragedy 1750-1850.* Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1996.

Heidecke, Manfred. "Berichtigte Berichtigung". *Theater der Zeit* 3 March, 1958.

Hermand, Jost. "Kleists *Penthesilea* im Kreuzfeuer geschlechtsspezifischer Diskurse." Monatshefte 87.1 (1995): 34 - 47.

Herrmann, Hans Peter. "Arminius und die Erfindung der Männlichkeit im 18. Jahrhundert." *Der Deutschunterricht* 47.2 (1995): 32 - 47.

Hettche, Walter. "'Ein eignes Blatt'. Der Schreiber Licht und der Prozeß um den zerbrochnen Krug." H.L. Arnold 84 - 99.

Hinderer, Walter (ed.). *Kleists Dramen. Neue Interpretationen.* Stuttgart: Reclam, 1981.

Holz, Hans Heinz. *Macht und Ohnmacht der Sprache. Untersuchungen zum Sprachverständnis und Stil Heinrich von Kleists.* Frankfurt a.M. and Bonn: Athenäum, 1962.

Hölter, Achim. *Die Invaliden. Die vergessene Geschichte der Kriegskrüppel in der europäischen Literatur bis zum 19. Jahrhundert.* Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1995.

Hörisch, Jochen. ""Die Not der Welt." Vieldeutige Ausnahmezustände in Kleists semantischen Komödien." *Was aber (bleibet) stiften die Dichter? Zur Dichter-Theologie der Goethezeit.* Ed. Gerhard vom Hofe, Peter Pfaff, Hermann Timm. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1986. 157 - 180.

Horn, Peter, ed. *Positionen I. Beiträge zur Germanistik. Heinrich von Kleist 1777 - 1811.* Capetown: n.p., 1977.

---. "Das erschrockene Gelächter über die Entlarvung einer korrupten Obrigkeit. Kleists zwiespältige Komödie *Der zerbrochne Krug.*" Dirk Grathoff 149 - 162.

Hoverland. Lilian. *Heinrich von Kleist und das Prinzip der Gestaltung.* Königstein/Ts: Scriptor-Verlag, 1978.

---. "Heinrich von Kleist and Luce Irigary: Visions of the Feminine." *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Neueren Germanistik.* vol. 10. Ed. Marianne Burkhard. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopoi, 1980. 57 - 82.

Hubbs, Valentine. "The Plus and Minus of Penthesilea." *Seminar* 6.3 (1970): 187 - 194.

Jacobs, Carol. *Uncontainable Romanticism. Shelley, Brontë, Kleist.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Joerden, Rudolf. "Über den Haß in der Dichtung". *Die Sammlung* 1947. 555 - 565.

Johnston, Otto. *The Myth of a Nation. Literature and Politics in Prussia under Napoleon.* Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1989.

Kamper, Dietmar, and Christian Wulf, eds. *Die Wiederkehr des Körpers.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1982.

---. "Die Parabel der Weiderkehr." Kamper and Wulf 9 - 21.

Kant, Immanuel. "Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht." *Werke in sechs Bänden.* Vol 4. Ed. Wilhelm Weischedel. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1964. 33 - 50.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Kanzog, Klaus, and Eva Kanzog. "Die Kleist-Aufzeichnungen von Wilhelm v. Schütz." *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 13 (1969): 33 - 46.

---, ed. *Heinrich von Kleist. **Prinz Friedrich von Homburg.** Text, Kontexte, Kommentar.* Munich and Vienna: Hanser, 1977.

---. "Kommunikative Varianten des Komischen und der Komödie. Zur Gattungsbestimmung der Lustspiele Heinrich von Kleists." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1981-82. 224 - 238.

---. "Heinrich von Kleists "Über das Marionettentheater" -- wirklich eine Poetik?" *Poetik und Geschichte. Viktor Zmegac zum 60. Geburtstag.* Ed. Dieter Borchmeyer. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989.

Kaußen-Mandelartz, Helga. "Morde aus Versehen? Kleists Trauerspiele *Die Familie Schroffenstein* und *Penthesilea* im Vergleich." *Studies in Humanities* 27. Shinshu University: Faculty of Arts, March 1993. 75 - 99.

Kearney, Richard. *The Wake of the Imagination.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Kehrli, Jakob Otto. *Wie **Der zerbrochne Krug** enstanden ist.* Bern: Verlag des schweizerischen Gutenbergmuseums, 1957.

Kennedy, Barbara. "For the Good of the Nation: Woman's Body as Battlefield in Kleist's *Die Hermannsschlacht.*" *Seminar* 30.1 (1994): 17 - 31.

Kittler, Wolf. *Die Geburt des Partisanen aus dem Geist der Poesie. Heinrich von Kleist und die Strategien der Befreiungskriege.* Freiburg: Rombach, 1987.

---. "Militärisches Kommando und tragisches Geschick. Zur Funktion der Schrift im Werk des preußischen Dichters Heinrich von Kleist." Grathoff 56 - 68.

---. "Bildschrift, Blindenschrift". *Beiträge zur Kleist-Forschung.* Frankfurt (Oder): Kleist-Gedenk- und Forschungsstätte, 1994. 19 - 32.

Klotz, Volker. *Kurze Kommentare zu Stücken und Gedichten.* [Hessische Beiträge zur deutschen Literatur]. Darmstadt: Eduard Roether Verlag, 1962.

---. "Aug um Zunge -- Zunge um Aug. Kleists extremes Theater." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1985. 128 - 145.

Kluge, Gerhard. "Der Wandel der dramatischen Konzeption von der *Familie Ghonorez* zur *Familie Schroffenstein.*" Walter Hinderer 52 - 72.

---. "Das Käthchen von Heilbronn oder die verdinglichte Schönheit: Zum Schluß von Kleists Drama." *Euphorion* 89.1 (1995): 23 - 36.

Angress, Ruth (Klüger). "Kleist's Treatment of Imperialism: *Die Hermannsschlacht* and "Die Verlobung in St. Domingo." *Monatshefte* 69.1 (1977): 17 - 33.

---. "Kleist's nation of Amazons." Peter Horn 5 - 28.

Klüger, Ruth. "Kleists Abkehr von der Aufklärung." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1987. 98 - 114.

---. "Die andere Hündin -- Käthchen." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1992. 103 - 115.

Kommerell, Max. "Die Sprache und das Unaussprechliche. Eine Betrachtung über Heinrich von Kleist." *Interpretation II. Deutsche Dramen von Gryphius bis Brecht.* (ed. Jost Schillemeit). Frankfurt a.M. and Hamburg: Fischer Bücherei, 1965. 185 - 222.

Kowsar, Mohammad. "Fugitive Desire: The Figural Component in Heinrich von Kleist's *Penthesilea.*" *Theatre Journal* 40.1 (March 1988): 61 - 76.

Krumpelmann, John T. "Kleist's *Krug* and Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure.*" *Germanic Review* 26.1 (1951): 13 - 21.

---. "Shakespeare's Falstaff Dramas and Kleist's *Zerbrochner Krug*". *Modern Language Quarterly* 2.4 (1951): 462 - 472.

Kurz, Gerhard. ""Gott befohlen". Kleists Dialog "Über das Marionettentheater" und der Mythos vom Sündenfall des Bewußtseins." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1981-82. 264 - 277.

Lange, Sigrid. "Kleists *Penthesilea*". *Weimarer Beiträge* 37.5 (1991): 705 - 723.

Linn, Rolf. "Comical and Humorous Elements in Kleist's *Die Hermannsschlacht.*" *Germanic Review* 47.3 (1992): 159 - 167.

Lukács, Georg. "Die Tragödie Heinrich von Kleists." in *Werke*. Vol. 7. Neuwied and Berlin: Luchterhand, 1964. 201 - 231.

Mahlendorf, Ursula. "Penthesilea's Wounded Self." *German Quarterly* 52.2 (1979): 252 - 272.

May, Kurt. "Kleists *Hermannschlacht*: eine Strukturanalyse." *Form und Bedeutung. Interpretationen deutscher Dichtung des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts.* Stuttgart: Klett, 1957. 254 - 262.

Mayer, Hans. *Heinrich von Kleist. Der geschichtliche Augenblick.* Neske: Pfullingen, 1967.

Martini, Fritz. "Kleists "Der zerbrochne Krug". Bauformen des Lustspiels". *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 9 (1965): 373 - 419.

---. "*Das Käthchen von Heilbronn* -- Heinrich von Kleists drittes Lustspiel?". *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 20 (1976): 420 - 447.

Medeiros, Paulo. "Cannabilism and Starvation: The Parameters of Eating Disorders in Literature." *Disorderly Eaters. Texts in Self-Empowerment.* Ed. Lilian Furst and Peter Graham) University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992. 11 - 27.

Michelsen, Peter. "Die Lügen Adams and Evas Fall. Heinrich von Kleists *Der zerbrochne Krug.*" *Geist und Zeichen. Festschrift für Arthur Henkel.* Ed. Herbert Anton et al. Heidelberg: Winter, 1977. 268 - 304.

---. "Die Betrogenen des Rechtgefühls. Zu Kleists *Die Familie Schroffenstein.*" *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1992. 64 - 80.

Milfull, John. "Ödipus und Adam -- Greek Tragedy and Christian Comedy in Kleist's

Der zerbrochne Krug." *German Life and Letters* 27 (1973-74): 7 - 17.

Miller, Norbert. "Verstörende Bilder in Kleists *Hermannsschlacht.*" *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1984. 97 - 105.

Mommsen, Katharina. *Kleists Kampf mit Goethe.* Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm Verlag, 1973.

Moysich, Helmut. *Die Selbst-Bildung und der Exzess des Blicks. Zum Werk Heinrichs von Kleist.* Frankfurt a.M, Bern, New York, Paris: Peter Lang, 1988.

Müller, Heiner. "DEUTSCHLAND ORTLOS. ANMERKUNG ZU KLEIST. Rede anläßlich der Entgegennahme des Kleist-Preises." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1991. 13 -19.

Müller-Seidel, Walter. "*Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*". Benno von Wiese 390 - 409.

---. "Die Vermischung des Komischen mit dem Tragischen in Kleists Lustspiel *Amphitryon.*" *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 5 (1961): 118 - 135.

---. *Versehen und Erkennen. Eine Studie über Heinrich von Kleist.* Cologne: Böhlau, 1961.

---, ed. *Heinrich von Kleist. Aufsätze und Essays.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973.

---, ed. *Kleists Aktualität. Neue Aufsätze und Essays.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981.

Muschg, Walter. "Erschreckung vor der Welt. Zu Kleists *Die Familie Schroffenstein.*" *Pamphlet und Bekenntnis.* Olten und Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, 1968.

356 - 361.

Nehring, Wolfgang. "Kleists *Prinz Fredrich von Homburg*: Die Marionette auf dem Weg zum Gott." *German Quarterly* 44.2 (1971): 172 - 184.

Neumann, Gerhard. "Hexenküche und Abendmahl. Die Sprache der Liebe im Werk Heinrich von Kleists." *Freiburger Universitätsblätter* 91 (1986): 9 - 31.

---. "...der Mensch ohne Hülle ist eigentlich der Mensch". Goethe und Heinrich von Kleist in der Geschichte des physiognomischen Blicks." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1988-89. 259 - 275.

---, (ed.) *Heinrich von Kleist. Kriegsfall - Rechtsfall - Sündenfall.* Freiburg: Rombach, 1994.

---. "Einleitung." Gerhard Neumann *Heinrich von Kleist* 7 - 11.

---. "Das Stocken der Sprache und das Straucheln des Körpers. Umrisse von Kleists kultureller Anthropologie." Gerhard Neumann *Heinrich von Kleist* 13 - 24.

Nölle, Volker. "Verspielte Identität. Eine expositorische "Theaterprobe" in Kleists Lustspiel *Amphitryon.*" *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1981-82. 160 - 180.

Nutz, Maximilian. "Lektüre der Sinne. Kleists *Penthesilea* als Körperdrama". Dirk Grathoff 248 - 262.

Pabst, Reinhard. "Blicke hinter jesuitische Jalousien. Weiße Flecken und neue Spuren zum unerklärlichen Heinrich von Kleist." *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 4 February 1997.

Paglia, Camille. *Sexual Personae*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.

Pauls, Eilhard Erich. "Das Käthchen und ihr Mantel." *Lehrproben und Lehrgänge für die Praxis der Schulen*. (October 1926): 6 - 11.

Peymann, Claus and Kreutzer, Hans Joachim. "Streitgespräch über Kleists *Hermannsschlacht*." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1984. 77 - 97.

Pfeifer, Wolfgang, et al, ed. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. 3 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1989.

Pfeiffer, Joachim. "Kleists *Penthesilea*. Eine Deutung unter den Aspekten von narzißtischer und ödipaler Problematik." Inge Stephan and Carl Piefzcker 196 - 202.

---. *Die zerbrochenen Bilder. Gestörte Ordnungen im Werk Heinrich von Kleists*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1989.

Pickerodt, Gerhart. "Penthesilea und Kleist. Tragödie der Leidenschaft und Leidenschaft der Tragödie." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 37 (1987): 52 - 67.

---. "Heinrich von Kleist. Der Widerstreit zwischen Mechanik und Organik in Kunsthteorie und Werkstruktur." *Die Mechanik in den Künsten. Studien zur ästhetischen Bedeutung von Naturwissenschaft und Technologie*. Ed. Hanno Möbius and Jörg Jochen Berns. Marburg: Jonas Verlag, 1990. 157 - 168.

Prandi, Julie. *Spirited Women Heroes. Major Female Characters in the Dramas of Goethe, Schiller and Kleist*. New York, Frankfurt a.M., Berne: Peter Lang, 1983.

Praz, Mario. *The Romantic Agony*. Trans. Angus Davidson. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP,

1970.

Reeve, W.C. "Ein Dunkles Licht: The Court Secretary in Kleist's *Der Zerbrochene Krug*." *Germanic Review* 57 (1983): 58 - 66.

---. *In Pursuit of Power. Heinrich von Kleist's Machiavellian Protagonists*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

---. *Kleist's Aristocratic Heritage and* ***Das Käthchen von Heilbronn***. Montreal and Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's UP, 1991.

---. *Kleist on Stage: 1804 - 1987*. Montreal and Kingston, London, Buffalo: McGill-Queen's UP, 1993.

---. "*Das Käthchen von Heilbronn: Amphitryon* 2." *Analogon Rationis. Festschrift für Gerwin Marahrens zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. Marianne Henn and Christoph Lorey. Edmonton: Henn and Lorey, 1994. 273 - 289

---. "On Feathers, Sex and Related Matters in Kleist's Works." *Colloquia Germanica* 28.2 (1995): 127 - 146.

---. ""Mit dem Hals bezahlt man alls." A Persistent Kleistian Motif." *Seminar* 32.3 (1996): 240 - 258.

Reh, Albert. "Der komische Konflikt in dem Lustspiel *Der zerbrochne Krug*." Walter Hinderer 93 - 113.

Reuss, Roland. ""...daß man's mit Fingern läse./" Zu Kleists *Amphitryon*." *Berliner Kleist-Blätter* 4 (1991): 3 - 26.

---. ""Im Geklüfft". Zur Sprache von Kleists *Penthesilea*." *Brandenburger Kleist-Blätter* 5 (1992): 3 - 27.

---. ""...uns, was wahr ist, zu verbergen." Notizen zur Sprache von Kleists "Lustspiel" *Der zerbrochne Krug*." *Brandenburger Kleist-Blätter 8* (1995): 3 - 18.

Ribbat, Ernst. "Babylon in Huisum oder der Schein des Seins. Sprach- und Rechtsprobleme in Heinrich von Kleists Lustspiel *Der zerbrochne Krug*." Dirk Grathoff 133 - 148.

Rösch, Ewald. "Bett und Richterstuhl. Gattungsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Kleists Lustspiel *Der zerbrochne Krug*." *Kritische Bewahrung. Festschrift für Werner Schröder*. Ed. Ernst-Joachim Schmidt. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1974. 439 - 475.

Ryan, Lawrence. "Die vaterländische Umkehr in der *Hermannsschlacht*." Walter Hinderer 188 - 212.

Sammons, Jeffrey. "Rethinking Kleist's *Hermannsschlacht*." Alexej Ugrinsky 33 - 40.

Samuel, Richard. "Kleists *Hermannsschlacht* und der Freiherr vom Stein." *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 5 (1961): 64 - 102.

Schadewalt, Wolfgang. "*Der zerbrochne Krug* von Heinrich von Kleist und Sophokles' *König Ödipus*." *Hellas und Hesperien*. Zürich: Artemis, 1960. 843 - 850.

Schlossbauer, Frank. "Das Lustspiel als Lust-Spiel. Eine Analyse des Komischen in Heinrich von Kleists "Der zerbrochne Krug"." *Zeitschrift für Germanistik* 2-3 (1992): 526 - 549.

Schmidt, Herminio. *Heinrich von Kleist. Naturwissenschaft als Dichtungsprinzip*. Bern:

Haupt, 1978.

Schneider, Helmut. "Deconstruction of the Hermeneutical Body: Kleist and the Discourse of Classical Aesthetics." *Body and Text in the Eighteenth Century*. Ed. Veronica Kelly and Dorothea von Mücke. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994. 209 - 226.

Schneider, Karl-Ludwig. "Heinrich von Kleists Lustspiel *Der zerbrochne Krug*." *Das deutsche Lustspiel*. Ed. Hans Steffen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968. 166 - 180.

Schrimpf, Hans Joachim. "*Der zerbrochne Krug*." Benno von Wiese 342 - 366.

Schwerte, Hans. "*Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*". *Der Deutschunterricht* 13.2 (1961): 5 - 26.

Seeba, Hinrich. "Der Sündenfall des Verdachts. Identitätskrise und Sprachskepsis in Kleists *Familie Schroffenstein*." Walter Müller-Seidel *Kleists Aktualität* ...

---. ""Historia in absentia". Zur Aussparung von Hermanns Schlacht bei Kleist." *Kleist-Jahrbuch* 1988-89. 242 - 252.

Seidlin, Oskar. "What the Bell Tolls in Kleist's *Der zerbrochne Krug*." *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*. 51 (1977): 78 - 97.

---. *Vom erwachenden Bewußtsein und vom Sündenfall: Brentano, Schiller, Kleist, Goethe*. Stuttgart: Klett: Cotta, 1979. 30 - 52.

Sembdner, Helmut. "Zur Sprache im *Zerbrochnen Krug*". *In Sachen Kleist. Beiträge und Forschung*. Munich: Hanser, 1974. 68 - 76.

---, ed. *Heinrich von Kleists Lebensspuren. Dokumente und Berichte der Zeitgenossen.* Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1992.

---, ed. *Heinrich von Kleists Nachruhm. Eine Wirkungsgeschichte in Dokumenten.* Frankfurt a.M.: Insel, 1984.

Smekal, Richard. "Der unanständige Kleist. Eine bisher unbekannte Kritik über Kleists *Käthchen von Heilbronn.*" *Neues Wiener Journal.* 17 Oct. 1927, 5 - 6.

Stephens, Anthony. "Die berechtigte Frage der Eve: "Was hilfts, daß ich jetzt schuldlos mich erzähle?" *Freiburger Universitätsblätter* 91 (1986): 33 - 44.

---.""Das nenn ich menschlich nicht verfahren." Skizze zu einer Theorie der Grausamkeit mit Hinblick auf Kleist." Dirk Grathoff 10 - 39.

---. "Verzerrungen im Spiegel: Das Narziß-Motiv bei Heinrich von Kleist." Gerhard Neumann 249 - 297.

---. *Heinrich von Kleist. The Plays and Stories.* Oxford and New York: Berg, 1994.

Sternberger, Dolf. "Kampf der Liebenden. Über Kleists *Penthesilea*". *Figuren der Fabel. Essays.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1950. 93 - 105.

Stipa, Ingrid. "Kleist's *Penthesilea*: from Misapprehension to Madness." *Seminar* 27.1 (1991): 27 - 38.

Streller, Siegfried. *Das dramatische Werk Heinrich von Kleists.* Berlin: Rütten und Loning, 1966.

---. "Heinrich von Kleist und Jean-Jacques Rousseau." Müller-Seidel *Heinrich von*

Kleist... 635 - 671.

---. "Thesen zu Heinrich von Kleists *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn.*" *Beiträge zur Kleist-Forschung*. Frankfurt (Oder): Kleist-Gedenk- und Forschungsstätte, 1979. 5 - 7.

Teichmann, Klaus. *Der Verwundete Körper. Zu Texten Heiner Müllers*. Freiburg: Burg-Verlag, 1986.

Thalmann, Marianne. "Das Jupiterspiel in Kleists *Amphitryon.*" *Maske und Kothurn* 9 (1963): 56 - 67.

Ueding, Gert. "Zweideutige Bilderwelt: *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn.*" Walter Hinderer 172 - 187.

Ugrinsky, Alexej, ed. *Heinrich von Kleist-Studien/Heinrich von Kleist Studies*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1980.

Vaget, Hans Rudolf. "*Die Natürliche Tochter.*" *Goethes Dramen. Neue Interpretationen*. Ed. Walter Hinderer. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1980. 210 - 225.

Vizinczey, Stephen. "The Genius Whose Time Has Come." *Truth and Lies in Literature*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986. 150 - 179.

Voss, E. Theodor. "Kleists *Zerbrochner Krug* im Lichte alter und neuer Quellen." *Wissen aus Erfahrung. Werkbegriff und Interpretation heute. Festschrift für Hermann Meyer*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1976. 338 - 370.

Ward, Mark G. "An Irresolute Resolution: On Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg.*" *Modern Languages* 58 (1977): 143 - 149.

---. *Laughter, Comdedy and Aesthetics: Kleist's Der zerbrochne Krug*. Durham: Durham University Press, 1989.

Weigand, Hermann. "Zu Kleists *Käthchen von Heilbronn.*" Walter Müller-Seidel *Aufsätze und Essays* 326 - 350.

von Wiese, Benno. *Die deutsche Tragödie von Lessing bis Hebbel.* 5th ed. Hamburg: Hoffmann and Campe, 1961.

---, ed. *Das Deutsche Drama.* Vol. 1. Zürich: Bagel Verlag, 1964.

Wills, David. *Prosthesis.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.

Wilson, Jean. ""After Molière": Kleist's *Amphitryon* and the question of genealogy." *Journal of European Studies* 19 (1989): 123 - 133.

Wittkowski, Wolfgang. "Die Verschleierung der Wahrheit in und über Kleists *Amphitryon.*" *Wahrheit und Sprache.* Festschrift für Bert Nagel zum 65. Geburtstag. Ed. Wilm Peters and Paul Schimmelpfennig et al. Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1972. 151 - 170.

---. "*Der Zerbrochne Krug*: Juggling of Authorities." Alexej Urginsky 69 - 79.

---. "Terror der Politik oder Politik des Terrors? Kleists *Hermannsschlacht* und "Die Verlobung in St. Domingo." *Beiträge zur Kleist-Forschung.* Frankfurt (Oder): Kleist-Gedenk- und Forschungsstätte, 1994. 93 - 108.

Wolf, Christa. "Kleists *Penthesilea.*" Kleist, Heinrich von. *Penthesilea. Ein Trauerspiel.* Wiesbaden: Fourier, [1982]. 157 - 167.

Zenke, Jürgen. "Kleist. *Der zerbrochne Krug*." *Die deutsche Komödie vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Ed. Walter Hinck. Düsseldorf: August Bagel, 1977. 89 - 109.

Zons, Raimer. "Von der Not der Welt" zur absoluten Feindschaft. Kleists *Hermannsschlacht*." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 109 (1990): 175 - 199.

Vita

Name: Matthew Lessey Pollard

Year and Place of Birth: 1965, Victoria, B.C.

Education:

1983: St Michaels University School, Victoria, B.C.

1988: B.A. (Hons.), English and German, Queen's University

1991: M.A., German, Queen's University

1998: Ph.D., German, McGill University

Teaching Experience:

1989-1991: Course Instructor, Department of German, Queen's University

1991-1996: Course Instructor, Department of German Studies, McGill University

1995-1996: Course Instructor, Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics, Concordia University

1997: Course Instructor, Department of Germanic Studies, University of Victoria

Awards:

1994-95: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Doctoral Fellowship

1992-94: McConnell Major Fellowship

1991: German Society Scholarship