

**Composition, Variation, Edition as Interpretation:
On Publishing Poetry Collections**

By

Clara Fisher

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

German

August 31, 2018

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Barbara Hahn, Ph.D.

Meike Werner, Ph.D.

Christoph Zeller, Ph.D.

Leah Marcus, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

I would like first and foremost to thank my committee members. To my advisor, Professor Barbara Hahn, without whom this project would not be what it is and I would not be quite the same person I am today: I am so grateful for all of your guidance and support on so many levels, throughout this project and the whole of my graduate career. Thank you, too, for teaching the course that inspired me to pursue a special interest in editions, for suggesting I read Else Lasker-Schüler's *Mein Herz*, and for pushing me to think outside the box, take creative risks, and be strong in and for myself. I would also like to thank Professor Meike Werner, whose excitement for her interest areas is palpable and catching, for introducing me to Arno Holz' *Phantasia* publications and starting me down the road to this project, for inspiring my passion for the strange and exciting thing that is literary modernity, and for encouraging me to keep my eye on the details in life and in my work, stay grounded, and advocate for myself. Another thank you goes to Professor Christoph Zeller, for appreciating my perspective, for his kindness and occasionally dark sense of humor, for encouraging creative thinking and exploring unexpected connections, and for reminding me to keep the big picture in mind and helping me to refine and strengthen my writing. Finally, thank you to Leah Marcus, for agreeing to be a part of this project and for taking the time and care to read my work and give me constructive feedback.

This work would also not have been possible without the financial support of the Vanderbilt Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages and the DAAD, or the guidance of Professor Gesa Dane, who met with me about my project idea and took me to the Brecht Archiv during my time in the Freie Universität zu Berlin's edition studies program.

Finally, I am so grateful to my community and support network for reminding me to take breaks and enjoy my life as well as my work, and for believing in me.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction	1
I. On the Authors and their Collections	2
II. On the Problem of Reception	9
III. On the Problem of Terminology	17
Chapter One: Publishing Plural and the Book Market.....	32
I. On the Concept(s) of Authorship.....	32
II. On Originality	35
III. Privilege and Poverty: A Short History of a Long Term Problem	37
IV. Else Lasker-Schüler and the Opposition between Art and Money	51
V. Conclusion	84
VI. Chapter Appendix	86
Chapter Two: Sampling, Remixing, and the Genre of Poetry	92
I. Sampling, Remixing, and Originality.....	92
II. Poetry: Compositions of Wholes and Combinations of Parts	108
III. Composing and Arranging Cycles and Collections	118
IV. Conclusion	126
Chapter Three: Reading and Interpreting <i>Hebräische Balladen</i>	129
I. Introduction	129
II. Reading and the Question of Presentation and Access	137
III. Interpretation History: How Have the <i>Hebräische Balladen</i> Been Read?	148
IV. Interpretation Possibilities: How Could We Read the <i>Hebräische Balladen</i> ?	162

V. Conclusion	167
Chapter Four: Presentation Possibilities	170
I. Introduction	170
II. Multiple ‘Versions’ in Practice & Theory (or: Texts versus Works).....	171
III. Poetry Editions (and: Edition is Interpretation)	187
IV. Edition Types and Intended Audience.....	198
V. Work-Group Editions? Possible Models & Adaptations	206
Conclusion	216
Bibliography	224

Introduction

Some works of literature do not fit the typical definition of a work. They are not simply written, completed, and then published by the author in one perfected form – and yet they are still often read this way. When a work that has not followed this simple teleology to a single publication is a collection of poems, the situation becomes even more complex. Poems themselves are individual works, and they also always need to be collected. A single poem cannot be published alone, but appears instead in the context of larger wholes: cycles, collections, anthologies, literary magazines with other short works, and so on. For the poets Else Lasker-Schüler, Arno Holz, and Bertolt Brecht, both collections of poetry as a whole and the individual poems appearing within them remained changeable after they had been printed, bound, and sold, and these authors each revised, rearranged, and republished their poetry cycles many times over a span of many years.

Walter Benjamin's statement that "[d]as Werk ist die Totenmaske der Konzeption"¹ seems to refer to the fact that a finished work marks the end of its conception, and hides the struggle of this conception and the working process by covering it with the appearance of an effortlessness and composed completion. Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht, by continuing to work on their poetry collections after the first publication, could be seen as slightly obscuring this mask. When regarded together, the multiple publications of each collection-group may provide a very limited visibility of the writing process that would normally remain unseen. At the same time, however, each publication boasts a death mask of its own. Each of these publications is still carefully composed, designed, and controlled. The production of multiple versions could

¹ Benjamin, Walter. *Einbahnstraße*, (Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt Verlag, 1928), 33.

perhaps be viewed as a rather unsurprising part of the writing process, but in the cases of Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht, the many versions that the authors created were not confined to the status of unpublished manuscripts that led to a single published work. These are multiple publications, simultaneously self-contained and contingent, both distinct from and firmly connected to their counterparts.

The focus of this dissertation is not an investigation into the writing process. Neither is it a statement on works as open-ended rather than contained entities. The aim is an in-depth consideration of the pluralities that have been produced: how they might be appropriately classified, what factors might have led to multiple publications of similar material, how they have been received, and ultimately, how these pluralities – and the changes across publications – can be most appropriately presented and read today. Works are produced to be collected and preserved,² and they must be available to be received and to come alive – but in what form? How can we present, receive, and thereby preserve works that are themselves both collections and part of a greater collection of variations?

I. On the Authors and their Collections

Else Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, Arno Holz' *Phantasmus*, and Bertolt Brecht's *Hauspostille*: these are titles that could refer to the total sum of publications that share this name (or a close variant), or alternatively, to one publication in particular. These three groups of poetry collections span from roughly around the turn or the beginning of the 20th century to the mid-20th century when regarded together. There are indeed some temporal overlaps, though none could be

² Groys, Boris. *Logik der Sammlung. Am Ende des musealen Zeitalters*, ed. Michael Krüger, (Munich/Vienna: Carl Hanser, 1997), 25.

said to neatly occupy exactly the same span of time. The cycle-collections also diverge rather drastically from one another with regard to content and form, at least beyond the matter of genre. In point of fact, however, plural publications draw these three work-groups together.

The publications bearing the title *Hebräische Balladen* by Else Lasker-Schüler appeared within a period of eight years. This timespan may seem rather compact when compared with that of the *Phantasmus* collections (1886-1929), but the many *Hebräische Balladen* also contain versions of several poems that appeared in earlier collections between 1902-1911, and many of these continued to be reworked for other cycles later in Lasker-Schüler's writing career.³ Publications of collections with the title *Hebräische Balladen* began in 1912 (printed as 1913),⁴ followed by a "zweite vermehrte Auflage"⁵ from 1914 that advertised the addition of more poems but was reworked in other ways as well. A third altered collection appeared in 1917 in an edition of collected poems,⁶ and then another publisher reissued this edition with more changes to the *Hebräische Balladen* in 1919.⁷ In 1920, Lasker-Schüler introduced a third issue of the collected poems volume⁸ and published a last version of the cycle in a different series of collected poems through Paul Cassirer.⁹ A handwritten manuscript from around 1915/16 with drawings from the author, which Lasker-Schüler had given as a gift to a friend, was also

³ For example: "Sulamith" (version in *Styx*, 1902; serves as the end of *Das Hebräerland* without its title, 1937); "Ruth" (version in *Der siebente Tag*, 1905; *Meine Wunder*, 1911); "Mein Volk" (version in *Der siebente Tag*, 1905; *Meine Wunder*, 1911; *Theben*, 1923); "Versöhnung" (version in *Meine Wunder*, 1911; *Theben*, 1923; *Das Hebräerland* as "Der Versöhnungstag," 1937). Compare to: Skrodzki, Karl Jürgen. "Else Lasker Schüler. Eine Übersicht über die Gedichte und Zyklen," *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2015). Web. 17 Apr. 2015. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_052.htm>.

⁴ Lasker-Schüler, Else. *Hebräische Balladen*, (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: A. R. Meyer, 1913).

⁵ *Ibid.* *Hebräische Balladen*. 2. vermehrte Auflage, (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: A. R. Meyer, 1914).

⁶ *Ibid.* *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte*, (Leipzig: Verlag der Weißen Bücher, 1917), 9-27.

⁷ *Ibid.* *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte*. 2. Auflage, (Munich: Wolff, [1919]), 9-28. Note that no date is given on the publication itself, but Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, co-editor of the historico-critical edition of Lasker-Schüler's works and letters, dates this publication to 1919. Refer to: Skrodzki, "Übersicht über die Gedichte und Zyklen."

⁸ *Ibid.* *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte*. *Sechstes bis zehntes Tausend*, (Munich: Wolff, 1920), 9-28.

⁹ *Ibid.* *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Hebräische Balladen*. *Der Gedichte erster Teil*. *Mit einer Einbandzeichnung der Verfasserin*, (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1920), 7-26.

eventually published posthumously.¹⁰ Throughout this group of collections, poems were cut, added, changed, and rearranged.

Arno Holz first used the title *Phantasmus* for a set of 13 poems embedded within a work called *Buch der Zeit* from 1886.¹¹ In 1898 and 1899, the name appeared again, but this time in conjunction with two *Hefte*,¹² each containing 50 poems and functioning as parts one and two of a single work that displayed an almost complete overhaul of the original concept from its *Buch der Zeit* predecessor. These 100 poems were then revised and combined into one book that appeared in 1916.¹³ 1925 saw a *Phantasmus* that had expanded into three volumes and was published as part of an edition of collected works.¹⁴ A fifth, fragmented version was left behind after Holz' death in 1929, over forty years after his first *Phantasmus* publication, and it spanned over 1500 pages.¹⁵ Part of this final fragment was edited by Holz's widow and included in a posthumous collected works edition in the 1960s.¹⁶

Bertolt Brecht's *Hauspostille* is the third and final collection of collections to be examined in this dissertation. In the case of this cycle-group, the changes go beyond rearrangement of parts as well; there are additions and deletions, and some versions even provided musical scores for several of the poems.¹⁷ In this case, the publishing history is an especially complex one. The poems in the first publication of the collection were written

¹⁰ Oellers, Norbert (ed.). *Hebräische Balladen: In der Handschrift von Else Lasker-Schüler*, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 2000). This version was a manuscript that Lasker-Schüler gave to a friend as a gift. Henceforth: Oellers (2000).

¹¹ Holz, Phantasmus 1-13," in: *Das Buch der Zeit. Lieder des Modernen*, (Zurich: Verlags-Magazin, 1886), 391-422.

¹² Ibid. *Phantasmus. Erstes Heft*, (Berlin: Sassenbach, 1898); *Phantasmus. Zweites Heft*, (Berlin: Sassenbach, 1899).

¹³ Ibid. *Phantasmus*, (Leipzig: Insel, 1916).

¹⁴ Ibid. *Phantasmus I-III*, in: *Das Werk von Arno Holz*, v. 7-9, (Berlin: J. H. W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1925).

¹⁵ See for example: Rarisch, Klaus M. "Über Arno Holz (zum Autorenregister)," in: *Die Horen. Zeitschrift für Literatur, Kunst und Kritik*, 12/88 (1972), ed. Kurt Morawietz, 96. For more detailed information on the changes in the size throughout the *Phantasmus* collection(s), see also: Schulz, 129-155.

¹⁶ Holz, Arno. *Phantasmus I-IV*, in: *Arno Holz. Werke*, v. 1-3, ed. Wilhelm Emrich and Anita Holz, (Neuwied a. Rh./Berlin-Spandau: Luchterhand, 1961). This edition will henceforth be referred to as *Holz Werke*.

¹⁷ In particular, "Gesangsnoten" are advertised in the titles of the 1926 private publication through Kiepenheuer and the 1927 publication from Propyläen Verlag. In later versions, neither the musical notes nor the reference to these in the titles appear.

between 1916 and 1925.¹⁸ In fact, however, a manuscript of *Hauspostille* was already authorized and confirmed for publication in 1922, but the publication never took place.¹⁹ 25 copies of a revised version were published privately under the title *Taschenpostille* in 1926,²⁰ and then a further altered *Hauspostille* appeared through a different publisher in 1927.²¹ Another version was authorized and ready to print in 1938 as part of the third volume of an edition of Brecht's collected works, but owing to events of the war, this volume was never published.²² In 1956, the year of his death, Brecht finalized a reworked *Hauspostille* based on the 1938 manuscript for a *Gedichte* edition through Suhrkamp and Aufbau. This appeared posthumously as the final publication of this collection in 1960.²³

What compels an author to rework material that has already been published? What interest do they have in rewriting their works of art and republishing the results? There are a number of factors at play in reworking and republishing, perhaps the most apparent of which are aesthetic and theoretical in nature.

Arno Holz' *Phantasmus* publications mirrored the shifting of his theories about what poetry should be, changing over time just as his aesthetic rules did. Some earlier publications exhibit a total extraction of rhyme, for example, but later versions find it reintroduced here and

¹⁸ See: "Entstehung," in: *Bertolt Brecht. Werke. Große kommentierte Berliner und Frankfurter Ausgabe*, v. 11, ed. Jan Knopf and Werner Hecht, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988), 299. This edition will henceforth be referred to as *BFA*.

¹⁹ See: *Ibid.*, 300-301.

²⁰ Brecht, Bertolt. *Bertolt Brechts Taschenpostille. Mit Anleitungen, Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang*, (Potsdam: Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1926).

²¹ *Ibid.* *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille. Mit Anleitungen, Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang*, (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1927).

²² This version was ready to be printed as the third volume of the *Gesammelte Gedichte* through Malik Verlag, but the publishing house in Prague was liquidated by local fascists in 1939, and the printing materials were confiscated and destroyed. See: "Text/Fassungen," in: *BFA*, v. 11, 303.

²³ Brecht, Bertolt. *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille*, in: *Gedichte*, v. 1, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1960).

there “through the back door,”²⁴ as Holz eventually concluded that strictly adhering to such a principle had affected the quality of some of his poems and their ability to truly “sparkle.”²⁵ Holz continued to work on his *Phantasmus* material for decades, in part because he saw himself as attempting to approach an ideal. He made this goal of working toward an ideal and creating a total *Weltbild*, (or at least approaching it more and more with each publication), as well as his theoretical reasoning and his process, extremely explicit in multiple texts; he published these texts in order to illuminate why there were multiple *Phantasmus* publications and to publicize that he was still working on it, still striving toward this perfection and totality.²⁶ Ultimately, this is not an explanation for why he chose to publish before he was sure that he had achieved it. On an aesthetic level, the knowledge that this endeavor would prove to be impossible, combined with the wish to perform the process of his attempt, could provide one answer. This is especially true if the context of modernism is taken into account, with its penchant for questioning the stability of things previously taken for granted as such, including the possibility of successful communication through language.²⁷

²⁴ Schulz, Gerhard (ed.). “Nachwort,” in: Holz, Arno. *Phantasmus. Faksimiledruck der Erstfassung*, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1968), 143. “Holz [hat] später den Reim wieder durch die Hintertür in seinen *Phantasmus* eingelassen [...]”

²⁵ See: Holz, Arno. “Idee und Gestaltung des *Phantasmus*” (1918), in: “Kunsttheoretische Schriften,” *Holz Werke*, v. 3, 100-101. Henceforth: *Idee und Gestaltung*. “Die erste Fassung, siebzehn Zeilen lange, damals »aus Theorie« ganz und gar reimlos, wurde von mir veröffentlicht bereits im Jahre 1898. Zu seinem Schluß hatte ein Tautropfen zu funkeln. Er funkelte nicht! Ich konnte die Worten drehen und schleifen, mich mühen wie ich wollte, mir »das Hirn« ausdrehen – er funkelte nicht! [...] Jetzt in der neuen Fassung, einunddreißig Zeilen – man überzeuge sich, man lese jene Stelle, Seite 320, nach – funkelte er! Funkelt er durch die Kraft eines plötzlich dreifach aufblitzenden Reimes, nachdem alles übrige in der alten, puritanischen Reimlosigkeit verblieben war!” Holz is referring to a particular poem that was originally printed in *Phantasmus* (1898) and appeared in different versions in the later *Phantasmus* collections.

²⁶ See for example: Ibid. See also: Ibid., “Die neue Form und ihre bisherige Entwicklung,” in: “Kunsttheoretische Schriften,” *Holz Werke*, v. 3, esp. 136. Henceforth: *Die neue Form*.

²⁷ Compare to: Zwerschina, Hermann. “Variantenverzeichnis, Arbeitsweise des Autors und Darstellung der Textgenese,” in: *Text und Edition. Positionen und Perspektiven*, ed. Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth et al., (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2000), 213. “[D]ie Unmöglichkeit des Schreibenden, sein eigentliches Gemeintes sprachlich zu fassen [...] erklärt] in der Tat [...], warum manche Autoren immer wieder neue Anläufe zur ‚Fertigstellung‘ unternehmen – ganz ‚fertig‘ wäre ein unter diesen Prämissen gesehener Text ja nie!”

Bertolt Brecht, too, had some ideas and creative habits that seemed to resist the notion that a work of art should necessarily be solitary in form. He regularly rewrote, restaged, and republished his theatrical works, and was even referred to as “die Verzweiflung der Verleger und Theaterdirektoren”²⁸ for this very reason, so it should come as no surprise that he would apply the same working approach to a poetry collection. One of his poems provides a concise description of one potential motivation for continuous reworking and reissuing: “Wie lange / dauern die Werke? So lange / als bis sie fertig sind. / So lange sie nämlich Mühe machen / verfallen sie nicht.”²⁹

Else Lasker-Schüler was for her part significantly less explicit about the theoretical or principled side of her creative process. This should in no way, however, suggest that she did not have one. One of the editors of her historico-critical *Werke und Briefe* edition states on the author’s process that she actually wrote “keine ‘Gedichtbücher’; sie schrieb vielmehr einzelne Gedichte, die sie zunächst meist in Zeitschriften veröffentlichte und dann später für eine Buchveröffentlichung zusammenstellte und zum Teil überarbeitete (dabei einzelne Verse umstellte, strich oder hinzufügte).”³⁰ She went about publishing her prose texts in much the same way, and in fact, many of her works exist in multiple published forms.

Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* are less straightforwardly understood or explained than either Brecht’s *Hauspostille* or Holz’ *Phantasmus*, and information as to the multiple publications as well as the publications themselves are also much less readily available and

²⁸ Feuchtwanger, Lion. “Bertolt Brecht. Dargestellt für Engländer,” *Die Weltbühne*, September 4, 1928. As quoted in: Villwock, Peter. *Bertolt Brecht, Notizbücher: Einführung in die Edition (NBA)*. Web version. 4 May 2015. <http://www.suhrkamp.de/download/Sonstiges/brecht_notizbuecher/Brecht_Notizbuecher_Einfuehrung_in_die_NB_A.pdf>, 11.

²⁹ Brecht, Bertolt. *Gesammelte Werke*, v. 10, ed. Elisabeth Hauptmann, (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1967), 31*. Henceforth: *GW*.

³⁰ Skrodzki, Karl Jürgen. “Stand und Perspektiven der Arbeit,” in: *Fäden möchte ich um mich ziehen. Ein Else-Lasker-Schüler-Almanach*, hg. von Hajo Jahn und Hans Joachim Schädlich, Wuppertal 2000, S. 188-202. Web version. 17 Apr. 2015. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_002.htm>.

accessible than is the case for the others. It is for precisely this reason that her set of collections will form the main focus for this dissertation, with the others serving as more normative and less enigmatic examples of this phenomenon – a phenomenon which is by no means exclusive to these three authors, and which can particularly be seen around the turn of the century into the 20th.

In practice, and in some cases in theory, the three of these authors resisted to one extent or another the idea that the material for a work of art must be linearly directed toward and finally confined to a single resulting product, and that this product and its contents should not remain changeable after an initial publication. To assume that this practice of publishing works in plural forms merely arose from a dissatisfaction with the original, or out of principle with regard to aesthetic theories, would be a gross oversimplification. There are further factors involved in multiple publications of what is often popularly thought of as a single work, and these range from the historical to the financial and practical. Authorship is, after all, a line of work, and publication a source of income. These facts are furthermore largely at the mercy of the historical situation and dynamic with regard to publishers and the book market. Precisely because these are multiple *publications*, it is necessary to examine this context and its contribution to the collection-pluralities from Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht, in order to determine what exactly it is that has been created. This is what the first chapter of this dissertation will explore.

The genre of poetry collections itself, too, seems to be involved in an essential way in the production of these multiple collections. The second chapter will investigate questions of the genre of poetry collections, its forms, and its traditions as they are related to a collection-group. In what way might this genre prove to be especially susceptible to changes and re-publication, specifically with regard to its special relationship between parts and the whole? To what extent is the long-standing tradition of writing a cycle of poems related to the act of collecting itself, and

how might this have contributed to the plurality of these work-groups? What is going on with the *Hebräische Balladen* in particular – a work-group for which there exists no reasoning or illumination from the author (as is the case with Holz), and which also did not simply arise out of a mixture of a well-documented appreciation for the writing and revision process and a rather straightforward situation of publishing issues due largely to historical context (as will be shown is the case for Brecht)?

Before the aforementioned factors and their function in the creation of plural published forms can be examined, however, there are a few problems that must be addressed.

II. On the Problem of Reception

Beyond the fact of their multiple published forms, these three authors' collective collections also have in common a certain amount of negative criticism upon initial reception. The scathing reviews came most often from author-contemporary critics receiving only one publication, but negative reviews were not necessarily bound to one publication in particular. In some cases they were also not confined the author's own lifespan.

With his many *Phantasmus* publications, as previously elucidated, Arno Holz aimed to depict and capture a total *Weltbild* by bringing together many fragmentary moments represented in individual poems. Each new publication increasingly approached concrete poetry, both graphically and through the use of the sound and rhythm of language. Depending on which version author-contemporary critics received, *Phantasmus* was either too telegram-like or too

long.³¹ After the Insel edition was published in 1916, one critic simply remarked: “Ein Gedicht soll doch kein Lexikon sein.”³² Posthumous reception of *Phantasmus* was not necessarily more forgiving. Shortly after part of the last *Phantasmus* fragment was published by Holz’s widow in the late 1960s, Gerhard Schulz reissued the 1916 version.³³ After some consideration of all versions and their teleological development in his introduction, Schulz concluded that the 1916 version was the only one worth reading, because the later revisions, in his opinion, spiraled out of control and ultimately led to “[d]ie Zerstörung der lyrischen Substanz durch eine Häufung von Details.”³⁴ In 1970, Martin Pfeideler stated rather bluntly on a radio program about Holz’ life and works that in his opinion, the work “war und blieb”, with *work* referring in this case to the sum of its parts, “eine monströse Totgeburt.”³⁵

Such harsh posthumous assessments were presumably based on the fact that the 40-year endeavor ended with a fragment, and statements like these ultimately dismiss the fact that multiple self-contained books were composed, produced, and published. If one is in favor of the idea that the last version must inherently be the most intended, and the final form happens to be both massive and unfinished, and if a work is regarded as the sum of its versions in teleology toward an end-goal **and** as being represented by its final form, it would follow that the work can be judged as a failure. By those measures, the goal was never met and the project was never

³¹ Holz was criticized for the “Depeschenstil” of his “Telegrammlyrik” in his 1898/99 *Phantasmus*. See: Fischer, Hans W. “Einleitung zum Phantasmus,” in: *Das Werk von Arno Holz*, v. 7, III. Later versions of his *Phantasmus* poems were then criticized for being too long, to which Holz simply retorted: “Was dann den schönen Aberglauben zeitigte, »wahre« Lyrik dürfe nie »lang« sein. Ein Hauch, ein Kaum-mehr-als-Nichts, eine Art Entleichterungsvergnügen für seelische Asthmatiker!” Refer to: Holz, *Idee und Gestaltung*, 87.

³² Benzmann, Hans. Review of *Phantasmus* (1916) in: *Berliner Börsen Zeitung*, 22 Apr. 1917. As quoted in: Wohlleben, Robert. “Der wahre Phantasmus,” *Fulgura Frango*, Apr. 2014, (Hamburg: Robert Wohlleben / Meiendorfer Drucke / fulgura frango). Web. 17 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.fulgura.de/extern/holz/phantasmus.html>>. Also printed in: *Die Horen. Zeitschrift für Literatur, Kunst und Kritik*, 116/4 (1979), 84-102.

³³ Holz, Arno. *Phantasmus. Faksimiledruck der Erstfassung*, ed. Gerhard Schulz, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1968).

³⁴ Schulz, 153.

³⁵ Pfeideler, Martin. “»Phantasmus«. Ein Rückblick auf Leben und Werk von Arno Holz mit Zitaten aus seinem Werk,” SFB, 1. Programm, 22. Mar. 1970 (Sendemanuskript). As quoted in: Wohlleben, “Der wahre Phantasmus.”

completed. Editors like Schulz chose to ignore the later versions of *Phantasmus*, published and fragmented alike, opting instead to distribute the 1916 publication (which was not the first, but the most widely received). Essentially, this is a decision to overlook Holz' perceived failure, and further communicates a viewpoint that Holz should have quit while he was ahead.

Bertolt Brecht's *Hauspostille*, 'prayers for the home' or 'manual of piety,' employed a traditional religious form stemming from Martin Luther, as the title implies.³⁶ Brecht specifically chose and then imposed critical content on this long-established religious form, which had some critics deeming the work blasphemous and provocative. A review in *Die Bürgerliche Presse* commented on the collection's "zerstörerischen Drang"³⁷ and saw this as being tied to his communism.³⁸ Another in *Schöne Literatur* saw the work "ohne jegliches Niveau als eine Maßlosigkeit, [...] die ganz im Gemeinen versinkt."³⁹ With regard to the individual poems contained in the cycle, *Legende vom toten Soldaten*, a poem in the first publication that was an immediate favorite for many readers,⁴⁰ would later be cited as a reason for Brecht's official expatriation in 1935, as one of "zahlreiche deutschfeindliche Artikel und Gedichte, [...] in denen er unter anderem den deutschen Frontsoldaten beschimpft."⁴¹ In Brecht's case, it is most often the 1927 version that is distributed and read posthumously, at the dismissal of all other publications of *Hauspostille*, largely because it was the most widely received.⁴²

³⁶ Refer to chapter 2 for more on the genre of poetry collections and the borrowing and repurposing of forms.

³⁷ As quoted in: *BFA*, v. 2, 311.

³⁸ Refer to: *Ibid*.

³⁹ See: Wagenknecht, Regine. "Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille," in: *Text und Kritik: Sonderband: Bertolt Brecht II*, ed. Heinz Ludwig Arnold, (Munich: R. Boorberg, 1972), 27.

⁴⁰ For example: Tucholsky, Kurt. (Pseudonym Peter Panter). "Bert Brechts Hauspostille," in: *Die Weltbühne*, 28 Feb. 1928, No. 9, 334. See also: *BFA*, v. 11, 312.

⁴¹ *Verfügung des Reichsministeriums des Innern vom 8. Juni 1935*, I A 5541/5013c. As quoted in: *BFA*, v. 27, 586. From the editors of the edition: "Angesprochen ist die *Legende vom toten Soldaten*."

⁴² Most reissues of *Hauspostille* are indeed reprints of the first (publicly) printed edition from 1927, with no mention of other versions. A few of these build off of a reprint from 1951, however, with "Gesang des Soldaten der roten Armee" in the first *Lektion* removed at Brecht's request: *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille. Mit Anleitungen*,

Hebräische Balladen also faced some disapproval, particularly after its first publication. One of Else Lasker-Schüler's contemporary critics, Ludwig Geiger, wrote that it seemed as though the author was either mocking Jewish history or modern poetry.⁴³ He dismissed the cycle as "unerklärliche[] Vignette"⁴⁴ and "öde[s] Wortgeklingel,"⁴⁵ a harsh criticism likely owed to the fact that the poems often employ free verse and, furthermore, feature titles that build directly on motifs and themes from the Hebrew Scriptures, such as *Esther* and *Versöhnung*, but then break with the expectations set in place by the titles, as the works themselves tend to contain "[w]eniger [...] biblische[n] Inhalt als vielmehr die Weltsicht des lyrischen Subjekts."⁴⁶ Lasker-Schüler's posthumous critics were generally more appreciative of the *Hebräische Balladen* than Geiger.⁴⁷ Unlike Geiger, however, they were also faced with the problem of what exactly to read and call *Hebräische Balladen*. In fact, one editor even chose to deal with this issue of multiple versions by crafting a contaminated version (*Mischtext*) of the *Hebräische Balladen* using parts of different versions of the collection, with a changed order and including poems he felt fit the overall theme and feel of the work, and this was disseminated for many years after Lasker-Schüler's death.⁴⁸ The edition was published in 1951, and the corrupted version found its way

Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1951). See: *BFA*, v. 11, 304. (Compare to reception, including posthumous editions and analyses, covered for Lasker-Schüler in Chapter 3.

⁴³ Geiger, Ludwig. "Hebräische Balladen von Else Lasker-Schüler. A. R. Meyer Verlag, 1913. Berlin-Wilmersdorf," in: *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, 77/18, 2. May 1913, (Berlin: 1913), 215.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Skrodzki, "Else Lasker-Schüler: Mein Volk."

⁴⁷ Posthumous reception will be handled in depth in Chapter 3.

⁴⁸ Ginsberg, Ernst (ed.). *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Dichtungen und Dokumente*, (München: Kösel, 1951), 9-32. The editor chose the last published version (Ausgabe letzter Hand) for his control texts (Textgrundlage), but for each of the poems rather than of the publications of *Hebräische Balladen* as a whole. The order, furthermore, does not follow that of any of Lasker-Schüler's own publications, and Ginsberg also added the poems "Abigail" and "Joseph wird verkauft" because he felt they fit the overall theme and feel of the cycle, although they do not appear in any of Lasker-Schüler's self-edited versions of *Hebräische Balladen*. Ginsberg explains on page 615 of his afterword: "Else Lasker-Schüler hat bei jeder neuen Herausgabe und Auswahl ihrer Dichtungen Aufbau und Anordnung weitgehend geändert, oft in einer fast zufällig anmutenden Weise. Der Herausgeber hat daraus für sich das Recht abgeleitet, die von ihm besorgte Auswahl zum Teil nach eigenen Gesichtspunkten zu ordnen." In the commentary section on *Hebräische Balladen*, he makes transparent his choice to insert thematically related poems: "Die Balladen

into several of her collected and selected works editions, even inspiring further contamination,⁴⁹ until a historico-critical edition of Lasker-Schüler's works and letters began appearing in the late 1990s.⁵⁰

Highlighting negative reviews is not meant to imply that these collections were only negatively received. Each of these collection-groups were also received quite positively by many, and continue to be appreciated. The negative reviews in particular, however, markedly demonstrate a historicity to the way works are read and judged. Author-contemporary criticism and criticism in later decades are necessarily different, predominately because reception is based on and guided by availability of information, including the texts themselves and the context in which readers are operating. These publications are not available to today's readers in the same way – and for most, in exactly the same forms – that they were for the original audiences. 21st century readers, for one, do not have access to the publications as they come out one by one in the way that a large majority of their original audience did. First editions are furthermore largely inaccessible to most of today's reading public. Readers today are instead predominately confined to accessing these works through reprints, and are confronted with the fact of multiple publications at once – or not, depending on the information provided (or not provided) in attainable copies of these collections.

Because they find themselves in a different time (and quite possibly place) than that of these authors and their original audience, contemporary editors and readers inevitably face a new

»Joseph wird verkauft«, in einer anderen Fassung »Karawanenballade« betitelt, und »Abigail« wurden aus thematischen und formalen Gründen unter die Hebräischen Balladen eingereiht. Sie entstammen aber einer späteren Schaffenszeit." (See page 619, "Zu S. 18 und S. 25").

⁴⁹ For example: (1) Kemp, Friedhelm and Werner Kraft (ed.). *Gesammelte Werke in 3 Bänden*, v. 1, (Munich: Kosel, 1959-1962), 291-311. (2) Ibid. (ed.). *Werke in 8 Bänden*, v. 1, (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1986), 289-309. (3) Bauschinger, Sigrid (ed.). *Werke. Lyrik, Prosa, Dramatisches*, (Munich: Artemis und Winkler, 1991), 40-51.

⁵⁰ Skrodzki, Karl Jürgen and Norbert Oellers (ed.). *Werke und Briefe*, v. 1.1-1.11, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1996-2004). For *Hebräische Balladen* and related information, refer especially to volumes 1.1-1.2.

situation of access to information. Any time one or more of these work-collections is reissued or included in an edition of any kind, editorial decisions are made for how the work is re-presented. Will there be a foreword or an afterword, and what kinds of information should be included in it, if so? Will there be commentary? Footnotes? An appendix? Should (or can) the original design, cover, font, footnotes, pagination, illustrations, and colors be retained? 21st century editors of the collections *Hebräische Balladen*, *Phantasmus*, and *Hauspostille* are, above all, left to deal with the fact of multiple publications, and the inescapable question that follows: Which publication(s) should be included, and how?

The solution to the problem of the plurality of these collections' forms has in the past most often been that one version was represented, and information about other versions, or even mention of the fact that others exist, was most often entirely omitted. In historico-critical editions, too, more often than not, a single version has usually been given in full as the edited text within the main body of the volume, while information about further publications or versions are banished to the appendix as supplementary.⁵¹ Frequently, variations among publications and manuscript forms are outlined in detail in such editions, but in highly encrypted forms, and the versions beyond the one chosen as the main representation of the work have seldom been printed in full, predominately due to practical limitations on funds and space.

The practice of re-issuing and re-presenting these work-groups as it has been done so far is not representative of the whole picture, that is to say of the plurality, equality, and simultaneous connectedness and independence of the publications. The choice to favor one publication at the expense of others has perhaps been practical in the past, especially considering the limits of the fixed and final form of a book, but it is also highly problematic. In the 21st

⁵¹ Compare to: Martens, Gunter. "Was ist ein Text? Ansätze zur Bestimmung eines Leitbegriffs der Textphilologie," in: *Texte zur Theorie des Textes*, ed. Stephan Kammer and Roger Lüdecke, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005), 96-97.

century, many editors view a choice to favor one version above other equally legitimate ones as outdated, because such a decision undermines the work-character⁵² of all other published versions. While it is by no means ideal, a compromise for historico-critical editions, given the limits of printed forms in general, is very often to put one version in the front of the volume based on the edition's choice of control text (*Textgrundlage*) – usually the first or last edition of the works in question. Although the other versions are then put in the appendix, they are at least given work-status through scribal abbreviations that mark them as publications. In any case, however, if the last publication (*Ausgabe letzter Hand*) is chosen as representative of the work, this overemphasizes teleological development from 'seed' to 'flower'; the seed was always a basic and preliminary form, the flower always intended and planned from the very beginning and therefore the most complete and perfect form.⁵³ If, on the other hand, a first or early publication (*Ausgabe erster, früher Hand*) is presented as the best version of the work, perhaps because it was the most widely received publication, this ultimately dismisses further changes and publications as frivolous.

During the author's lifetime, it is often understood that the most recent publication overrides any earlier versions, but Siegfried Scheibe sees an author's authorization of *Ausgabe letzter Hand* as ending upon the event of the author's death.⁵⁴ Especially with Else Lasker-Schüler and Bertolt Brecht, moreover, the idea that a most recent version was specifically meant to invalidate all others is debatable in the first place. In the end, assertions about what exactly the author intended are at worst speculation, and at best, interpretation. In the words of Boris V.

⁵² See: Martens, Gunter. "Das Werk als Grenze. Ein Versuch zur terminologischen Bestimmung eines editorischen Begriffs," in: *editio*, 18 (2004), 181.

⁵³ Compare to: Hermand, Jost. "Einleitung," in: *Arno Holz. Phantasmus*, (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968), v. Hermand asserts in his foreword that the first published version of *Phantasmus* "ist nicht nur ein Embryo des Späteren, sondern zugleich eine "entwickeltere" Form frühere Versuche und hat daher durchaus seinen Eigenwert."

⁵⁴ Scheibe, Siegfried. "Zum editorischen Problem des Textes," in: *Probleme neugermanistischer Edition. Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 101*, ed. Norbert Oellers and Hartmut Steinecke, (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1982), 20.

Tomaševskij, it is not where the author intended to go but where they landed that matters.⁵⁵ Particularly in Germany, the modern editor's standpoint is that each version "wird zu *einer* historischen Tatsache neben anderen."⁵⁶ What is conclusive is that each published version was very much intended and authorized at one point in time,⁵⁷ and after an author's death, the reality is that more than one legitimate, published version of *Hebräische Balladen*, *Phantasmus*, and *Hauspostille* exists.

A few central questions with regard to the reception of poetry collections and these collection-groups will later be addressed in depth. Why and how do readers perceive poetry collections as a coherent work of art, and to what extent are the individual parts that make up the whole regarded as such? How might this reception of both part as whole and whole as the sum of its parts extend to interconnected but separate publications? How are we to read the changes among versions? Following the first chapter investigating the historical context in which these publications arose, and the second chapter on questions of the genre of poetry collections, the third chapter of this dissertation will examine how these plurally-published collections have been received and analyzed posthumously.

There is, furthermore, no question that the presentation of works, the forms in which they are made available to readers, affects how those works are read. In the event of reissuing these collections, one should survey and examine what is there, consider what these are, and reassess how these pluralities might be represented and made available. We must work with what we have, receive as we are now, and bridge gaps where possible and necessary. For this reason, the fourth and final chapter will explore 21st century possibilities for presenting these work-groups in

⁵⁵ Boris V. Tomaševskij, as quoted in Martens, *Text*, 98.

⁵⁶ Scheibe, 20.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

ways (both book and digital) that could make them easily accessible and receivable as they are: equal parts independent and interconnected.

21st century editing, in both practice and theory, has been adapting itself to current and rapidly developing technologies. Digital editions provide new possibilities and flexibilities for presenting works, and while this is by no means an argument that digital forms make traditional book editions unnecessary or obsolete, at this point it is undeniable that digital platforms remove many of the limits within which book editions are forced to operate. Digital editions are uniquely capable of establishing a space where information can be layered and linked together in a dynamic and immediate way. In an age where such flexibility is possible, the choice to present a single version of a work when many published versions exist does indeed seem rather dated. As far as book editions go, there may also be the potential to adapt new kinds of representation for such work-groups as *Hebräische Balladen*, and thereby to provide readers with all of the information and the personal choice to approach these groups as they wish, but it remains to be seen whether more ideal forms of book-bound representation will not also prove impractical.

III. On the Problem of Terminology

There is one more issue that cannot be ignored, and that is the problem of how exactly to refer to these pluralities of collections. The terminology – and therefore the framework – for discussing work-groups like Holz's *Phantasus*, Else Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, and Brecht's *Hauspostille* is decidedly lacking. Terminology is a particularly important matter at hand because it directly affects the way that works are presented and received, and this extends from popular reception to reception by specialists. Steffen Martus, author of a book on the

politics of the term *work*, sums this up succinctly: “Je nach Werkkonzept verändern sich die Relevanz und Legitimität von Fragen, die an das Werk gestellt werden.”⁵⁸ While existing definitions and terms can provide partial insight, they leave just as many gaps and contradictions in their wake.

The definition of a work is problematic to begin with. There is no single prevailing, universally accepted description. Definitions that exist have been varied, adapted, and fundamentally questioned in different ways depending on the period of time, and nuances depend largely on field of study. The first level of consideration of the term, however, must necessarily be to locate its position in the context of the general timespan in which Arno Holz, Else Lasker-Schüler, and Bertolt Brecht were writing and publishing.

Until the 1900s, the predominant concept was the emphatic notion of the work of art (*emphatischer Werkbegriff*). Wolfgang Thierse summarizes this conceptualization concretely with a description of the Hegelian aesthetic:

Autonomie, Individualität und Originalität, Ganzheit und Geschlossenheit, Organizität [...] und innere Zweckmäßigkeit, das in sich Vollendete, Einheit, ja Identität von Inhalt und Form, Eigenwert der Kunstgestalt als spezifisches Objekt der Kommunikation, Adäquanz von absoluter und sinnlicher Gestalt. Das Werk wird aufgefaßt als sinnliche Erscheinungsform der Wahrheit, als Welt in sich, als Mikrokosmos, welches als Analogon zum Weltganzen, als Symbol, als zweite Natur interpretiert wird.⁵⁹

A work is in this sense a work if it features qualities such as uniqueness, wealth of meaning, unity of content and form, self-referentiality, and wholeness or closedness.⁶⁰ This concept of the

⁵⁸ Martus, Steffen. *Werkpolitik. Zur Literaturgeschichte kritischer Kommunikation vom 17. bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 21.

⁵⁹ Thierse, Wolfgang. “‘Das Ganze aber ist das, was Anfang, Mitte und Ende hat.’ Problemgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Geschichte des Werkbegriffs,” in: *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe. Studien zu einem historischen Wörterbuch*, ed. Karlheinz Barck and Martin Fontius, (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1990), 404. See also: Benthien, Claudia / Stephan, Inge. “Einleitung,” in: *Meisterwerke: deutschsprachige Autorinnen im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Claudia Benthien and Inge Stephan, (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2005), 14.

⁶⁰ Refer to: Ibid., 34. “[D]as Werk [zeichnet sich] aus durch seine Einzigartigkeit, seine Sinnfülle, die Einheit von Gehalt und Gestalt sowie seine Selbstbezogenheit und seine Geschlossenheit.”

work further emphasizes “das Ineinander von Partialität und Universalität, das die Totalität des Werks bildet, sowie die unendliche, nicht zu Ende kommende Auslegungsarbeit, die auf der Eigentümlichkeit und Individualität des Werks als Ausdrucks eines Individuums gründet,”⁶¹ and here it is precisely the finiteness of the work that is seen as inducing its infinite abundance of meaning.⁶²

Upon publication, according to the emphatic notion of a work, a work was a child of its author, the expression of an individual, but it also became separated from its parent to the extent that it became an autonomous authority as a totality, that is to say, in and of itself.⁶³ Furthermore, and we will focus on the literary work in particular, the emphatic notion of the work of art seems to suggest that a work is a work regardless of the edition or version in which it finds itself; the book or text as product of publication is, from this perspective, a necessary and unobtrusive medium of a higher idea contained within.

Then, around 1900, the work of art found itself in crisis – even under attack – with movements such as modernism and the avant-garde. Modernism separated itself, at least partially, from the emphatic notion of the work. Much of modern literature explicitly drew attention to the inefficacy of language and writing through exactly these mediums,⁶⁴ and the problematic act of writing and the textuality of the productions that resulted were very often given an expressed and visible position.⁶⁵ Beginning as early as with Romanticism, authors

⁶¹ Thierse, 16.

⁶² Ibid. “Gerade die Endlichkeit des Werks soll seine infinite Sinnfülle bewirken.”

⁶³ See: Ibid.; Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Hermeneutik und Kritik. Mit einem Anhang sprachphilosophischer Texte Schleiermachers*, ed. Manfred Frank. (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1993), 167, 185.

⁶⁴ For examples, refer to: Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Ein Brief (Chandos-Brief)*, in: *Der Chandos-Brief und andere Aufsätze über Hofmannsthal*, (Darmstadt: Agora, 1977); Holz, Arno. “Phantastus (bisher ungedruckt),” in: *Das Inselschiff: eine Zeitschrift für Freunde der Literatur und des schönen Buches*, v. 1 (1919/20), (Leipzig: Insel, 1920), 66-67. The second is a poem Holz wrote about his process of writing *Phantastus* and will be addressed later. Henceforth: *Phantastus* (1919/20).

⁶⁵ Schulte-Sasse, Jochen. “Foreword: Theory of Modernism versus Theory of the Avant-Garde,” in: Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. Michael Shaw, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), xiii, xxix.

played with the form of the fragment, but ultimately this was done in a way that still implied that a fragment could itself form or suggest a totality (and was perhaps even the most perfect form in which an infinite world could be captured as a totality due to its simultaneous openness and closedness).⁶⁶ With both Romanticism and Modernism and their approaches to the work, the criteria of relative closedness and wholeness, and the meaning seen as being conceived through these qualities, were generally maintained.⁶⁷ Steffen Martus describes the why and how of this phenomenon, writing that

zwar in der Moderne bestimmte Kunstwerke auf Offenheit angelegt sein mögen, daß sie aber im Kunstsystem verarbeitet und kommuniziert werden wie ‘geschlossenen’ Kunstwerke: Sie werden Autoren bzw. Künstlern zugerechnet, und sie provozieren die Interpretationskunst einer aufs enigmatische Kunstwerk abonnierten Kunstbeobachtung. Das kommunikative Element wird dabei gewissermaßen gegen diese Intention des Kunstwerks auf Selbstabschließung eingeführt.⁶⁸

The avant-garde of course took a much more extreme approach to the creation and characterization of works of art. Experimentation on what a work could be, and what could be a work, was at the heart of this movement, which would inevitably come to alter the way future generations would understand and employ the concept of a work.⁶⁹ Such purposeful affronts to the traditional notion of a work, with Duchamp’s Ready-Made urinal⁷⁰ providing a classic example,⁷¹ were “radical confrontations between artists and society,”⁷² essentially functioning as statements on the contradiction between art’s autonomous status in society and the role art

⁶⁶ For example: Schlegel, Friedrich. *Athenäumsfragmente*, in: Schlegel, Friedrich. *Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, v. 2, ed. Ernst Behler et al., (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1967). For theory on this matter, refer to: Lukács, György. *Die Theorie des Romans. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der grossen Epik*, (Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand, 1963).

⁶⁷ Refer to: Martus, 36-37.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁶⁹ Schulte-Sasse, xli.

⁷⁰ Marcel Duchamp is typically given credit for the Ready-Made urinal, but many now attribute the work to a woman named Baroness Elsa.

⁷¹ See also: Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. Michael Shaw, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 56.

⁷² Schulte-Sasse, xi.

simultaneously plays in commenting on society. Also integral to avant-garde works are “a realization of the social *ineffectiveness* of [the artist’s] own medium”⁷³ and a provocative questioning of the nature of art as “the individual creation of unique works.”⁷⁴ Avant-garde artists sought to create “unclosed, individual segments of art”⁷⁵ that would dissolve the “traditional unity of a work,”⁷⁶ especially with regard to “the relationship between part and whole that characterizes the organic work of art,”⁷⁷ and furthermore to challenge those who would receive these works “to make [them] an integrated part of his or her reality and to relate [them] to sensuous-material experience.”⁷⁸ With regard to both modernism and the avant-garde, the crucial point of focus is the shifting to the forefront of the textuality of works, the explicitness of the inefficacy involved in artist’s works as acts of communication with society, the matter of uniqueness, the problematic relationship between part and whole, and the tension between the aesthetic and the more practical (material and economic) aspects of a work of literature (or art in general).

A few of these points of friction find themselves manifested in the works at hand from Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht, particularly with regard to their plurality and their repeated, various, published approaches to composing wholes from parts, both of which disrupt the normative and traditional concept of a work as a single closed entity as unity. First and foremost, the avant-garde called into question the unmediated “unity of the universal and the particular”⁷⁹ that was assumed necessary to the “organic (symbolic) work of art.”⁸⁰ The avant-garde work is a

⁷³ Schulte-Sasse, xi.

⁷⁴ Bürger, 56.

⁷⁵ Schulte-Sasse, xxxix.

⁷⁶ Bürger, 55.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 56.

⁷⁸ Schulte-Sasse, xxxix.

⁷⁹ Bürger, 56.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

nonorganic or allegorical work of art in which the unity between the universal and particular is explicitly mediated and thereby essentially negated, since “in the extreme case, it is the recipient who creates it.”⁸¹ Though it is not being posited that Holz, Lasker-Schüler, or Brecht created avant-garde works, in a very particular way, this tension between part and whole, and the matter of their unity and its mediation, could be viewed as having followed from this historical reconsideration of the way works, their forms, and their roles in society are conceptually understood. The problem of the relationship between part and whole ultimately provides one of the central questions at hand with regard to the many published versions of *Phantasmus*, *Hauspostille*, and perhaps especially *Hebräische Balladen*; the unity between part to whole, especially with regard to *work* as the higher idea contained within and *work* as published product(s), should in these cases no longer be assumed or taken for granted.

In the avant-garde, the aesthetic and practical aspects of what makes a work a work also began to appear at odds with one another. The Ready-Made urinal is not a work because it meets the aesthetic criteria to be one, as the artist’s unique creation. It is a work because it is posited and exhibited as such. This point of tension is clearly visible, albeit in a more nuanced way, in the situation of many different publications by the same author with one title; in this case, each meets the aesthetic criteria of a work, and each the practical criteria through their publication. The problem, however, is that through the fact of multiple publications, the former criteria of uniqueness is undermined.

The tension between the aesthetic and practical aspects of a work is still quite perceptible as a rift in modern definitions of the word *work*. According to Ralf Klausnitzer, for example, the constitution of a work is bound to four specific criteria: an author’s realized intention

⁸¹ Bürger, 56.

(intentional criterion), identification through a title (paratextual criterion), the degree of closedness or completeness (aesthetic criterion), and finally, the act of publication and socialization (institutional criterion).⁸² Interestingly, though, Klausnitzer still sees multiple publications like those of *Phantasmus*, *Hebräische Balladen*, and *Hauspostille* as essentially being single works with an ongoing nature:

Ein Autor kann – so lange er will und ein Verleger mitspielt – immer wieder in sein Werk eingreifen und dieses verändern. [...] Dieses Interventionspotential des Autors in Bezug auf sein (zu Lebzeiten notwendig unabgeschlossenes) Werk hat zur Folge, dass Leser eigentlich stets mit *vorläufigen Objekten* der Lektüre und Interpretation beschäftigt sind.⁸³

Because these objects are publications, however, it bears noting that they are by definition not merely stages of a work (*Arbeitsstufen*); rather, they themselves are closed forms, and technically, each of the publications meets Klausnitzer's four criteria for being considered works.

Common dictionary definitions also prove unaccommodating in pinpointing origins or reasons for, or even addressing, the idea that such plural objects are essentially one work in many published forms. Modern definitions further fail to resolve the tension between aesthetic versus institutional criteria in the act of characterizing something as a work. Duden, for example, describes a work of art as “Produkt schöpferischer Arbeit”⁸⁴ and “Gesamtheit dessen, was jemand in schöpferischer Arbeit hervorgebracht hat,”⁸⁵ definitions which as a whole focus on aesthetic aspects. The Merriam-Webster definition is similarly vague and aesthetically rather than institutionally focused; a work is “something produced by the exercise of creative talent or

⁸² Klausnitzer, Ralf. *Literaturwissenschaft. Begriffe – Verfahren – Arbeitstechniken*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 284.

⁸³ Ibid., 297.

⁸⁴ “Werk.” *Duden.de*, (Bibliographisches Institut GmbH, 2013). Web. 24 May 2015. <<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Projekt>>.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

expenditure of creative artistic production.”⁸⁶ By either of these formulations, each of the publications of *Phantasmus*, *Hebräische Balladen*, and *Hauspostille* would qualify separately as works – but technically, so too could manuscripts that were never published or authorized for publication.

Definitions from the field of editions, alternatively, tend to focus primarily on the institutional criterion from Klausnitzer’s four-part definition, or even to provide separate definitions that rely on institutional and aesthetic ideas respectively and, as a result, appear to contradict one another. Editor and editions theorist Siegfried Scheibe, for instance, defines a work as a text that the author either published or authorized for publication in an exact, already achieved form.⁸⁷ By this definition, even Brecht’s 1922 and 1938 versions of *Hauspostille* would, for example, be considered works, because Brecht had authorized them for publication, despite the fact that the publications themselves never took place. On the other hand, Scheibe also poses a second, separate definition, this time by which a work is the sum of its recorded versions (*Fassungen*).⁸⁸ This essentially means that *Hauspostille* is also somehow a single work, as a higher idea contained in and throughout all existing versions. The conflict at hand here is clear. Whereas one of these definitions undermines the connectedness of all publications, the other dissolves the independent nature of these individual objects in favor of emphasizing unity.

A further definition stems from editor Gunther Martens, who states that a work is “eine in sich geschlossene Einheit,”⁸⁹ “etwas Grenzensetzendes und selbst Begrenztes.”⁹⁰ According to

⁸⁶“Work.” *Merriam-Webster.com*, (Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2015). Web. 24 May 2015. <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/project>>.

⁸⁷ Scheibe, Siegfried. “Werk und Edition. Aus dem Eröffnungsreferat zum Internationalen Editions-kolloquium 1989,” in: *Zu Werk und Text 1991*. As quoted in: Martens, *Werk*, 175.

⁸⁸ Zeller, Hans / Schilt, Jelka. “Werk oder Fassung eines Werks,” in: *Zu Werk und Text: Beiträge zur Textologie*, ed. Siegfried Scheibe and Christel Laufer, (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991), 61.

⁸⁹ Martens, *Werk*, 177.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

Martens, the phenomenon of an author breaking open a finished work and reworking it⁹¹ serves as a confirmation of the “Dialektik der Abgeschlossenheit”⁹² of a work. Works are indeed dynamic and open by this definition,⁹³ but only in that they do not **have** meaning; they generate meaning through their reception.⁹⁴ Multiple publications, moreover, function not as proof that works are open, but of their dialectic of closedness: once a work is finished and published, and therefore closed, the generation of meaning through the reception that follows is “eine Bewegung, an der der ausübende Künstler ebenso beteiligt ist wie der Rezipient.”⁹⁵ For the author of the already finished work, this has the potential to instigate a reprisal of the authorial role through “eine neue schöpferische Tätigkeit.”⁹⁶ Martens does not provide explicit terms for such reworkings and republications. Furthermore, this characterization of the work term heavily depends on the aesthetic criteria of closedness and on the traditional idea that closedness leads to openness through reception, but in this case, closedness and wholeness occur expressly through the institutional act of publication.⁹⁷ Following this perspective on the term as well, then, each published version could qualify as a work. At the same time, Martens, too, references the act of rewriting of an already published work as the ‘breaking back open’ of a single work.

At hand in the aforementioned definitions are two conflicting conceptualizations of what is designated as a work and how: first, that the unity of a work lies beyond its material appearance in various publications or editions,⁹⁸ and second, that a work is any product of

⁹¹ Ibid., 178.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid. “Die Dynamik und Offenheit des Werks.”

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ According to Martens, texts from Franz Kafka that Kafka himself did not publish or authorize for publication are, to illustrate this further, necessarily *texts* and not works, because they were not made closed and final in form by their author through the act of publication. These must therefore be approached and read differently than works. See, for example: Ibid., 178, 183.

⁹⁸ Refer to: Martus, 37; Derrida, Jacques. *Grammatologie*, (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1983), 35.

authorial creation and production that has specifically been closed and authorized through publication. What to do with these conflicting, or at the very least tension-ridden, ways of applying the term *work*? In his *Werkpolitik*, Steffen Martus addresses a possible root of the problem:

Für die Widersprüche der Werkpolitik ist unabhängig davon aufschlußreich, daß die Schrift auf der einen Seite insofern die mediale Voraussetzung (oder zumindest: ein medialer Katalysator) des emphatischen Werkbegriffs ist, als sie Stabilität über Raum und Zeit hinweg suggeriert, und daß die Schrift zugleich den Werkbegriff destabilisiert – sie provoziert und dokumentiert beispielsweise Fassungen und wirft damit die Frage nach der Einheit des Verschiedenen auf (zumindest dann, wenn Fassungen gesammelt werden und nicht mehr als vernachlässigswerte Vorstufe gelten).⁹⁹

Along with this crucial question of tensions in the term *work* itself, an additional and related problem has presented itself quite explicitly: should these separate publications be referred to as works, or versions (*Fassungen*) of a work?

The issue with the terms *version* and *Fassung* is first and foremost that both words can and do refer to both published and non-published texts. According to editions theorist Bodo Plachta, for example, a *Fassung* is a “[v]ollendete oder nicht vollendete Ausführung eines (Kunst-)Werks, die von einer anderen Ausführung abweicht.”¹⁰⁰ The English counterpart *version* boasts the same ambiguity pertaining to non-published and published texts, but this word carries additional complications, like the German *Version*, due to its broadness in meaning. Beyond manuscript or print versions from an author using similar base material and central themes, the word can also be used to describe “reasonably viable surrogate[s] or stand-in[s] for some work of art,”¹⁰¹ such as translations, and “remakes and adaptations [...that] take some artistic item as a

⁹⁹ Martus, 39.

¹⁰⁰ Plachta, Bodo. *Editionswissenschaft. 3. Auflage*, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2013), 136.

¹⁰¹ Livingston, Paisley. “Texts, Works, Versions,” in: *Art and Intention. A Philosophical Study*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 131.

source and introduce sufficient novelty to give it another spin.”¹⁰² In this last sense, Brecht’s *Hauspostille* are a version of Martin Luther’s *Hauspostille*, Holz’ *Phantasmus* can be seen as a spin on or a direct reference to Tieck’s *Phantasmus*, and many poems from Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* are versions of stories from Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁰³ In broader terms, according to theorists such as Gérard Genette, all literary works are essentially versions in that they all inevitably imitate and transform.¹⁰⁴

It is apparent, at least, that *version* is too expansive in nature to be sufficient for referring to multiple different but intimately related publications with the same title from the same author. *Fassung* for its part may be somewhat more apt, but it still undermines the fact of the publication of these various printed editions by including any unpublished manuscript versions without explicit distinction. In either case, both terms also inevitably imply that these publications are all variations of one thing – but what is that? The embedded notion with these terms, too, is that the work somehow exists outside of the materials produced.

Beyond terms that endeavor to characterize separate but related literary objects, theorists of editions have also posed terminology that attempts to address the relationship among *Fassungen*. Such relational terms consider other non-published and incomplete materials to be of equal importance,¹⁰⁵ if not categorically the same types of material, from the standpoint of an editor and with a historico-critical (developmentally focused) approach to works in mind. The question of how to refer exclusively to the relationship among multiple publications, however, remains unanswered.

¹⁰² Ibid., 132.

¹⁰³ This will be addressed further in the second chapter.

¹⁰⁴ Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes*, (Paris: Seuil, 1982), Ch. 44. As quoted in: Livingston, 132.

¹⁰⁵ See, for example: Scheibe, 19.

One such encompassing term is the *text of a work*. This way of categorizing a relationship among objects falls directly in line with Scheibe's aforementioned definition that a work is the sum of its *Fassungen*. In the case of this concept, though, it is the *text* of a work, not the work itself, that "besteht aus den von seinem Autor hergestellten Fassungen."¹⁰⁶ Text therefore serves a unifying function, whereas the term work can potentially be pluralizing¹⁰⁷ if "Textfassungen, die in einem textgenetischen Zusammenhang stehen, [...] eigenständige *Werke* [sind], wenn sie selbst vom Autor veröffentlicht wurden oder für eine Veröffentlichung vorgesehen waren."¹⁰⁸

A similar term, *Werkzusammenhang*, denotes the relatedness of a group of manuscripts and works (as publications) specifically to a particular work (as publication):

Ein *Werkzusammenhang* ist eine Gruppe von Texten, die in einem genetischen Zusammenhang mit einem *Werk* stehen. Einem *Werkzusammenhang* können Texte verschiedener Art zugehören: Stichwortnotizen, Vorentwürfe, Entwürfe, Reinschriften und auch selbst wiederum mehrere *Werke*.¹⁰⁹

This term approaches and acknowledges situations of multiple publications found with groups of publications such as those of *Hebräische Balladen*, *Phantasmus*, and *Hauspostille*, and recognizes the individual work-character of plural objects through the simple fact of their publication. In the end, however, the development of a particular work over time is what is emphasized, with the focus being primarily on a work's various stages and any related materials that were created in the process, complete and fragmentary, published and non-published. This term therefore acknowledges but simultaneously glosses over the independence of plural publications and their distinction from versions and materials that were not completed or authorized for publication. It is not through the term itself but rather only through the practice of editing, more specifically through certain methods of representation, that this distinction can (ideally) be relayed.

¹⁰⁶ Zeller / Schilt, 78.

¹⁰⁷ Martus, 20.

¹⁰⁸ Martens, *Werk*, 180.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 181.

Another possible characterization is the term *Werkkomplex*, which comes somewhat closer to describing the relationship among multiple fundamentally linked but separate literary objects with work-character. At the same time, however, although it does concentrate on a complicated relationship that entails simultaneous interconnected and self-contained qualities, and one that is also at play in the genre of the poetry cycle as a whole, *Werkkomplex* addresses a different situation than the central one at hand in this dissertation. This term describes the fact that a published poetry cycle is a work that simultaneously contains and is made up of a series of individual poems, which are themselves also individual works:¹¹⁰ “eine Reihe von in sich eigenständigen *Werken*, die vom Autor in einen thematischen oder auch strukturellen Zusammenhang gestellt und in einer von ihm bestimmten festen Anordnung veröffentlicht wurden.”¹¹¹ While this is clearly a relevant term with regard to the poetry cycles being considered, and will in fact be incorporated into the examination of genre to follow, it does not go far enough to describe the individuality and interconnectedness that can occur beyond the level of single publication and the parts (themselves smaller stand-alone wholes) of which it is comprised.

An alternative solution to the aforementioned terms might seem to be to choose a term from outside the fields of editions and literature to describe the complex nature of the relationship among these multiple publications with the same title. In consideration of more vague designations such as *project*, however, the end result is still that such terms tend to emphasize unity and an always-intended teleology over the reality of the situation of these interconnected and self-contained artistic products. *Project*, in particular, does well to capture the ongoing and repeated engagement of the artist with their materials and subject matter, but it also

¹¹⁰ Martens, *Werk*, 182.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*

carries with it the connotation that there was a specific plan and goal in place from the beginning, carried out in steps and with intention over a period of time. Merriam-Webster defines this word, for example, as “a planned piece of work that has a specific purpose [...] and that usually requires a lot of time”¹¹² or “a specific plan or design.”¹¹³ The definition from Duden for the German counterpart *Projekt* is similarly a “[groß angelegte] geplante oder bereits begonnene Unternehmung; [groß angelegtes] Vorhaben.”¹¹⁴

The importance of terminology cannot be stressed enough, as it shapes the way that literary objects are discussed, presented, and received. What has been demonstrated is that many terms come close to addressing, and could potentially be adapted to address, the phenomenon of pluralities of publications that forms the basis of this dissertation. Ultimately, however, no existing term is truly fitting; there currently exists no terminology for, nor a framework for understanding or receiving, nor any theoretical examination of a phenomenon that finds multiple varying but decidedly similar instances beginning over 100 years ago. While it is not necessarily exactness that is important in finding a term to refer to the objects that serve as the focus of this dissertation, it is imperative that broadness and conflicts embedded within existing terms and their definitions be acknowledged, especially if they are to be applied despite being problematic.

With the terminology that has been considered in mind, the multiple publications of *Hebräische Balladen*, *Phantasus*, and *Hauspostille* will be referred to as **work-groups** and **groups or sets of collections** in lieu of any of the aforementioned terms, because this term seems best fitted to simultaneously acknowledge both the unifying definition of *work* as the sum of its

¹¹²“Project.” *Merriam-Webster.com*, (Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2015). Web. 24 May 2015. <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/project>>.

¹¹³“Ibid.”

¹¹⁴ “Projekt.” *Duden.de*, (Bibliographisches Institut GmbH, 2013). Web. 24 May 2015. <<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Projekt>>.

versions and the work-character of each separate publication. To refer to individual publications that make up these work-groups, *version* will never be used; for the purposes of this dissertation, as in line with the previously discussed definitions of a work, a version is an unpublished manuscript or, with Lasker-Schüler, a non-author-authorized corruption.

The unique form of interrelation of the work-groups from Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht indeed makes terminology a complex matter, but in the end, it is also precisely the impetus for exploring how these work-groups came about, how they have been read, and how they might be presented to readers in such a way that approaching the publications either separately or together, or finding a compromise between the two, would be possible. Because these literary objects are self-contained publications, each is worth receiving in its own right. At the same time, the fact of their connectedness cannot be denied. To accomplish a presentation of these objects that is able to embody both of these features, an awareness of the complex relationship among these objects needs to be achieved (and finally, relayed).

Due to the “relatively recent transformation of the artist’s economic position”¹¹⁵ and the fact that “die Marktförmigkeit die literarische Kommunikation bestimmt,”¹¹⁶ the first matter of investigation will be to determine the role and function of the historical situation of publishing and the relationship between the authors and their publishers in the creation of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen*, as well as those of *Phantasmus* and *Hauspostille*. The following chapter will provide insight on this subject by concentrating primarily on Else Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* and will also further illuminate the reasoning behind making Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* the focal point of this dissertation.

¹¹⁵ Schulte-Sasse, x.

¹¹⁶ Martus, 22.

Chapter One: Publishing Plural and the Book Market

I. On the Concept(s) of Authorship

Over centuries, the term *author* has meant many different, even conflicting things: Scribe and medium through which a divine inspiration works and creates;¹¹⁷ one who has learned and employs traditional and established rules, structures, and skillsets in order to compose a written literary text;¹¹⁸ moral educator of the masses;¹¹⁹ observers of and commentators on society;¹²⁰ earthly, mortal version of God the Creator;¹²¹ imaginative imitator of nature;¹²² creative and gifted Genius;¹²³ father or mother who conceives and gives birth to a child, the Work;¹²⁴

¹¹⁷ *Poeta vates*. Refer, for example, to: Jannidis, Fotis / Lauer, Gerhard / Martinez, Matias / Winko, Simone. "Rede über den Autor an die Gebildeten unter seinen Verächtern. Historische Modelle und systematische Perspektiven," in: *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs*, (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999), 4-5.

¹¹⁸ *Poeta faber*. See: Ibid., 5. Martin Opitz is an example of an author who held this notion of authorship, and this is especially visible in his *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* (1624). Another term that is important here is that of the "regelgeleitete *ars*." See: Begemann, Christian. "Der Körper des Autors. Autorschaft als Zeugung und Geburt im diskursiven Feld der Genieästhetik," in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, ed. Heinrich Detering, (Stuttgart / Weimer: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 47.

¹¹⁹ This idea dates back to Greek theatre, but persisted well into later time periods. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, for example, was a strong supporter of this view, perhaps most explicitly in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767/1769). This concept of authorship is especially visible throughout the history of the drama, but is by no means limited to theatre.

¹²⁰ Compare to: Begemann, 44.

¹²¹ "Wir Gottminiaturen erschaffen Weltminiaturen. »Zuerst war das Wort.«" Lasker-Schüler, Else. *Ich räume auf!*, in: *Werke und Briefe*, Bd. 4.1, ed. Norbert Oellers, Heinz Rölleke and Itta Shedletzky, (Frankfurt a. M.: Jüdischer Verlag, 2001), 78-79. This edition will henceforth be referred to as *WB*. This particular image of the role of an author is extremely prevalent in both literature and theory. See, as another example, the poem "Prometheus" by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.

¹²² See for example Friedrich Schiller's *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* (1800). This, too, finds a tradition reaching back to Greek antiquity (such as with idyllic poems).

¹²³ There are countless texts on this author concept. For more on this, refer for example to: Begemann, 44-61; Berndt, Frauke. "Die Erfindung des Genies. F. G. Klopstocks rhetorische Konstruktion des Au(c)tors im Vorfeld der Autonomieästhetik," in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, 24-43; Jannidis / Lauer / Martinez / Winko, 5; Woodmansee, Martha / Jaszi, Peter. "Die globale Dimension des Begriffs der ›Autorschaft‹," in: *Rückkehr des Autors*, 391-419 (esp. 394). Perhaps the most well known author to embody this concept of the author is Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.

¹²⁴ Roland Barthes refers to this notion in his *The Death of the Author* (1967): Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author," in: *Image, Music, Text*, ed. and trans. Stephen Heath, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 145. See also: Begemann, 44-61; Bohnenkamp, Anne. "Autorschaft und Textgenese," in: Ibid., 62-79 (esp. 63).

expresser and embedder of experience and feeling in written forms;¹²⁵ subject executing an intention in order to embed meaning within a text,¹²⁶ and the final authority on and privileged interpreter of the meaning of that text;¹²⁷ inventor and craftsman, maker of something of aesthetic worth;¹²⁸ producer of a product, of words for sale;¹²⁹ creator and authorizer of a publication, and subsequent owner of original, artistic, written content as intellectual property;¹³⁰ self-sacrificing

¹²⁵ Rainer Maria Rilke writes in his *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*, to give an example, “Verse sind nicht, wie die Leute meinen, Gefühle (die hat man früh genug), – es sind Erfahrungen.” See: Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*, in: *Sämtliche Werke*, v. 6, ed. Rilke-Archiv in connection with Ruth Sieber-Rilke and Ernst Zinn, (Wiesbaden / Frankfurt: Insel, 1966), 724f. See also: Woodmansee / Jaszi, 394. Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi talk of the development of the idea that authors are generalizing and embedding their personal sensory experiences into their works: “Erst im Verlauf des 18. Jahrhunderts, und auch dort hauptsächlich in Westeuropa, entwickelte sich eine abweichende Vorstellung vom Vorgang kreativer Produktion, bei dem die Begabung und Leistung des genialen Individuums in den Mittelpunkt gestellt wurde. In schroffer Abgrenzung zum Selbstverständnis der vorausgehenden Schriftstellergenerationen sahen die Autoren der neuen, romantischen Denkrichtung ihre Aufgabe darin, den Stoff der persönlichen Sinneserfahrung der Tätigkeit ihrer als individuell und unverwechselbar verstandenen Genialität zum Zwecke der kreativen Verwandlung zu unterstellen. Diese Veränderung in der Akzentuierung führte zu einer Mystifizierung des Schaffensbegriffs, weil dadurch die Inanspruchnahme der Werke anderer von seiten dieser Dichter letztlich verschleiert wurde.” According to other views, poems are encoded moods and emotions. For more on this, refer for example to: Winko, Simone. *Kodierte Gefühle: zu einer Poetik der Emotionen in lyrischen und poetologischen Texten um 1900*, (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2003), 1-456.

¹²⁶ See, for example: Jannidis / Lauer / Martinez / Winko, 7. This notion of the author is particularly relevant for hermeneutic interpretations of a text.

¹²⁷ In some forms of interpretation, if the author has expressed that they intended a passage or work to mean something specific, this is ultimately who has the final say. Other approaches attempt to reconstruct what the author intended. For further interpretative approaches, what the author intended might be considered valid where explicitly expressed, but possible meanings and interpretations are not limited to what the author explicitly intended. See, for example, *Ibid.*, 19: “In konstruktivistischen wie auch in dekonstruktivistischen Modellen wird der Autor aus der Menge bedeutungskonstituierender Instanzen ausgeschlossen: Bedeutung wird einem Text im Akt der Lektüre verliehen, indem Individuen (>Normalleser< oder Experten) Textelemente und Kontexte variabel fokussieren. Schreibt ein Autor seinem Text Bedeutung zu, so tut er dies nur als Leser und keineswegs als privilegierter Interpret. In allen anderen Modellen, in denen die Bedeutung eines Textes mit Bezug auf eine überindividuelle Instanz bestimmt wird, erhält der Autor zumindest eine Minimalfunktion.”

¹²⁸ See, for example: Bosse, Heinrich. *Autorschaft ist Werkherrschaft. Über die Entstehung des Urheberrechts aus dem Geist der Goethezeit*, (Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh, 1981), 14. “[S]owie der Schriftsteller zu den Erfindern zählt, darf er billigerweise anderen verbieten und erlauben, von seiner Erfindung Gebrauch zu machen. Im schriftlichen Diskurs produziert der Autor nach dem Muster des Erfinders, und daraus ergibt sich eine spezifische Beziehung zu seinem Produkt.” Christian Begemann refers to writing as a “wenigstens teilweise erlernbares Handwerk.” Begemann, 47. Woodmansee and Jaszi write further: “Die Schriftsteller der vorromantischen Epoche sahen – wie andere Handwerker – ihre Aufgabe darin, das Material der Tradition nach Prinzipien und Techniken umzuarbeiten, die sie in Rhetorik aufbewahrt und überliefert fanden.” Woodmansee / Jaszi, 394.

¹²⁹ Bosse, 16. “[D]as Produkt [ist] sein geistiges Eigentum. Er kann seine Werkherrschaft ausüben, indem er die Wörter unbesorgt verkauft – es bleiben ihm ja die Worte. *Die verkauften Wörter.*”

¹³⁰ For more on *Urheberrecht* refer to: Bosse. See also: Woodmansee / Jaszi, 391. “Von Herder über Goethe bis hin zu Wordsworth und Coleridge wurde authentische Autorschaft als originäre Genialität in dem Sinne aufgefaßt, daß nicht eine Variation, Imitation, Adaption oder gar eine Reproduktion stattfindet; vielmehr wird ein neues, nie-

subject that dissolves in the act and process of writing;¹³¹ reader, weaver, re-purposer, re-interpreter of pre-existing texts;¹³² a special function of discourse within a particular culture that serves to both create and limit meaning;¹³³ an empirical person, an intention-capable and intentional instance, or the function of a speaker, through which interpreters of literary texts determine the meaning of and/or contextualize a given text.¹³⁴ The *author* is a cultural figure with a long and complex history, and a term laden with nuances and shifts with regard to how it has been and continues to be understood.

With this multitude of conceptualizations of the term *author* in mind, one central question is: How did Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht approach, perform, and develop the concept of authorship? These three particular authors each performed the function of the author, to varying individual degrees, as vibrant and performative public personalities, as educators and provokers, as re-purposers and re-interpreters of old texts and forms, as inventors and composers of unique texts, as observers of and commentators on society, and as embedders, creators, and arbiters of experience, feeling, and meaning.

dagewesenes, eben ›originales‹ Werk hergestellt, für das der Schöpfer Besitzansprüche geltend machen kann und das deshalb gesetzlichen Schutz verdient.”

¹³¹ Michel Foucault, for example, writes about the kinship between writing and death or sacrifice, and the disappearing subject, in his *What is an Author?*. See especially: Foucault, Michel. *What is an Author?* (1969), in: *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1977), 116-117. Roland Barthes, too, describes writing as “the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body of writing.” Barthes, 142.

¹³² Refer especially to: Barthes, 146.

¹³³ See: Foucault, 124, 147.

¹³⁴ Jannidis / Lauer / Martinez / Winko, 25. “Interpreten literarischer Texte beziehen sich auf den Autor, um die Textbedeutung zu ermitteln und/oder Texte gesellschaftlich, geistesgeschichtlich, medial etc. zu kontextualisieren. Dabei kann der Autorbegriff die empirische Person bezeichnen, eine intentionsfähige und intentionale Instanz oder die Funktion eines Sprechers, einer ›Ich-Origo‹ im Text.”

II. On Originality

The specific understanding of an author as one who creates something **original** is problematic, at least to a certain extent, especially in light of these particular authors' multiple publications of related, reworked content. As previously considered with regard to the concept of a work, the general timespan in which Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht were operating as authors appears to offer a contextual parallel; around and after the turn of the century, the problems of uniqueness and originality were specifically being thematized, most extremely (though by no means exclusively) by authors and artists considered to be part of the avant-garde movement. Indeed, particularly beginning in literary modernism, authorship experienced a general push for the "Entlastung vom Originalitätsdruck der Genie-Ästhetik."¹³⁵ According to Friedhelm Marx,

[d]ie Renaissance des *poeta vates* in der Moderne vollzieht sich unter weitgehender Aussparung der für die Genie-Ästhetik konstitutiven schöpferischen Aspekte. An die Stelle des (problematisch gewordenen) Konzepts originärer Autorschaft rückt das Experiment einer priesterlich-»autoritären« Herrschaft im Zeichen der Schrift, an die Stelle des kreativen Akts der Rekurs auf gegebene, auratische Texte, die in Erinnerung gerufen, zelebriert, gelebt sein wollen.¹³⁶

Theorists such as Roland Barthes would retrospectively look to this broad timespan and at works being created throughout, and arrive at the idea that authorship is in essence readership; authors read other texts and weave these together to create new ones, and a work is not a unique message bestowed upon readers by an "Author-God,"¹³⁷ but rather "a multi-dimensional space in

¹³⁵ Marx, Friedhelm: "Heilige Autorschaft? *Self-Fashioning*-Strategien in der Literatur der Moderne," in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, 119-120.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Barthes, 146.

which a variety of texts blend and clash.”¹³⁸ Others such as Pierre Bourdieu would go on to write of authors in their role as *cultural producers* to avoid the ideology behind the term *creator*, that is to say, “the mystique of the unique artist,”¹³⁹ while at the same time being careful to avoid reducing authors to simply *producers* and thereby ignoring “the specificity of this space of production, which is not a form of production like the others.”¹⁴⁰

Bourdieu, like Barthes, ultimately sees authors as readers of, and reactors to, one another, rather than as entirely unique geniuses. Authors function in a field that is relatively closed and therefore also inherently reflexive; even when they attempt to break from the history and tradition of a genre with their works, those works necessarily implicitly contain the entire history of their genre – in fact much more so than other works considered typical for their time and genre. (Such works therefore require the reader to have a higher competence to understand its significance in the greater context of that genre’s history).¹⁴¹ At the same time, works more typical for their time and genre are also fundamentally produced within the context of many other existing works, both past and contemporary, to which these works are ultimately responses and reactions, implicitly or explicitly. If all works are produced as reactions of some kind to other works, or on a broader scale to the history of a genre or the current state of the literary field, they are (in this sense at least) not ‘purely’ original creations.

Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht were all certainly cultural producers, creating works that were inherently reactions to other works within the context of the literary field and the histories of the genres in which they were writing. These three work-groups, as a matter of fact,

¹³⁸ Barthes, 146. This particular aspect of the work-groups *Phantasus*, *Hebräische Balladen*, and *Hauspostille* – as drawing on and adapting previously existing traditions and texts – will be addressed in the second chapter.

¹³⁹ Bourdieu, Pierre. *Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), 110.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996), 242-243.

each explicitly draw on older works and forms to create something quite different from what they reference: for Lasker-Schüler, these are stories from the Hebrew Bible and the form of the ballad; for Brecht, Martin Luther's *Hauspostille*; and for Arno Holz, Ludwig Tieck's collection of dreams titled *Phantasus*.¹⁴² Each title also further problematizes the uniqueness of works, at least implicitly, through the fact of their multiple and varying authorized publications.

The fact that the originality of works was being questioned during the lifespans of these three authors, however, and retrospectively by theorists that followed, does not alone provide a solid explanation for the phenomenon of the plural publications of work-groups such as *Hebräische Balladen*, *Phantasus*, and *Hauspostille*.

III. Privilege and Poverty: A Short History of a Long Term Problem

As cultural producers and therefore also cultural figures, Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht each lived the function of authorship in ways that fell in line with the common understanding of authors as outsiders and sufferers. Else Lasker-Schüler occasionally dressed as her alter-ego Prinz Jussuf, ruler of the imaginary Theben; she was an avant-garde poet who blended genres as well as fact and fiction in quite an atypical fashion in her works, and she won prizes for her writing but suffered in poverty for much of her lifetime – not to mention that she was a Jewish woman and single mother in the early 1900s; Holz' *Selbstinszenierung* was one of the romantic dreamer and poet in his chamber, seeing and feeling the world and all of history from a special removed position, he was a champion of naturalistic writing that portrayed life and society in ways that showcased the rougher, harsher edges to its receiving public, and he,

¹⁴² This will be handled explicitly in the second chapter.

too, suffered financial difficulties; Brecht seems to have seen it as his job as a writer to observe and critique society, often rather bluntly and provocatively, and though he earned more in general than Holz or Lasker-Schüler, his interpretation of the role of an author as a critical outsider led directly to his expatriation and exile during the Third Reich for his “zahlreiche deutschfeindliche Artikel und Gedichte,”¹⁴³ as previously mentioned.

These two images of the author, the outsider and the sufferer, are especially of interest for this chapter, because they are arguably direct results of the way that authorship functions as a line of work – namely, as the production and publication of literary works to be published **for an income**, in what Bourdieu refers to as the inverse economy of the artistic fields.¹⁴⁴ Authors were producers of products for sale, on which they relied to earn an income, and as income earners within the context of the book market during this historical period, they were also bound contractually to a relationship with their publishers. Else Lasker-Schüler, Arno Holz, and Bertolt Brecht were, moreover, operating during a timespan that saw the book market being heavily influenced by mass media and mass production and reproduction, which meant (among other things) that the struggle to stay relevant and to earn an income was taking place not only in competition with other authors, but with other forms of media.

The question is, how could the economic role of the author, the relationship between author and publisher, historical publishing practices, and the historical situation of the book market have contributed to the many publications of these work-groups? This chapter means to investigate an understanding of authors as sufferers and outsiders through the context of the inverse economy of the literary field and a cultural structuring of the relationship between artistic fields and money, and to consider how factors of the book market as well as publishing practices

¹⁴³ *Verfügung des Reichsministeriums des Innern vom 8. Juni 1935*, I A 5541/5013c. Specifically references Brecht’s poem *Legende vom toten Soldaten*. As quoted in: *BFA*, v. 27, 586.

¹⁴⁴ Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, 142.

and relationships could have, in conjunction with this, led authors such as Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht to issue a number of differing but interconnected publications over a period of many years.

Money in a Lifetime, or Honor in the Afterlife

Authors have long been, and are still frequently, seen as others within their own societies. According to this notion, it is only by being such that they are able to create meaningful, insightful works that affect and move the societies in which they live. An author must necessarily be an outsider; they do not, and should not, fit within society, but rather are (and must be) above and beyond it, in order to observe and comment. This otherness is both a positive exceptionality and a negative one. The idea of authors as sufferers maintains that from suffering comes creativity and perspective, and furthermore, that an author is one who sees, experiences, and feels more deeply and is then able to channel this into his or her works.¹⁴⁵ Authorship is a position of privilege, but a lonely and painful one. The notion of the author as an other is one that prevails and appears in many forms: “der Künstler als Seher und Prophet, als Rasender und Wahnsinniger, Melancholiker oder Leidender usw.”¹⁴⁶

An author’s suffering can be seen as the cause for their outsider status, but it is ultimately also a consequence of it. Such ways of seeing and understanding the author-figure become rather interesting when considered together with the author’s role as producer of products for income. Those in this position have historically earned a collective reverence in exchange for their

¹⁴⁵ Compare to: Woodmannsee / Jaszi, 394; See also: Bertram, Ernst. “Thomas Mann. Zum Roman *Königliche Hoheit*,” in: *Mitteilungen der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn*, v. 4 (1909), 197: “Erlöser der andern, haben sie die Gewalt über fremde Seelen nur durch das Leid der eigenen.” As quoted in: Marx, 116.

¹⁴⁶ Begemann, 44.

suffering and outsiderdom,¹⁴⁷ but typically not wealth, or even a stable and sufficient source of financial means, through their works. The idea that they are necessarily outsiders in their own societies because they are in some way exceptional appears to have even directly influenced and contributed to how, and how much, authors are paid for their publications. In the field of authorship, earning honor, acknowledgement, and a name for one's self through one's works has been seen as ultimately and fundamentally more important than earning money for labor expended. In fact, the word *Honorar* comes from the Latin and quite explicitly means "Ehrengabe,"¹⁴⁸ and even modern royalties rarely correspond to "der geleisteten Arbeit" of an author.¹⁴⁹

The idea that authors are exceptional others and writing a special service through which one should earn honor rather than money, at least in the Western European tradition, can be seen as stemming from the very old notion that authors are in some way holy and writing in some way divine. Authorship has had religious connotations stemming back from the Christian image of the monk as scribe, himself unimportant and his name unmentioned in relation to the words the monk was transcribing, and from the general religious notion of prophets who do not themselves speak or act, but who are channels through which a god spreads a message. Following this idea historically was the image of literary authors as not themselves creative and brilliant, but rather mediums through which God inspires and works.¹⁵⁰ Even into the latter half of the 18th century, the conceptualization of writing as divine work was the justification for the view that any sort of direct or explicit monetary compensation for such work was inappropriate. As Goethe explains

¹⁴⁷ Marx, 116.

¹⁴⁸ "Honorar" in: *Wörterbuch des Buches*, 3rd ed., ed. Helmut Hiller, (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1967), 141-142.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ *Poeta vates*. Refer back to the first footnote in this chapter.

retrospectively, “[d]ie Produktion von poetischen Schriften [...] wurde als etwas Heiliges angesehen, und man hielt es beinah für Simonie, ein Honorar zu nehmen oder zu steigern.”¹⁵¹

With some time, the earning of royalties came to be seen as an acceptable practice, “da es als Anerkennung galt,”¹⁵² but the attempt to increase the amount “um sich am Gewinn des Verlegers zu beteiligen”¹⁵³ was still seen as “standeswidrig und unschicklich.”¹⁵⁴ Writing a book was a service and the book itself a *Handwerk*;¹⁵⁵ “Daher [war] [...] die] Arbeit [eines Autors] anzuerkennen, auch finanziell, nicht aber der Erfolg seiner Arbeit. Was ihn vom Gewinn trennt[e], [war] die Standesschranke.”¹⁵⁶ In early capitalism, “[d]ie ‘Idee des ehrenhaften Erwerbs’, [...] jene Bindung der Wirtschaftssubjekte durch Religion und Sitte”¹⁵⁷ applied to “den Gelehrten wie für den Kaufmann.”¹⁵⁸ In either case, “die Gewinnsucht [sei] schändlich, unehrenhaft.”¹⁵⁹ It was honor and acknowledgement from society that should act as due compensation for an author’s (worthy, successful) contributions – even when it came “spätestens von seiten der Nachwelt.”¹⁶⁰

Pierre Bourdieu maintains that this is, in essence, still the case for modern authors, (or at least specifically those authors who see their main objective as creating true art, rather than catering to the desires of the public and to existing markets to earn money), comparing the relationship between a publisher and author to that of the priest and the sacristan and detailing

¹⁵¹ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, from *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (Buch 12), as quoted in: Bosse, 79.

¹⁵² Bosse, 80.

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 74.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Werner Sombart as quoted in: Ibid., 73.

¹⁵⁸ Werner Sombart as quoted in: Ibid. The concept of the *Gelehrte* follows the notion that to write well is to have studied and learned certain rules and skills (*ars*), and it encompassed the poet and literary writer until it found itself being defined negatively against the idea of the *Genie*, which arose in the 18th century. After this point, the ‘studied imitator’ was often differentiated from the ‘original genius.’ Refer to Edward Young’s *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759) and: Scholz, Bernhard F. “Alciato als emblematum pater et princeps,” in: *Rückkehr des Autors*, 326.

¹⁵⁹ Werner Sombart as quoted in: Ibid.

¹⁶⁰ Marx, 116.

the ways in an author is (softly) exploited because writing is seen as a type of sacred work, as compared to common jobs where one simply works for wages.¹⁶¹ According to Bourdieu, there are authors who strive to make money through the production of bestsellers, and there are authors who see true artistry and authorship as aiming to make ‘art for art’s sake,’ that is to say, explicitly not with the intention of catering to a paying public to make good money.¹⁶² Those who work to create works for the sake of creating true art, explicitly without commercial aims, can even find validation and affirmation in a lack of commercial success.¹⁶³ Bourdieu writes: “In the artistic world as an economic world reversed, the most anti-economic “follies” are in certain respects “reasonable” since in them disinterestedness is recognized and rewarded.”¹⁶⁴ This is because “the economy of practices is founded,” he explains further, “as in the game of *loser takes all*, on an inversion of the fundamental principles of the field of power and of the economic field.”¹⁶⁵ Authorship, ‘true’ authorship, privileges asceticism, suffering, poverty, and an indifference to earning money (or at least the believable appearance thereof),¹⁶⁶ over the intention to earn money through the production and publication of one’s works.

If an author lives in poverty and suffers throughout their lifetime, struggling to earn a living through their art, and is then eventually recognized (perhaps post-mortem) as one of the Greats, their impoverished and difficult existence quite often serves as proof that they were true artists who were ‘ahead of their time.’ If an author’s name is recognized after their death or late

¹⁶¹ Bourdieu, *Practical Reason*, 111-118.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 84

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 219: “Failure may [...] always find justifications in the institutions resulting from a whole historical labour – for example, the notion of the ‘cursed artist’ [*artiste maudit*] confers a recognized existence on the real or presumed gap between temporal success and artistic value.”

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, *Practical Reason*, 112. For Bourdieu, disinterestedness refers to an author’s apparent denial of economy and disinterestedness in earning a living or making a profit from their works, due to the belief that art should instead be created for the sake of art itself.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, *Distinction*, 217.

¹⁶⁶ See: *Ibid.*, *Practical Reason*, 86.

in their lifetime, their suffering in poverty and lack of recognition is justified and romanticized as a necessary part of living the role of a true Author, and furthermore as an obvious marker of their exceptionality. In fact, this applies to all artistic fields, not only to authorship. Names of artists and authors with such legends behind them include those of painter Vincent van Gogh, writer Edgar Allen Poe, and poet and dramatist Else Lasker-Schüler. The narrative in cases such as these is always as follows: these creators suffered poverty during their lifetimes because they were so brilliant and dedicated to art itself that they created works that were above and beyond the time and place they lived, and their works were economically unsuccessful during their creator's lifetime because they were too 'ahead of their time' to be grasped by their contemporaries. At best, such authors tend to be 'author's authors' during their own lifetime, which is to say, their works are appreciated primarily by an audience that consists of their peers – fellow authors and artists – who are also ultimately their competitors on the market.¹⁶⁷ Else Lasker-Schüler, in fact, is a prime example of such an author.¹⁶⁸

On the other hand, economic success during one's lifetime can actually count against an author in the long run.¹⁶⁹ Popular and bestselling authors are frequently dismissed by other authors with 'purer' aims as simply commercial, and in fact, the names of such authors very often do fall quickly into obsolescence and obscurity, remaining forgotten in later eras, and they

¹⁶⁷ Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, 82. "[P]roducers may have only their competitors as clients, at least in the short run." Bourdieu also explains: "While the reception of products called 'commercial' is more or less independent of the educational level of receivers, 'pure' works of art are not accessible except to consumers endowed with the disposition and the competence which are necessary for their appreciation. It follows that producers-for-producers depend very directly on the education system, even though they increasingly inveigh against it." (Ibid., 147).

¹⁶⁸ "Else Lasker-Schüler" in: *KILLY Lexikon*, 2nd ed., v. 7, ed. Walther Killy, (Berlin: Walther de Gruyter, 2010), 244. Lasker-Schüler was "zu Lebzeiten vornehmlich von anderen Künstlern rezipiert."

¹⁶⁹ Bourdieu, *Practical Reason*, 110. See also: Ibid., *The Rules of Art*, 148: "[I]mmmediate success has something suspect about it, as if it reduced the symbolic offering of a priceless work to the simple 'give and take' of a commercial exchange. The vision that makes of asceticism in this world the condition of health in the hereafter finds its principle in the specific logic of symbolic alchemy that maintains that investments will not be recouped unless they are (or seem to be) operating at a loss, in the manner of a gift, which cannot assure itself of the most precious counter-gift, 'recognition', unless it sees itself as without return."

are usually unrecognized by institutions determining who belongs in the literary canon.¹⁷⁰ Some authors, as Bourdieu explains,

see in immediate success ‘the mark of intellectual inferiority’. And the Christlike mystique of the ‘*artiste maudit*’, sacrificed in this world and consecrated in the one beyond, is no doubt just the transfiguration into the ideal, or into a professional ideology, of the specific contradiction of the mode of production which the pure artist claims to establish. One is in fact in an economic world inverted: the artist cannot triumph on the symbolic terrain except by losing on the economic terrain (at least in the short run), and vice versa (at least in the long run).¹⁷¹

Traditionally, even today, authors are understood (and very often understand themselves and their work’s end goal) as striving to earn a name for themselves.¹⁷² Ideally, if one is successful, one is honored for that success through recognition and the immortality of their name. This ultimately applies to both those authors who would be considered commercial because they earn a decent living writing bestsellers, and the many more who do not see success and recognition during their own lifetime. Authorship is in this way a rather strange line of work, because the possibility for this kind of success and recognition extends well beyond the mortality of a writer.¹⁷³ It is also a field unlike most others because for a cultural producer, economic success during one’s lifetime is often actually detrimental to the goal of creating a long-lasting, recognizable, ‘immortal’ name.¹⁷⁴

The nature of the inverse economy of the literary field, in which the perceived ‘purity’ of an author and the symbolic value of a genre such as poetry is directly inverse to commercial (economic) success,¹⁷⁵ and in which disinterestedness in earning money is privileged if one is to

¹⁷⁰ Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 120-121.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 83.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, *Practical Reason*, 291. Bourdieu refers to this as symbolic capital, which is “the acquisition of a reputation for competence and an image of respectability and honourability.”

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, *Distinction*, 114.

be considered a true author, authorizes exploitation of cultural producers.¹⁷⁶ The work is seen as a privilege and a kind of culturally sacred duty; doing such sacred work with an aim to earn money is therefore seen as improper.¹⁷⁷ This exploitation and symbolic violence extends to the relationship between, in an example Bourdieu gives, an avant-garde publisher and a young author; after a difficult month, the publisher can stress that a true and admirable author such as Beckett “has never touched a penny of his royalties,”¹⁷⁸ which causes the poor writer to feel ashamed, because “he is not sure he’s a Beckett, but he is sure that unlike Beckett he is base enough to ask for money.”¹⁷⁹

The problem is, of course, that

[a]ls Arbeiter oder als Fabrikant, im öffentlichen Dienst oder im Dienst der Menschheit, wie auch immer, die Arbeit des Autors eingeordnet [ist] in eine Gesellschaft, in der alle arbeiten sollen, um überleben zu dürfen. In der produktiven Totale muß der Schriftsteller sein Produkt unbeschränkt absetzen können, um den maximalen Gewinn zu erzielen.¹⁸⁰

Royalties and Earning a Living

Beginning with Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock in the 18th century, the question of an author’s ability to make a decent living off of works began to find a place in public forums. Klopstock argued openly that authors were not looking to get rich – “nur gutes Auskommen [zu verdienen].”¹⁸¹ Many other authors around the same time period began voicing similar complaints. Friedrich Schiller wrote that his publishers “Schwan und Götz wissen, daß ich durch

¹⁷⁶ Bourdieu, *Practical Reason*, 111, 118.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 118.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 111.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁰ Bosse, 91. Emphasis mine.

¹⁸¹ Friedrich Klopstock as quoted in: *Ibid.*, 74.

Schriftstellerey allein existiren, und auf jeden Profit sehen muß, dennoch behandeln sie mich so wucherhaftig, daß ich von einem Stücke, das sie das drittemal auflegen 10 Carolin in allem gewonnen habe.”¹⁸² Even Goethe, “der besthonorirte Autor seiner Zeit – man schätzt, daß ihm allein Cotta insgesamt rund fünf Millionen Mark zukommen ließ – [...] fürchtete sich dennoch sein Leben lang vor Geldmangel.”¹⁸³ In the early 19th century, an essay called *Vom freien Geistes-Verkehr* by Heinrich Luden argued that society, or more specifically the government of a society, should allow for an author to earn a payment “groß genug, ihm das Leben zu erleichtern, und seinen Geist aufzufordern zu neuer Thätigkeit,”¹⁸⁴ as a reward and thanks for the service he provides and to allow for his book to become public property.¹⁸⁵

Over time, though authorship has roots in divine and sacred work done for honor and recognition rather than monetary compensation, the associations with authorship and the purpose of works have generally (but by no means entirely or exclusively) become more secular in nature. Both the act of writing and the resulting works themselves, however, have generally continued to be viewed as a type of public service carried out by these special other-figures within a society.¹⁸⁶ The increasingly insistent view that authors deserved to earn a living wage for the work they do, and the service they provide the reading public, was one that ultimately contributed to some of the changes and reforms that took place in the 18th and 19th centuries – especially those deeming authors the legal owners of their content (*geistiges Eigentum*, or

¹⁸² Friedrich Schiller as quoted in: Bosse, 89.

¹⁸³ Wittmann, Reinhard. *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels. Ein Überblick*, (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1991), 169.

¹⁸⁴ Heinrich Luden, *Vom freien Geistes-Verkehr*, as quoted in: Bosse, 93-94.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ See, for example: Marx, 108.

“spiritual property”) in the beginning of the 19th century,¹⁸⁷ and the subsequent shifts in how royalties were earned.

Royalties first appeared in the German region in the 16th century, and became common practice by the late 1500s.¹⁸⁸ A flat payment per *Bogen* printed, either in a single lump sum or in installments over a period of time, given from publisher to author and without regard to sales, became the typical practice around the 17th century,¹⁸⁹ though at this point in history, royalties were still more of an act of recognition rather than compensation for calculated amount of labor or for products sold or even copies printed; on occasion and out of generosity, publishers might give a sort of bonus for a further print run if a book was selling well.¹⁹⁰ Essentially, until around the 18th century, the payment of royalties to an author amounted to the purchasing of a manuscript by the publisher, and the publisher was then the rightful owner of the work as far as earning – or risking not earning – from sales was concerned: “[Autoren mussten ...] ihre Schriften an Buchdrucker oder Verleger zu einem festen Preis verkaufen, wobei diese den Gewinn, die Autoren aber die Ehre ha[tt]en.”¹⁹¹

With the expansion of the literary market at the end of the 18th century, this type of royalty payment was gradually replaced by the *marktwirtschaftliches Honorar*,¹⁹² through which

¹⁸⁷ Wittmann, 159. “Erst am Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts setzte die Kodifizierung [des] neuen Urheberrechtsbewußtseins ein, wobei die Rheinbundstaaten dem französischen Vorbild folgten. Als erster deutscher Staat sicherte Baden 1806 und 1810 dem Autor lebenslangen Schutz gegen Nachdruck zu; von den «Rechten des Urhebers» ist 1813 erstmals die Rede – in einem bayerischen Gesetzbuch. Eine intensive gesetzgeberische Tätigkeit zum Urheberrecht ist in den deutschen Bundesstaaten erst nach dem Wiener Kongreß [1814-9. Juni 1815] zu registrieren.”

¹⁸⁸ Bosse, 66.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 66, 75. The respective terms for this type of *Honorar* are *Pauschalhonorar* (a flat lump sum paid to the author), *Verlegerhonorar* (royalties paid from publisher to author for a work with the amount agreed upon being independent from sales, either actual or projected), and *Bogenhonorar* (wherein the payment is based on the number of *Bogen*, or large folio sheets, needed to print a work). Also interesting is the fact that very often, even in the 19th century, part of the payment or royalties was given in books rather than money, which the authors could then sell for profit. (See: Ibid., 76).

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 75.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 71.

¹⁹² Ibid., 65.

an author is paid based on sales of their works – often with a pre-arranged lump sum paid once or broken up into installments as per the former tradition, but which is based on projected sales rather than on *Bogen*, and which is then supplemented with adjustments or extra payments according to actual sales¹⁹³ – and for any new editions (*Auflagen*) of previously published works.¹⁹⁴ In the first half of the 19th century, *marktwirtschaftliche Honorare* became common practice,¹⁹⁵ and because of this development, the unauthorized reprinting of authors’ works (*Nachdrucke*) became a problem for authors, where it had previously only affected publishers’ profits.¹⁹⁶ Laws making *Nachdrucke* illegal in the 19th century¹⁹⁷ thus helped authors earn more from their works, and as of 1837, with the legal definition of the author’s rights to their content over the publisher’s (*Urheberrecht*), it was officially no longer the case that an author effectively sold their manuscript, and with it the rights to ensuing profits, to a publisher.¹⁹⁸

Considerations of copyright, the expanding book market, and changes in literary interests and priorities of the reading public¹⁹⁹ all affected how the payment of authors developed. The situation of the author as a worker has seen manifold changes over the centuries, and the concept of authorship has changed along with it, but the struggle that authors face with regard to earning

¹⁹³ Bosse, 74: “[H]eute [ist] das Pauschalhonorar neben dem Absatzhonorar üblich [...]”

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 75.

¹⁹⁵ Wittmann, 159.

¹⁹⁶ Bosse, 92.

¹⁹⁷ See Wittmann, 158-159, 208. *Nachdrucken* was the practice of reprinting copies of an author’s previously published work without the author’s authorization (or often even knowledge), and from which the authors themselves saw no profits.

¹⁹⁸ Typically, before this time, it was the publishers who held eternal rights to a manuscript once they had purchased it from its author: “Sobald der Autor sein Werk aus der Hand gab, war es auch finanziell für ihn verloren.” (Wittmann, 162). The publisher’s rights to the manuscript post-purchase was even explicitly laid out in a law called *das Allgemeine Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten* from the year 1794. (*Ibid.*, 159). In the 18th century, Goethe was the first to pit publishers against one another for the rights to a manuscript, in order to earn a competitive price for his works. After the law changed in 1837 in favor of the author’s rights to his content after the sale of a manuscript, it became possible for the author to continue to earn money from subsequent sales and reprints of his work. (*Ibid.*, 208).

¹⁹⁹ Royalties for poets rose somewhat in the late 18th century, for example, because poetry “wurde zum Motor des expandierenden Buchmarkts,” (Bosse, 87) whereas “[d]er Buchhandel [...] sich in früherer Zeit mehr auf bedeutende, wissenschaftliche Fakultätswerke [bezog],” (*Ibid.*, 79) and “Poeten [wurden daher] schlechter honoriert als die Verfasser von wissenschaftlichen Fakultätswerken.” (*Ibid.*, 81).

an income through their trade and their works has remained a constant, indeed well into the timespan in which Lasker-Schüler, Holz, and Brecht were writing and publishing works.

One central reason for the continuation of these financial struggles around the turn of the 20th century is that, although copyright laws and the structures of payment themselves had indeed developed quite a bit, the attitude centered on authors earning honor and acknowledgement from readers rather than a stable financial living ultimately remained, though perhaps somewhat morphed in form. Authors were still seen as earning names for themselves, rather than simply (and in many ways, instead of) sufficient monetary compensation for their labors during their own lifetime. Earning money was still seen as being at odds with true art, and authors were thus still subject to exploitation by publishers.

Despite the eventual legal application of rights and ownership of works to their authors, works are still seen as ultimately belonging to the reading public once they have been published.²⁰⁰ The view on authorship and the creation of works as a public service has greatly affected how and how much authors are paid. After all, it is for the public that works are ultimately created – and it is perhaps precisely for this reason that the modern reading public, and its apathy or interest, holds a great deal of power in determining an author's earnings. In the 20th century, due to the aforementioned development of the *marktwirtschaftliches Honorar* as well as the rarer *Erfolgshonorar* (in which authors earn solely based on actual sales), the reading public's recognition and appreciation of an author's works became intimately connected to the royalties an author earned.

This history of earning royalties as an author is significant because, by the lifetimes of the authors Holz, Lasker-Schüler, and Brecht, an author's income relied much more heavily on the

²⁰⁰ This has also affected literary theory and the interpretation of works, as seen, for example, in Barthes' *The Death of the Author*.

actual sales of works as a marker of public interest than it had before. Once this became the case, if an author was writing works that catered to the wishes and desires of a pre-existing market and demand, this author would likely earn a living. If, however, one is writing a genre such as poetry, which is not typically a popular seller though it is highly valuable on a symbolic level, and if the author is furthermore breaking with traditional forms and content and thereby writing for a market that may not yet exist rather than catering to pre-existing markets and demands, they are essentially writing works as a long-term investment rather than a short-term one.²⁰¹ Even if such an author can find a publisher to put the work out into the world, the author is risking exploitation from publishers tied to the notions about authors working for the possible privilege of recognition and in the name of true and pure art rather than for money, and ultimately also a lack of stable or sufficient income resulting from the sales of their works in the short-term. This second author could be considered a ‘true’ author because they are following inspiration rather than popular demand – but they are also very likely not earning a living through their writing.

The price to pay for possible immortality, for honor and recognition, is the risk of a life of poverty and suffering – that is, if an author does not possess a second source of income such as an inheritance or a stable job.²⁰² As the French author Gustave Flaubert described it:

If one does not address the crowd, it is right that the crowd should not pay one. It is political economy. But, I maintain that a work of art (worthy of that name and conscientiously done) is beyond appraisal, has no commercial value, cannot be paid for. Conclusion: if the artist has no income, he must starve! [...] We are workers of luxury; thus nobody is rich enough to pay us. When you want to earn money with your pen, you have to do journalism, serials, or the theatre.²⁰³

²⁰¹ See: Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, 84, 143-144.

²⁰² Ibid., 83-84. Bourdieu writes that the particular advantage of those with inheritances or other incomes who create ‘pure art’ is that they can “‘hold on’ in the absence of a market.”

²⁰³ Gustave Flaubert as quoted in: Ibid., 82.

IV. Else Lasker-Schüler and the Opposition between Art and Money

Else Lasker-Schüler was indeed a worker of luxury that nobody was rich enough to pay. All of the aspects discussed had a profound influence on her life and career – most particularly, the difficulty of earning enough to live off of in the short-term through the occupation of authorship in the inverse economy of the literary field. This is of course especially the case given that she was creating art for the sake of art, which is a long-term investment: the kind of work that has the potential to eventually be highly symbolically valued and carries with it the chance to gain recognition later in one's life or in the afterlife, but at the expense of short-term economic gain or financial stability, because it does not address or cater to the crowd. The predicament of earning enough of an income through creating cultural products while simultaneously creating for the sake of art rather than for commercial success, a predicament which is inscribed into the market of any artistic field, contributed to her image (and self-image) as an author who is a sufferer and outsider in their own society as much as it influenced her (very directly related) lifelong endeavors to have enough money to live from.

Such efforts are visible in both her diverse and broad publication history (which include poetry, prose, and more lucrative and popular theatrical works,²⁰⁴ smaller and quicker publications in newspapers and literary magazines,²⁰⁵ altered and expanded book editions of such publications,²⁰⁶ and further special and new editions of previously published works) and her constant efforts to survive financially. Else Lasker-Schüler's struggles with poverty and

²⁰⁴ It should be noted that with Else Lasker-Schüler, it cannot truly be said that any single one of her works can be purely and easily categorized into a single genre. She often blended genres such as poetry and prose together.

²⁰⁵ See, for example, *Briefe nach Norwegen*, which appeared as a serial in *Der Sturm* between September 1911 (v.2, nr. 77) and June 1912 (v. 3, nr. 113/114).

²⁰⁶ For an example, refer to the book *Mein Herz* (1912), which was created using the already published *Briefe nach Norwegen*, but is quite a different work. First publication: *Mein Herz. Ein Liebesroman mit Bildern und wirklich lebenden Menschen*, (Munich / Berlin: Verlag Heinrich F. S. Bachmair, 1912).

publishers are well documented in her letters, journals, and many of her publications. Lasker-Schüler saw low earnings from her poetry, felt exploited by multiple publishers, and was not being paid enough from her writing to live a stable life; she struggled with debt, hunger, and homelessness. Requests for financial help, including charity and personal loans, appear very frequently in her letters over the span of several decades, and she often subsisted only on advances, occasional funding, and the generosity of others. She wrote and published many books and poetry cycles over her lifetime, earned small amounts of money quickly through small publications in newspapers and literary magazines, made some income here and there through the sales of her drawings,²⁰⁷ and her dramas earned her more than her poetry (as theatre was, as aforementioned, a much more popular and lucrative genre than poetry, though much less symbolically valued), but these earnings from her work as an author and artist did not suffice. Lasker-Schüler was an avant-garde author writing for a market that was ‘not yet ready.’ Writing was her main occupation and source of income in a market that symbolically values those artists and authors who (appear to) have a disinterest in earning money and prioritize making art purely for the sake of art, and that simultaneously exploits such authors by offering the possibility of prestige and eventual recognition in exchange for works over (indeed, even directly at odds with) substantial economic reimbursement for labor expended and product rendered.

²⁰⁷ See “Brief 322,” in: *WB* 7, 177. See also: “Brief 332,” in: *Ibid.*, 180: “Ich bin hier in München, spreche heute bei Wolff, der trotz Charme doch einen sehr feinen betrügerischen schleichenden Zug im Gesicht hat. Ich irre mich leider nie. Meine Bilder hängen bei Thannhäuser und 14 sind schon verkauft.” (To Karl Kraus, March 1920).

A Brief Note on Holz and Brecht

Both Holz and Brecht also dealt with the issues of earning a living through writing poetry; Holz, for example, protested the common practice of publishers of poetry anthologies who approached poets asking for printing rights to poems free of charge by founding the *Cartell lyrischer Autoren* in 1902 with Richard Dehmel – a group that boasted 123 members by 1906, including well-known names such as Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Detlev von Liliencron.²⁰⁸ In 1902, the group of poets hoped for the “Erlangung eines bestimmten materiellen Mindestentgelts für den Nachdruck literarischer Produkte”²⁰⁹ and demanded at least 50 Pfennig per line of verse, “was bei einem 40zeiligen Gedicht dem Wochenlohn eines Arbeiters gleichkam,”²¹⁰ although they eventually reduced this demand to 25 Pfennig in 1904,²¹¹ presumably due to a lack of success. To earn money and fund his passion of writing *Phantasmus*, Holz also took work in a theater, noting to Maximilian Harden in 1903:

Was mich zu dieser neuen »Firma« veranlaßt hat? Die Erkenntniß, die mir mit jedem Jahre mehr aufgegangen ist, daß sich mit Kunst im allersublimsten Edelsinne auf Zeitgenossen nicht wirken läßt. Am wenigsten heut und auf dem Theater. Von diesem Theater absehn KANN ich aber nicht, den ich muß existieren! Und sei es auch nur, um nach vielleicht 10 oder meinerwegen 20 Jahren meinen einen »Phantasmus« unterzubringen, in dem ich jene Kunst geben will, die auf Zeitgenossenschaft verzichtet.²¹²

The poet occasionally earned additional small and quick sums of money by publishing in literary magazines and newspapers, as well, including sneak-peeks of new in-progress manuscript

²⁰⁸ Wittmann, 294.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² Letter from Arno Holz to Maximilian Harden, 14 Jan 1903, as printed in: Stüben, Jens. “»Ich warte sehnsüchtig [...] auf den ›Stoff‹ den Du mir schenken solltest«. Arno Holz’ Produktionsgemeinschaft mit Oskar Jerschke,” in: *Literarische Zusammenarbeit*, ed. Bodo Plachta, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 201.

versions²¹³ of *Phantasmus*²¹⁴ and essays on the development of the cycle,²¹⁵ and in this way he simultaneously attempted to maintain public interest in the project.²¹⁶ Due to financial problems, he was unable to publish a new edition of his *Phantasmus* after 1916 until 1925; before the 1925 edition finally appeared in print,²¹⁷ a friend arranged a special private publication of three poems from Holz' then most recent version of *Phantasmus* as a gift for his 60th birthday in 1923.²¹⁸ (The 1925 edition was also the last authorized publication, and the last publication before the fragmented manuscript left behind after his death was edited and published post-mortem in 1961 by Arno Holz' widow Anita Holz).²¹⁹

Brecht, for his part, had perhaps the fewest financial struggles of all three of these authors, excluding the 16 years he spent in exile, but he, too, made most of his money from the theater, and not from his poetry. According to Reinhard Witmann,

²¹³ Here the word *version* is used because individual poems are being released specifically as excerpts of a new *Phantasmus* cycle still *in progress*, that is, as parts of a whole cycle that is still an uncompleted manuscript (with previously published counterparts), in order to garner attention for the upcoming cycle publication. The whole cycle being referenced is not yet completed or authorized for publication, making it a *Fassung* of, and not yet part of a work-group with, the existing cycle publications. The poems being published individually here are themselves of course works (and exist in a similarly complex work-group relationship with any previously published individual poem counterparts).

²¹⁴ See, for example: Holz, *Phantasmus* (1919/20), 66-67.

²¹⁵ Refer, for example, to: Ibid., *Idee und Gestaltung*, 86-109. See also: Ibid., *Die neue Form*, 110-137.

²¹⁶ His widow Anita Holz used the same approach of maintaining public interest and earning small sums of money through publications of sneak-peeks after Holz' death, before the eventual final edition appeared in 1961. See, for example: "*Wintergroßstadtmorgen*: ([Gedicht] Aus der nachgelassenen, noch unveröffentlichten Neubearbeitung des "Phantasmus"), in: *Die Weltbühne: Wochenschrift für Politik, Kunst, Wirtschaft*, v. 25, II (1929), (Berlin: Verlag der Weltbühne, 1929), 809-810.; "*Inferno*: ([Gedicht] Aus dem Manuskript der vom Dichter hinterlassenen völlig neu durchgeformten Fassung des Phantasmus)," in: *Der Dichter und das Buch: Zum 25jährigen Bestehen des Berliner Bibliophilen Abends, Titellithographie von Alfred Kubin*, (1930), 20-22; "Aus dem *Phantasmus*: Nachgelassene neudurchformte Fassung," in: *Das Gedicht: Blätter für die Dichtung*, v. 2/14 (1936); "*Rücktrauer*: Ms. aus der nachgelassenen neudurchgeformten Fassung des "Phantasmus" unveröff.," in: *Freude an Büchern, Monatsheft für Weltliteratur*, v. 4 (1953), 129.

²¹⁷ Holz, *Phantasmus I-III*.

²¹⁸ Ibid., "*Phantasmus*": *Drei neue Phantasmus-Gedichte*, (Offenbach am Main: Ernst Engel, 1923), no page numbers. Dedication: "Arno Holz zu seinem 60. Geburtstag gewidmet." On the last page: "Die vorstehenden drei Stücke entstammen einer Neufassung des „Phantasmus“ von Arno Holz, deren Drücklegung aus allgemein wirtschaftlichen Gründen bisher noch nicht erfolgen konnte. Sie wurden gedruckt durch Ernst Engel in Offenbach a.M. als erstes Buch in seiner Mörike-Fraktur und fünfter seiner Handpressendrucke im Auftrage von Richard Doetsch-Benziger Sommer 1923. Hundert Abzüge wurden hergestellt."

²¹⁹ Ibid., *Phantasmus I-IV*.

[d]em vielversprechenden Jungautor sicherte ein Fünfjahresvertrag mit Ullstein ein monatliches Fixum von 500 Mark; sein erfolgreichstes Stück, die die «Dreigroschenoper», hatte er aus dem Vertrag freilich ausgeklammert und konnte sich als einen der seltenen Fälle rühmen, «in denen Ullstein von einem Autor ausgebeutet» werde.²²⁰

That this was a possibility for Brecht and not for Holz or for Lasker-Schüler had largely to do with the fact that he, unlike the others, had at this point established major popularity and recognition through his theatrical works, which also unlike either Holz or Lasker-Schüler, formed the personal focus of his life's work over his poetry. Any publisher who managed to snag Brecht and attach his name to their company could at this point be relatively well assured that the young and already successful playwright would continue to earn and be well received, and that they would profit off of his previously established success and name, rather than taking a risk and having to do the work of helping him make one. The other two wrote plays as well, as aforementioned, through which they both earned some money and recognition, but they were not nearly as popular as Brecht in this arena, and they both focused much more on their poetry throughout their writing careers than their theatre.

A Note on War and the Literary Market

Of course, it should briefly be addressed here that wars also have a drastic affect on the literary market, including the ability to publish works and how well works sell, and the economy of a country as a whole. Such moments in history therefore further complicate the economic situation of the author as one who creates cultural products for an income, as they are certain to affect productivity, publications, sales, and earnings. All three of these authors suffered the

²²⁰ Wittmann, 319.

consequences of war on their ability to publish and earn a living to varying extents. One of Brecht's *Hauspostille* versions was authorized and ready for publication, but never made it to the shelves because the Malik publishing house in Prague, and the printing materials, were destroyed by local fascists in 1939.²²¹ The amounts of his royalties were affected by inflation (as was everything) after the First World War. A poem from his *Hauspostille*, as previously mentioned, was given as the official reason Brecht was expatriated in 1935.²²² Brecht went into exile in 1933, which from a purely literary market perspective removed him from his original reading public (and audience) both geographically and linguistically and forced him to find publishing opportunities abroad, in and from Prague, Paris, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, and eventually the US, until his return to Germany in 1949.²²³ Else Lasker-Schüler's royalties (and the purchasing power of these amounts) were drastically affected by extreme inflation, as well, as will be detailed shortly, and she too went into exile in 1933, moving from Germany to Zurich, Jerusalem, Ascona, and finally back to Jerusalem in 1939, where she remained until her death in 1945.²²⁴ She also experienced the delay of the appearance of her *Gesammelten Gedichte* due to the war's effect on publishing houses: "sie verzögern sich der Druckerei wegen; immerfort werden die Leute in den Krieg geholt."²²⁵ Holz, having died in 1929, was not affected in his life or career by the events of World War II as Lasker-Schüler and Brecht were, but he lived through the events of the First World War and saw its drastic effects on the economy, inflation,

²²¹ See: "Text/Fassungen," in: *BFA* 11, 303.

²²² *Verfügung des Reichsministeriums des Innern vom 8. Juni 1935*, I A 5541/5013c. As quoted in: *BFA* 27, 586. The editors of the edition clarify that the poem was the "Legende vom toten Soldaten."

²²³ See, for example: "Bertolt Brecht: Biographie," in: *Bertolt Brecht Werke. Eine Auswahl* (20 CDs and a booklet), ft. Ekkehard Schall / Ernst Busch / Hilmar Thate, (Random House Audio, 1997), 66-83.

²²⁴ Refer to: "»Fresse schon meine Fingerspitzen wie Spargelköpfe«. Else Lasker-Schüler (1869-1945)," in: *»Ich bin ganz, ganz tot in vier Wochen«. Bettel- und Brandbriefe berühmter Schriftsteller*, ed. Birgit Vanderbeke, (Berlin: Autorenhaus Verlag, 2006), 45, 47. She was invited back to Palestine in 1937 but was unable to pay the 60 *Pfund* required upon entry to the country.

²²⁵ "Brief 195," in: *WB* 7, 120. (August 1916). Lasker-Schüler expected *die Gesammelten Gedichte* to appear in print much sooner than they actually did, about a year after this letter was written, in 1917. See: "Anmerkung zu Brief 200," in: *Ibid.*, 425. (An Fritz Engel <wahrscheinlich September 1916>).

publishing opportunities, and the literary market, just as the other two authors did. On a much more broad and basic level, moreover, in the case of all three authors' works, a generally lower interest in reading for leisure as well as lower financial ability of most citizens to purchase works for their enjoyment during times of war (and in its wake) would have had an effect on the success of works,²²⁶ if success is determined by the purchases of a contemporary reading public, and the resulting royalties from sales (either projected or actual). This is especially true for less popular genres and non-popular literature in general.²²⁷ Reinhard Wittmann describes how the atmosphere post-WWI left writers in a rather miserable situation:

Kaum einer konnte von den schmalen Nachkriegsgehältern allein existieren. Das galt auch für die Honorarmisere der Schriftsteller, wie die «Weltbühne» 1923 bilanzierte: «Sie wollen nicht zugeben, daß sie proletarisiert sind, und sie können nicht der <Wirtschaft> dienen, sie lavieren und sie kommen zu keinem Ende, sie sind kaum noch produktiv, und ihre Bücher werden nicht gekauft, ihre Verleger können und wollen nichts für sie tun, Zeitungen haben keinen Raum für sie, und wenn sie Raum haben, so zahlen sie erbärmlich, Zeitschriften gibt es nur noch wenige in Deutschland, Theater spielen nur Werke, die irgend Aussicht auf sensationellen Erfolg haben [...]»²²⁸

The economy and market in war-ridden and post-war Germany did affect these three authors. As has already been addressed in the previous section of this chapter, however, times of war are by no means the only reason an author would struggle to make a living through their works.

²²⁶ According to Wittmann, before WWI in the year 1912, around 52% of Prussian citizens had a yearly income below 900 Mark and did not need to pay taxes, and a further 43% fell between 900 and 3000 a year, making 95% of the population "minderbemittelt." (Wittmann, 296). Furthermore, "[i]n den Einkommensklassen bis etwa 1200 Mark jährlich blieb der Kauf eines Buches ein kaum erschwinglicher Luxus. Die maximal zehn Mark, die in einem Arbeiterhaushalt für Lektürezwecke abgezweigt werden konnten, waren mit einem Zeitungsabonnement und vielleicht einem Kolportagelieferungsroman schon verbraucht." (Ibid., 296). This did not improve as WWI drew closer, or in its wake, especially during the period of extreme inflation after 1923. Inflation exacerbated the problem and resulted in rising book prices, which publishers defended due to rising paper and printing costs, "wogegen das kaufkraftschwache Publikum entsprechende Preiserhöhungen nicht akzeptierte." (Ibid., 316). By 1928, 58% of the income-earning population made less than 1200 a year, and a further 32% between 1200 and 3000. "Kurt Tucholsky rechnete seinem Verleger vor, daß ein qualifizierter Angestellter zum Erwerb eines deutschen Romans im Preis von 10 Mark etwa 6 Stunden arbeiten müsse." (Ibid., 323).

²²⁷ Ibid., 323: "Verleger und Kritiker stellten übereinstimmend fest, daß sowohl das Zeit- wie das Finanzbudget der potentiellen Buchleser insbesondere der jüngeren Generation durch die neuen Medien Film und Funk sowie durch Sport und Tanz weitgehend erschöpft seien; wer sich trotzdem noch dem Buch zuwende, sei meist vom Novitätenhunger befallen [...]."

²²⁸ Wittmann, 315-316.

On Authorship and Gender

While there are indeed some aforementioned commonalities and parallels among these three authors with regard to writing as a source of income, as well as some differences and specific individual circumstances in each case which would each be worthy of a more in-depth look, Else Lasker-Schüler is specifically being highlighted in this chapter on publishing relations, the book market, the opposition between art and money,²²⁹ and the effects these factors had on the appearance of multiple different authorized publications of a poetry cycle, as well as this dissertation. This is partially because for Lasker-Schüler, attempting to earn a name as well as a living through writing and publishing was gendered in a way it of course was not for Holz or for Brecht.

Earning a name and recognition as an author,²³⁰ public interest, participation in and support from author communities,²³¹ and publishing relationships are all highly gendered aspects of authorship. Authorship is traditionally considered a man's work,²³² and even today, the literary field is a very male-dominated one. Around the turn of the century into the 20th, women were able to break free of genre limitations bound to their gender, where it was previously deemed acceptable for women to write only letters and poetry,²³³ “[a]ber dennoch bleibt das Geschlecht des Autors *das* entscheidende Kriterium für die Lektüre von Texten, dennoch gibt es nach wie

²²⁹ Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 91.

²³⁰ For more on this, refer to: Hahn, Barbara. *Unter falschem Namen*, (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1991).

²³¹ See, for example, a passage about a fight that occurred in a literary circle around 1900 regarding Lasker-Schüler: Reiß-Suckow, Christine. „*Wer wird mir Schöpfer sein!*“. *Die Entwicklung Else Lasker-Schülers als Künstlerin*, (Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre Verlag, 1997), 28.

²³² Foucault addresses the special function and status of the name of an author in his *What Is an Author?* and refers to the author as a male figure throughout the essay, for example. Barbara Hahn, in *Unter falschem Namen*, addresses that the default for many is: “Der Autor – ist ein Mensch – ist ein Mann.” (Hahn, *Namen*, 8). *Unter falschem Namen* examines the names of authors who are not white men, but rather marginalized authors, here particularly women and/or Jewish authors.

²³³ Hahn, *Namen*, 10-11.

vor »Frauen«, die ihre Texte besonders zeichnen müssen,”²³⁴ and there were certainly still “Vorurteile und Ressentiments im Literaturbetrieb gegen die Konkurrenz der schreibenden Frauen, die übereinstimmend als Hauptproduzenten minderer Fabrikware angesehen wurden.”²³⁵ Franz Philips, *Herausgeber* of the literary magazine *Gesellschaft* at the beginning of the 20th century, believed for example that “die meisten Dichterin nicht zwischen Liebe und Lust unterscheiden könnten.”²³⁶ Terms such as *Frauenlyrik* were applied to women’s works to differentiate them from *Lyrik*,²³⁷ and this differentiation often went hand in hand with judgments pertaining to expectations of innate inferiority and limited scope of ‘feminine’ content and topics.

Women writers generally both sold and earned less (both monetarily and in terms of recognition) than their male counterparts, although it was also true at this time that “die allermeisten von [schreibenden Frauen] Schriftstellerei nicht zum Broterwerb [betrieben].”²³⁸ Lasker-Schüler’s struggle to earn an income by writing as a woman therefore already made her situation atypical. Coupled with the fact that she was also a single mother²³⁹ with a sick child²⁴⁰ and possessed neither an inheritance nor the ability to earn a living through a second line of work, her undertaking to earn enough to make a living off of her works was arguably both higher stakes and, due to her gender as well as her Jewishness, more extremely affected by factors such

²³⁴ Hahn, *Namen*, 11. This is especially in reference to the fact that while male authors are referred to by a single name (such as Goethe) (Hahn, *Namen*, 8), women writers “haben grundsätzlich zwei Namen, einen Vor- und einen Nachnamen, wobei Vater und Ehe-Mann als namengebende Instanzen gleichgewichtig nebeneinander stehen.” (Ibid., 10)

²³⁵ Wittmann, 261.

²³⁶ Reiß-Suckow, 142.

²³⁷ Ibid., 138.

²³⁸ Wittmann, 261.

²³⁹ This is a fact which unfortunately both bears emphasizing and which is also too often emphasized at the expense of the content of Lasker-Schüler’s works and the significance of her career beyond the fact that she managed to be both a mother and strive to have a career at the beginning of the 20th century “obwohl bürgerliche Konventionen für die Frau eher ein Aufgehen in der Mutterrolle vorsahen” (Reiß-Suckow, 23-24). For this time period in particular, it is noteworthy that a woman writer was also a single mother.

²⁴⁰ See, for example: Vanderbeke, 44-45. A letter from Lasker-Schüler in May of 1926 to Franz Werfel describes how Lasker-Schüler’s son Paul has been in the hospital with a lung disease for months.

as publishing relations and public interest determining earnings than it was for either Holz or Brecht.

At the risk of focusing on the biography of a female author in a way that is typically not done to quite the same extent for male authors, it does bear addressing that poverty and earning an income through writing were more of a problem for Else Lasker-Schüler than for the other two authors mentioned in this dissertation, and that this is furthermore not unrelated to the fact that she was a Jewish woman trying to earn money in a male-dominated field that already saw men struggling to make a living from their works because of the way the system is set up to exploit (especially avant-garde or ‘non-commercial’) authors to begin with. The choice to highlight Else Lasker-Schüler for this chapter and dissertation is not, however, intended to suggest that her biography should be in focus over her works, or that these works should be read first and foremost, either in content or in the fact of their multiple forms, through the lens of her struggles with poverty. To do so would be a gross oversimplification and an entirely unwarranted reduction of the significance of both the fact of the multiple publications of *Hebräische Balladen* and the changes made across versions – changes which are, quite uniquely to the case of the *Hebräische Balladen* in comparison to *Phantasmus* and *Hauspostille*, large-scale changes like the addition, deletion, and reordering of poems, as well as the curious changing of poem dedications, and which moreover have compelling and significant consequences for potential interpretations of the cycle with each new edition, both with regard to the story the cycle tells as a whole and to the relationships among individual poems throughout each publication.

The argument in this specific chapter is, rather, that the state of the market, the relationship between author and publisher, and the overall struggle to earn an income from poetic works can easily be considered a **contributing** factor for the multiple publications of the poetry cycles of all three authors, and that Else Lasker-Schüler serves as an especially good example of

this. Poverty and the difficulties of earning an income through authorship were by no means the only, or the even necessarily the most important, reasons for the multiple publications of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen*. They are, however, indeed quite relevant points of investigation, in the mix of many others.

Else Lasker-Schüler and Writing for an Income

Else Lasker-Schüler was an avant-garde poet whose works were mostly appreciated by other authors during her own lifetime, though she later gained recognition through literary prizes such as the Kleist-Preis in 1932²⁴¹ and finds herself among other Greats in the German-speaking literary canon today. Even after her official recognition through prizes, however, she did not earn enough to live securely. Her letters throughout several decades, both before and after recognition, are peppered with requests for personal loans, institutional funding, advances on royalty payments, and charity to help her maintain a living. Though some biographies allege that she was able to live out her final years in Jerusalem (1939-1945) without financial difficulties, letters written during this time tell another story.²⁴²

Like many other authors throughout the course of history, Lasker-Schüler faced rather frequent bouts of homelessness and hunger, or the impending threat of the same, and was often forced to resort to begging and asking for help to survive. She writes in 1912 to Rudolf Börsch, “ich muß soviel verdienen und schreib so wenig – ebenso viel wie ich dichten kann. Und was ich

²⁴¹ Vanderbeke, 44.

²⁴² Compare to: Ibid., 47-48. Vanderbeke makes this point and gives the example of a letter from 21. February 1941 to Georg Landauer asking for financial help.

dichte, muß alles sehr bezahlt werden sonst muß ich verhungern.”²⁴³ Over the years, she details her circumstances and struggles to the recipients of such letters, describing that she is hungry, needs to pay the rent (or occasionally that someone is helping her pay the rent for a particular period of time),²⁴⁴ and that she must take care of her son and pay for expenses such as his schooling and care. In a letter to Richard Meyer in 1913, she explains:

Für jedes Vierteljahr bezahle ich ungefähr 600 Mk Odenwaldschule; da ist auch **Kleidung** und Ausflüge dabei – alles. [...] Daß man ein Kind im frühesten Jahr schon die Askese des Lebens angewöhnen soll, leuchtet mir wahrhaft nicht ein, zumal die Erinnerung mit weiterlebt oft alles Dunkle später erhellt. [...] Ich will nicht betteln, aber **ich bitte** Sie im Interesse meines Jungen im Interesse meiner Gedichte [...] sprechen *Sie mit* den Leuten oder wie Sie, glaub ich, sagten mit dem Verein, daß sie mir das Geld für meinen Jungen geben.²⁴⁵

Lasker-Schüler frequently assures the recipients of her requests for financial help that she has a publication due to appear soon, or that she will make money from an upcoming staging of one of her dramas:

Ich muß Ihnen auch sagen, daß **wahrscheinlich fast sicher** Ende April meine Wupper aufgeführt wird oder Anfang Sept. Ludwig **Kainer** macht die Dekoration. Ich bin dann reicher. Der Fakir und Professor sagte damals zu mir, daß meine Stadt in jedem Jahr dieses unerhörte Geschenk haben sollte. Aber es ist noch kein Jahr vorbei seitdem und doch könnte dieses große Opfer nun mich selig machen; wie ein großes Schiff mit dem ich über den Ozean könnte, ich käm dann nicht mehr in Not. Monatlich verdient ich 200 Mk. Ich habe meinen Jungen gut erziehen lassen, er braucht nur noch zwei Jahre dann hilft ihm Marc, Kainer etc. weiter vorwärts. Er wird Zeichner – und wird dann zuerst angestellt für Plakate etc. Mein Jung muß aber sein Einjähr. machen vorerst. Nun bin ich durch viel was zusammen kam in Verlegenheit. Ich will aber durchaus nicht mehr das große Opfer **geschenkt** haben, es wäre direkt **unerhört** von mir, wenn aber meine Stadt es geliehen bekäme, der Fakir und die Levkoje das Vertrauen hätten!²⁴⁶

²⁴³ See: “Brief 407,” *WB* 6, 262. (An Rudolf Börsch. <Berlin-Grunewald, frühestens am 4. November, vor dem 27. Dezember 1912.>). “

²⁴⁴ See, for example: *Ich räume auf!*, *WB* 4.1, 74. Lasker-Schüler describes having to abandon her furniture to make up for the rent she can’t pay. See also: Vanderbeke, 45. Vanderbeke includes a letter to Dr. Heinz Simon from Zürich in January 1934, wherein Lasker-Schüler writes that her rent for the current month is being paid by someone.

²⁴⁵ Vanderbeke, 40-41. (To Richard Meyer, 11. Jun 1913).

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 42-43.

In 1916, she asks the Schillerstiftung for funding to help her finish *Theben*, describing how she never seems to have enough and needs to feed her son, but her request is rejected.²⁴⁷ In 1926, she writes to Franz Werfel asking for help with “Verlags-Sachen,”²⁴⁸ informing him that she has a new manuscript and has had trouble finding a publisher for it for the past year. She asks that Werfel speak to Zsolnay on her behalf – “Sie müßten kaufmännisch mich loben, **bin sehr fleißig** und Bücher stehen im Curs”²⁴⁹ – and ends the letter with “Zsolnay soll viel Geld haben! Und ich fresse schon meine Fingerspitzen wie Spargelköpfe.”²⁵⁰ In this particular letter, she also explains that her son has been in the hospital with a lung disease, and she reasserts her desire to be able to have money to care for her son: “[n]un muß ich einmal klug sein, schon damit mein Pälchen immer eine Rente hat.”²⁵¹ In 1934, she asks Dr. Heinz Simon for money to help pay for an operation she needs to have on her arm, “nachdem sich nun / durch ruheloses Schreiben **und** Zeichnen, Eiter im Knochen sich bildete,”²⁵² explaining further, “[i]ch schreibe mit Brett unter dem Arm”²⁵³ and assuring him, “**Sie kriegen wieder!**”²⁵⁴ In 1937, she is invited to come back to Palestine, but she cannot go because she cannot afford the 60 Pfund required upon entry into the country.²⁵⁵ In 1941, in the final years of her life in Jerusalem and well after having been awarded the Kleist-Preis, she writes to Georg Landauer:

²⁴⁷ “Brief 175,” *WB* 7, 111. (To die Deutsche Schillerstiftung, May 1916). They refused her request. Several months later, in August of 1916, she writes to Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche asking for help getting the Schillerstiftung (“Brief 194,” *Ibid.*, 119), and receives a rather unkind response, which she details in a later letter. (“Brief 195,” *Ibid.*, 120).

²⁴⁸ At this point in time, Lasker-Schüler was having difficulties finding publishers because of her scathing public complaint toward publishing practices and exploitation, *Ich räume auf!*, a year before (1925) – which will be detailed shortly. See: Vanderbeke, 44 (for the commentary from Vanderbeke and for the letter to Franz Werfel in May 1926).

²⁴⁹ Vanderbeke, 44-45. (Letter to Franz Werfel, May 1926).

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 45.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 45. (To Dr. Heinz Simon, Zürich 13.1.34).

²⁵³ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 47. (See author commentary).

Ich arbeitete an meiner Maschine 6-8 Stunden täglich – also ich faulenzte nicht. [...] Auch möchte ich noch sagen, Sie fragen, da ich schwer krank gelegen: Rippenfellentzündung, etc. ich enorm an Medizin brauchte, ich lauf auf Löchern – Auf Stelzen, ob, da ich doch immer unserm Volk Ehre mache, brachte, extra 3-4 Pfund haben könnte?? [...] Ich kann vor Schwäche nicht mehr schreiben. **Verzeiht den Blei**, Adon! [...] ich weiß noch einen Ausweg, daß man mir ein Bild abkauft? Selbst Prof. Slevogt schrieb damals **herrliche** Kritik. Vielleicht wissen Sie Jemand, Adon?²⁵⁶

At 75 years old, she writes Landauer again, pleading, “Herr Doktor, kann ich nicht 20 Pfund bekommen monatlich?”²⁵⁷ – despite the fact that her final poetry cycle *Mein blaues Klavier* had just been published.²⁵⁸ These are only a few examples of many years worth of letters, directed at many different addressees, to varying degrees personal acquaintances, professional contacts, and institutions, asking for aid.

Considering Lasker-Schüler’s broad publication history, it should be clear that her many encounters with poverty were by no means due to idleness or an aversion to work. Neither are they a testament to the quality of her works; as the highly quoted assertion from another early 20th century poet goes, Else Lasker-Schüler was “die größte Lyrikerin, die Deutschland je hatte.”²⁵⁹ Even so, she lived a life full of financial problems. Beyond asking for help from others, she often needed to request advances from her publishers,²⁶⁰ which led in turn to debt; when she

²⁵⁶ Vanderbeke, 48. (21 Feb 1941 to Georg Landauer).

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid. (See author commentary).

²⁵⁹ Gottfried Benn, 1952 in the British Center in Berlin, as quoted in: Koldehoff, Stefan. “Vom Nachklang der Schöpfung. Endlich erhält die große Dichterin Else Lasker-Schüler eine historisch-kritische Werkausgabe,” in: *Die Zeit*, v. 46/1997 (7 Nov. 1997), available online at: *Zeit Online*, (Hamburg: *Zeit Online*, 2009-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.zeit.de/1997/46/Vom_Nachklang_der_Schoepfung>. While it should not be necessary to rely on a male author’s endorsement to legitimize Lasker-Schüler as a great poet, this and similar quotes have also been used to emphasize the injustice of the fact that Lasker-Schüler lived in poverty all of her life. See Vanderbeke, 48, for example. See also: “Erläuterungen zur Zuschrift an das »Berliner Tageblatt« (1925),” in: *WB* 4.2, 80-84. In a public letter from Fritz Kalischer defending Lasker-Schüler against Paul Cassirer after Lasker-Schüler’s publication of *Ich räume auf!* (1925), Kalischer writes that Cassirer has also referred to Lasker-Schüler as “die größte Dichterin der Jetztzeit” (*WB* 4.2, 80) but has not treated her well. This letter was originally published in: *Berliner Tageblatt*, v. 54, nr. 77 (Abend-Ausgabe, 14. Feb 1925).

²⁶⁰ See: “Brief 451,” *WB* 6, 289. (Asking Verlag A. Juncker for money); “Brief 601,” Ibid., 368. (Asking Kurt Wolff for an advance on the *Gesammelten Gedichte*); “Brief 211,” *WB* 8, 101-2. (Asking for a 1000 Mark advance for the staging of her play *Die Wupper*).

received the royalty payments from her publications, these were therefore adjusted to account for the debts she owed.²⁶¹ In such a situation, an author effectively starts back at square one, having already spent much of a paycheck before it arrives, and then needing to write more in order to earn more, (in the meantime possibly asking for another advance), which perpetuates the vicious cycle. Arnold Zweig describes the situation of a freelance writer succinctly:

Welchen Weg auch immer die geistige Leistung heute nimmt, sie trifft auf organisierte Umstände. Die Zeitungen, die Verleger, die Sortimenten und in den Buchgemeinschaften selbst die Bücherkäufer bilden heute einen klaren aktiven Staat im allgemeinen Staate der wirtschaftlichen Reibungen. Es reiben sich große Schollen aneinander, und der Schriftsteller, der als Einzelner zwischen sie gerät, wird immer der Zerriebene sein. Den berechtigten Forderungen der organisierten Buchbinder, Buchdrucker oder Sortimenten wird er nur seine eigene Organisation entgegensetzen können, oder ein unendliches Quantum Leidenschaft und Energie seinem Talent abringen müssen, um seinem Schicksal standzuhalten.²⁶²

Lasker-Schüler explicitly lamented the exploitation of “die lebenden und toten Dichter”²⁶³ by their publishers, as had many authors before her. In 1925, she published an essay called *Ich räume auf!* calling out publishers for promoting, perpetuating, and happily profiting from “diese [...] hochbegrüßte Askese”²⁶⁴ and calling on fellow authors to join her in a revolt. “Gehungert haben wir ja alle,”²⁶⁵ she writes, “und es konnte oft durch den Ertrag unserer Bücher vermieden werden.”²⁶⁶ Alongside scathing derision of publishers in general, comparing them to the biblical “Händler [in] dem Tempel,”²⁶⁷ likening them to Satan (and authors to God) – “ob Gott nicht selbst jung und ungeduldig seine Schöpfung: Die Welt, dem Satan zu verlegen gab, der nun seinen Nutzen herauszieht?”²⁶⁸ and asking “Befinden sich unsere Bücher im Verlag eines

²⁶¹ This will be detailed shortly.

²⁶² Arnold Zweig, as quoted in: Wittmann, 318.

²⁶³ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 49.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 56-57.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 49.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 64.

Verlegers oder im Bordell eines Seelenverkäufers?“²⁶⁹ she describes her experiences with being indebted to her publishers for having needed payment advances,²⁷⁰ her low earnings from her works, and grievances with specific publishers she has worked with, some of whom she suspected of lying about how many of her books had actually sold,²⁷¹ one of whom displayed a lack of charity when asked for financial help after the war had begun,²⁷² one of whom took two of her drawings because he insisted she owed him for the cost of electricity that “ich wohl beim Kolorieren in der Galerie Flechtheim verbraucht haben könne,”²⁷³ and in particular her first publisher, who apparently even hesitated to give her a single copy of her own books free of charge,²⁷⁴ to provide only a few examples. She recalls having to resort to stealing copies of her own books because she could not afford to buy them herself,²⁷⁵ and details a bout of homelessness shortly after the beginning of the Second World War: “Ich lag wo in einer Ecke der Straße zwischen Halensee und Grunewald unbegraben, heimatlos noch im Tode. [...] Ich war vor dem Wirt geflüchtet, meine Möbel hatte ich in der Eile zum Ersatz der Miete zurückgelassen.”²⁷⁶ For her entire career to this point, she was “genötigt, mir irgendwie täglich Geld zu schaffen,”²⁷⁷ and as has already been detailed, this would continue for the rest of her life.

²⁶⁹ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 77.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 56: “Ich hatte ja beim Erscheinen meiner gesammelten Bücher und der nachfolgenden zwei mein Geld erhalten und ich konnte noch froh sein, da ich ihm [Alfred Flechtheim] nichts mehr schuldete.”

²⁷¹ Refer also to: “Brief 535,” WB 6, 333. (An Paul Zech. <Berlin-Halensee, 17. Mai 1913. Samstag.>). “Lieber Paul Zech. Sie sagten mir doch 800 Balladenbücher sind von mir bei Meyer fort. Er schrieb mir – denken Sie nur 200. Ich bitte Sie dieses Mal kein Diplomat zu sein. Wir müssen das ruhig besprechen. ich werde dort selbsredend nicht verraten. Ich habe satt für die Leute zu arbeiten. Gott sei Dank bin ich eingekehrt zu Wolff-Rowohlt. Bitt die Wahrheit! Es ist kaum denkbar. (Mir gehts mater. schlecht.) [...] / Viele Grüße Ihr <Komet> / Jussuf.” See also the commentary for this letter, in: WB 6, 696: “Anscheinend hatte Else Lasker-Schüler den Verdacht, daß Alfred Richard Meyer ihr gegenüber die Anzahl der verkauften »Hebräischen Balladen« zu gering angegeben hatte [...]”

²⁷² Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 74. This refers to Erik Ernst.

²⁷³ Ibid., 50. Referring to Alfred Flechtheim: “So schloß er sich im Nu zwei meiner Zeichnungen für die fünftausend Mark, die ich ihm schuldete, die dazumal jedes meiner Bilder zu rahmen kostete, einfach in sein Fach. Aber ich verlangte sie baldigst zurück, endlich in der Lage, ihm bar meine Schuld abzuzahlen.”

²⁷⁴ Ibid., 62. Referring to Axel Juncker, her first publisher.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., 62-63.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 74.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 56.

Lasker-Schüler asserts in her *Brandbrief* that “[i]ch läge trotz meiner zahlreichen Bücher lange an Bleichsucht gestorben unter der Erde, wenn nicht Glücksfälle mir immer wieder das Leben erkaufte.”²⁷⁸

Lasker-Schüler further derides the exploitative nature of “Einladungen [...] mit dem Programm: »Zum Butterbrot und einer Tasse Tee«”²⁷⁹ and specifically addresses the myth that from suffering comes inspiration:

Es kommt uns ja nur [...] darauf an, mit gewissenhaften Verlegern zu tun zu haben, mit großzügigen, die uns seelisch und körperlich schonen, noch dazu in dieser Zeit. Vor ihr kostete Reichsein alles. Heute kostet Armsein mehr. [...] Keineswegs tut dem Dichter »bittere Not« gut; solche Rezepte sind Geschäftskniffe der Herren Verleger, ihr Gewissen, wenn sie so etwas Ähnliches besitzen sollten, leichthin entlastend, vom Publikum allzu voreilig nachgeleiert. Ist es so unumgänglich vonnöten, zum Krüppel geworden zu sein, Tiefstes zu gestalten? Glauben Sie etwa, die Melone gibt, im Keller ohne Licht und Trank gewachsen, süßeren Saft?²⁸⁰

Indeed, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs from 1943 would go on to solidify Lasker-Schüler’s point, confirming that a person must satisfy lower level basic needs such as food and shelter before they are able to progress to meeting higher level needs of growth.²⁸¹ The ability to work creatively is hindered by suffering from the lack of fulfillment of basic needs – not fed by it.

Lasker-Schüler’s publication history is in fact marked by very low economic returns for her works. Her first work, *Styx* (1902), was lauded by her first publisher, Axel Juncker, who allegedly called it “Kaviar für’s Volk. Was für ihren Wert zeugt, aber ein Risiko für den Verlag bedeutet. Ich will es dennoch versuchen.”²⁸² She gave Juncker the rights to this work for nothing, noting that “[a]ndere Dichter steuerten zu den Druckkosten ihres ersten Buches bei und mir

²⁷⁸ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 83.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 67.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 55.

²⁸¹ Maslow, Abraham. “A Theory of Human Motivation,” in: *Psychological Review*, v. 50/4 (1943), 370-396.

²⁸² Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 60.

wurde es erlassen.”²⁸³ She sold her second work, *Das Peter-Hille-Buch* (1906), for 100 Mark, though Axel Juncker originally offered only 50.²⁸⁴ Her third book, *Die Nächte der Tino von Bagdad* (1907), “fiel wiederum Juncker zum Opfer. [...] Honorieren könne er mir dieses Buch nicht, da sein Verlag noch rückständig stehe mit den ersten zweien. Er habe eben die Werke einer Dichterin und nicht die Bücher einer Journalisten gedruckt.”²⁸⁵ Lasker-Schüler summarizes that “für meine drei Bücher, für den *Styx*, für das *Peter-Hille-Buch*, für *die Nächte der Tino von Bagdad* erhielt ich im ganzen? Raten Sie [...]? 100 Mark, d.h. für zwei der drei Bücher habe ich nie einen Pfennig von Juncker empfangen.”²⁸⁶ These 100 Mark were her earnings from book publications over the span of five years, from 1902 to 1907. In 1909, she published her drama *Die Wupper*, this time through Erich Österheld. She writes “Ich ehrte seine Verblüffung, mich selbst nicht honorieren zu können, nicht dazu imstande zu sein. Nicht ihm gehöre der Verlag Österheld sondern Herrn Cohn.”²⁸⁷

Not all of her royalties and earnings are documented, including those for her first edition of the *Hebräische Balladen* in 1913 – but the fact that the same year the cycle was published for the first time, Karl Kraus, a fellow author and friend of Lasker-Schüler’s, put several appeals for donations on Lasker-Schüler’s behalf in newspapers and literary magazines such as the *Fackel*,²⁸⁸

²⁸³ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 61.

²⁸⁴ Ibid. “Der Verleger erwartete allerdings mich vor allem, den Kontrakt in der Hand, für den ich ihm ein Seelenheil überreichte, für 50 Mark, h.P., für 50 Mark – wie paradox. Trotz meines zerrissenen Kittels in der Frühjahrs-sonne, deren schmeichelnde Hand Axel Juncker bewog, statt mich mit fünfzig mit hundert Mark abzufertigen. Ich habe also gewissermaßen notgedrungen für hundert Mark meinen ehrfurchtsvollen Freund, den unantastbaren Propheten und Dichter St. Peter Hille verkauft [...]”

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 62.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 63.

²⁸⁸ Wied, Pauline Fürstin zu and Selma Lagerlöf, Richard Dehmel, Karl Kraus, Adolf Loos, Helene Fürstin Loutzo, Karin Michaelis, Peter Nansen, Walter Otto, Arnold Schönberg. [Spendenaufruf zugunsten Else Lasker-Schülers], in: *Die Fackel*, v. 14, nr. 366/367 (11 Jan. 1913), printed on the inside back cover.; Ibid. [Spendenaufruf zugunsten Else Lasker-Schülers], in: *Berliner Tageblatt*, v. 42, nr. 37 (Abend-Ausgabe, 21 Jan. 1913).; Ibid. [Spendenaufruf zugunsten Else Lasker-Schülers], in: *Prager Tagblatt*, v. 38, nr. 46 (Morgen-Ausgabe, 16 Feb. 1913), 8.; Ibid. “Ein Aufruf für Else-Lasker-Schüler,” in: *Die Freistatt*, v. 1, nr. 1, (Apr 1913), 68f.; Kraus, Karl: [Notizen – Zum Spendenaufruf für Else Lasker-Schüler], in: *Die Fackel*, v. 14, nr. 370/371 (5 Mar. 1913), 33. Compare to: Skrodzki,

strongly suggests that what she earned was not sufficient. Her earnings from the second expanded edition are also undocumented. It has, however, been recorded that she made 200 Mark a month from her first edition of the *Gesammelte Gedichte*, which included a third further revised edition of the *Hebräische Balladen*, through Erik Ernst (Verlag der Weißen Bücher) in 1917, as per the contractual agreement.²⁸⁹ This publishing house was connected to Kurt Wolff, who took over further publications of this title, as well as a few others:

Wieder wurden Karten – ich meine Kontrakte gewechselt, unterzeichnet. In seine Obhut nahm von jetzt an väterlich Kurt Wolff meine Bücher, die zu honorieren der ästhetische Wolff sich weigerte, selbstredend aus Geschmacksgründen! [...] Jedoch er machte mir [...] für meine drei Bücher monatlich ein »Geschenk« von hundert Mark. [...] Es handelte sich um meine gesammelten Gedichte, den Prinzen von Theben und um ein neues Manuskript, einem Essaybuch.²⁹⁰

The *Gesammelte Gedichte* were then taken over by Paul Cassirer in 1919, who published a 10-volume edition of Lasker-Schüler's collected works,²⁹¹ with

Wolffs Einverständnis zu einer zweiteiligten, zweiten Ausgabe meines Buches: *Gesammelte Gedichte*, die beim Erscheinen meiner gesammelten Werke nicht fehlen konnten. Ich taufte dieses Zwillingebuch selbst: Die Kuppel, das silberne: Die hebräischen Balladen.²⁹²

This arrangement, too, however, left Lasker-Schüler shortchanged, and not only because inflation had begun to take its toll:

Beim Erscheinen der gesammelten Bücher im Jahre 1919 sollte mir die Summe von 50.000 Mark abzüglich der vorangegangenen Honorare im Kassenschrank Cassirer aufbewahrt werden. 27.000 Mark verblieben mir. Ich wurde mein eigener Dieb. Außerdem lief mein Budget liebenswürdig weiter, bis die Briefe Peter Hilles an mich und der Wunderrabbiner von Barcelona 1921 im Cassirer-Verlag erschienen. Für die beiden Bücher à 3000 Auflage erhielt ich 9500 Mark. Das heißt: 2500 Mark, nachdem mir, trotz Flehen und Mordioschreien, die

Karl Jürgen. "Else Lasker Schüler. Beiträge zu Leben und Werk. Ein Verzeichnis für die Jahre 1903-1945," *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_044.htm>.

²⁸⁹ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 73.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, *Gesammelte Werke in zehn Bänden*, (Berlin: Cassirer, 1919/1920).

²⁹² *Ibid.*, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 76-77.

laufenden Honorare 6000 M. abgezogen wurden. Außerdem sperrte man mir meiner eingetretenen Phantasielosigkeit wegen, ich lieferte nichts, das Portefeuille.²⁹³

Throughout the rest of her career after the *Hebräische Balladen* and the *Gesammelten Gedichte*, her royalties continue to be a problem. In 1923, for example, for Lasker-Schüler's book *Theben*, Alfred Flechtheim "hatte mir die Hälfte des Reingewinns von jedem Exemplar versprochen – netto,"²⁹⁴ but in the end,

[e]s sind nach den Berichten des Querschnittverlags ein Viertel Bücher verkauft und ich erhielt bis auf den heutigen Tag, 11. April 1924, für meine A- und B-Thebenbücher ungefähr 66 Millionen und 11 Billionen Mark, allerdings werden mir, wie üblich, meine Bücher angerechnet, die ich mir bestellte; es handelt sich bis jetzt um etwa vier Bücher, von denen ich drei meinen Freunden zum Geschenk machte. Bei der Herausgabe meines Luxuswerkes erhielt ich nach Verlagsordnung einige Freiexemplare, eine A-Ausgabe und drei B-Ausgaben, außerdem für das 2½monatige Kolorieren der Bilder und mühsamen tausenden Namenszügen, dank der energischen Forderung des Anwalts, eine Million Mark, und zwar je eine halbe Million Mark halbmonatlich sofort ausgezahlt am Juni 1923.²⁹⁵

Paul Cassirer, one of Lasker-Schüler's publishers, accused her of lying and embellishing in his public retort of her *Ich räume auf!*,²⁹⁶ but her lawyer Fritz Kalischer put a response in the paper defending her account and detailing her earnings.²⁹⁷ He confirms:

Frau Else Lasker-Schüler, welche Herr Paul Cassirer als die größte Dichterin der Jetztzeit bezeichnet, [hat] ihr gesamtes Lebenswerk dem Verlage Paul Cassirer anvertraut [...]. Richtig ist ferner, daß Frau Else Lasker-Schüler, bis alle Bände ihrer gesammelten Werke herauskamen, ein monatliches Honorar bekam, und zwar in Höhe von 450 Mark, das später auf 650 Mark erhöht wurde. Diese Zahlungen erfolgten aber in entwerteter Mark, so daß etwa 150 bis 200 Goldmark zu jener Zeit monatlich gezahlt wurden. Späterhin, als die Werke erschienen

²⁹³ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, *WB* 4.1, 84. The seemingly high amounts are evidence of the beginnings of extreme inflation.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 52.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 54. In the editors' commentary, found in *WB* 4.2, 62: "Die hohe Summe deutet auf die Entwertung der Mark zur Zeit der Inflation von 1923 hin."

²⁹⁶ Paul Cassirer's letter was originally published on 3 Feb. 1925 in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, nr. 57 (Abend-Ausgabe).

²⁹⁷ The lawyer Fritz Kalischer's response to Cassirer followed in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, nr. 77 (Abend-Ausgabe) on 14 Feb. 1925, in which Else Lasker-Schüler's response to Kalischer also appeared. For Cassirer and Kalischer, see: "Erläuterungen zur Zuschrift an das »Berliner Tageblatt« (1925)," in: *WB* 4.2, 80-84. For Lasker-Schüler's response, see: *WB* 4.1, 93.

waren, hörten diese Zahlungen auf und wurden von der späteren Abrechnung abgezogen. Diese Beträge wurden von dem Gesamthonorar von 50000 Mark mit etwa 23000 Mark abgezogen, das Resthonorar wurde in völlig entwerteter Mark gezahlt. / Da Frau Else Lasker-Schüler auf diese Weise um ihr ganzes Lebenswerk infolge der Entwertung der Mark gebracht war, hat sie einen Aufwertungsantrag gestellt und erhält seit Stabilisierung der Mark 20 Prozent der Brutto-Einnahme. [...] Aus dieser Abrechnung werden Sie entnehmen, daß Frau Else Lasker-Schüler per 17. Okt. 24 gegen den Verlag Cassirer eine Schuld von 17,40 Mark hatte, und das sie für das Vierteljahr für ihr Lebenswerk (12 Bücher) 25 Mark ausgezahlt erhalten hat, so daß ihr also ihr Lebenswerk eine monatliche Einnahme von 8,35 Mark gebracht hat.²⁹⁸

Kalischer emphasizes further that a poet who is starving cannot be expected to produce:

Der Verlag Cassirer hat Frau Lasker-Schüler vorgeworfen, daß sie keine weiteren Manuskripte schickt. Frau Lasker-Schüler ist jedoch hierzu nicht in der Lage, da sie mit 2 Mark wöchentlichem Einkommen nicht schöpferisch, dichterisch tätig sein kann. »Die größte Dichterin der Jetztzeit« muß also entweder hungern oder Lohnarbeit verrichten, um leben zu können.²⁹⁹

Finally, he asserts that publishers have a responsibility to their authors:

Der Verleger ist ein Unternehmer und muß in ein Unternehmen soviel Geld hineinstecken, um einen wirtschaftlichen Erfolg zu haben. Er hat nicht das Recht, einen Menschen, den er für einen der wertvollsten Deutschlands hält, verhungern zu lassen, weil er sich nicht entschließen kann, in das Unternehmen diejenigen Gelder hineinzustecken, die hineingesteckt werden müssen, damit es annähernd floriert. [...] Wer das Glück hat, die »größte Dichterin der Jetztzeit« verlegen zu dürfen, hat nach der Meinung der Freunde der Frau Lasker-Schüler auch noch bei ihren Lebzeiten die Pflicht, ihr Werk zu propagieren [...]. [...] Jeder Operettenverleger bringt seine Operetten mit großem Kostenaufwand heraus, weil er weiß, daß nur dort Geld zu verdienen ist, wo Geld hineingesteckt wird. Es kann nicht verkannt werden, daß es ein größeres Risiko ist, das Meisterwerk der »größten Dichterin der Jetztzeit« herauszubringen. Dafür ist es aber auch eine größere Ehre, ein literarischer Verlag zu sein, als ein Operettenverlag, und wer dieses Ehre für sich in Anspruch nimmt, hat nach der Meinung der Frau Lasker-Schüler auch Pflichten.³⁰⁰

Work, Work, Work: the Many Publications of Die Hebräischen Balladen

²⁹⁸ Fritz Kalischer, as quoted in: "Erläuterungen zur Zuschrift an das »Berliner Tageblatt« (1925)," in: *WB* 4.2, 80-81.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 81.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 81-82.

How does this struggle of authorship as work for income affect the way that works are produced? Since the second half of the 19th century, with the book market having been increasingly influenced by the ever-developing industrial mass culture, literature has been viewed as a product,³⁰¹ and the literary market “orientierte sich folgerichtig immer ausschließlicher nach dem Prinzip der Gewinnmaximierung.”³⁰² As a result, authors in such a market, including non-commercial authors such as Lasker-Schüler and any author without another source of income such as an inheritance or another line of work, have needed to produce, produce, produce in order to earn:

[u]nter dem Gesichtspunkt der Produktion verschwindet der Unterschied zwischen dem Schriftsteller und dem Fabrikanten; wie dieser hat der Schriftsteller zunächst investiert, um produzieren zu können, und wie dieser hat der Schriftsteller den Anspruch, aus seinem Produkt einen echten Gewinn zu ziehen, um weiter produzieren zu können.³⁰³

When she was in need, Lasker-Schüler made money however she could. Beyond asking for financial help, and beyond what she managed to make from her books and plays, this included sales of her drawings, and participation in cabarets, such as the *Neopathetischer Cabaret* or the *Gnu* in 1910 and 1911,³⁰⁴ which were an essential way of making a living for many artists.³⁰⁵ “in Phasen großer finanzieller Schwierigkeiten [versprach sich ... Else Lasker-Schüler] immer wieder Rettung durch Auftritte mit eigenen Produktionen.”³⁰⁶ She took

³⁰¹ Wittmann, 257.

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Bosse, 90.

³⁰⁴ Reiß-Suckow, 33. Compare also to: Sprengel, Peter. “Else Lasker-Schüler und das Kabarett,” *Text + Kritik* 122: Else Lasker-Schüler, (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1994), 75-86.

³⁰⁵ Ibid..

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

commissioned work on occasion, reasoning for example, “ich muß alles annehmen wo ich verdienen kann für Paulchen.”³⁰⁷

Moreover, as previously indicated, Lasker-Schüler’s publications in almanacs, anthologies, annuals (*Jahrbüchern*), catalogues, playbills, newspapers, and magazines were extensive and varied.³⁰⁸ Such publications were attempts to make small sums of money quickly³⁰⁹ as much as they were also literary communication and, as such, an attempt to publicize her work, widen her audience, maintain public interest, and gain recognition. From the vast list of Lasker-Schüler’s publications of this type, there are at least 61 instances between 1907-1945 of poem titles that were also found in some form in the book publications of her *Hebräischen Balladen* work-group.³¹⁰ Publishing poem titles appearing in the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group, specifically, was not only a chance to earn a bit more money, it was also an opportunity to capitalize on any already-existing appreciation or awareness of Else Lasker-Schüler as an author, as well as to garner interest in the cycle of the *Hebräische Balladen*, whether a book publication was upcoming or already on the shelves, and to reach potential new readers in general.

³⁰⁷ Else Lasker-Schüler, as quoted in: Reiß-Suckow, 42.

³⁰⁸ For a list of her publications in newspapers and literary magazines from 1899-1944, see: Skrodzki, Karl Jürgen. “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Zeitschriften und Zeitungen,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_029.htm>. For a list of Lasker-Schüler’s publications included in almanachs, anthologies, annuals, catalogues, and playbills from 1901-1945, see: Ibid. “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Almanachen, Anthologien, Jahrbüchern, Katalogen und Programmheften,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_034.htm>. Both lists also include posthumous publications past these dates. The second list includes posthumous anthology publications of works Lasker-Schüler had published during her own lifetime.

³⁰⁹ See for example: “Brief 108,” *WB* 8, 52-3. (From January 1926): “Nicht, daß momentan ich in Not wäre – im Gegenteil, ich schreibe jetzt sehr viel für Zeitungen und Berliner T. bezahlt mir gut.”

³¹⁰ This number is per publication, i.e. not per poem title included in the same anthology or newspaper issue (for example). Many of these instances include more than one poem title from the *Hebräische Balladen* book publications. The list begins in 1907 because, although the first *HB* publication was in 1913, some of the poem titles were also published in the cycle *Styx* in 1902, and then were published in other forums before the titles were included in the *HB* work-group. For the list of newspaper, literary magazine, almanac, anthology, annual, catalogue, and playbill publications of versions of poems that also appeared in some form in the cycle publications of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen*, see Appendix (D) at the end of this chapter, p. 58-62. This information was compiled from two extensive lists of Lasker-Schüler’s non-book publications, both by Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, an editor of the Lasker-Schüler critical edition. (See: Skrodzki, “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Zeitschriften und Zeitungen”; Ibid., “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Almanachen, Anthologien, Jahrbüchern, Katalogen und Programmheften.”)

Lasker-Schüler's specific royalty amounts and difficulty earning from her works were, in the early 20th century, ultimately tied to public interest, by this time synonymous with potential and actual sales of her works, which were written "ohne Rücksicht auf ein mögliches Publikum"³¹¹ and "[wurde] auch dementsprechend wenig gelesen."³¹² The specifics of how well her first two editions of the *Hebräische Balladen* sold are unknown – except, that is, for the aforementioned documented suspicion that Lasker-Schüler had that Alfred Richard Meyer was lying when he reported that the first edition was not selling well.³¹³ There is, however, evidence to the fact that this was one of her most well-received and recognized works. According to Norbert Oellers, who worked as an editor for both the critical edition of Else Lasker-Schüler's works and published a handwritten manuscript version of the *Hebräische Balladen*, Lasker-Schüler even referred to herself as the "hebräischen Balladendichterin."³¹⁴ From the number of reviews in papers in 1913,³¹⁵ it is clear that this was a symbolically valuable work that earned recognition and attention from Lasker-Schüler's contemporaries.

This recognition and attention, along with a need for income, provides at least one explanation for why Lasker-Schüler would have followed the first edition with the second

³¹¹ Reiß-Suckow, 41.

³¹² *Ibid.*, 42.

³¹³ "Brief 535," *WB* 6, 333. (An Paul Zech. <Berlin-Halensee, 17. Mai 1913. Samstag.>): "Lieber Paul Zech. Sie sagten mir doch 800 Balladenbücher sind von mir bei Meyer fort. Er schrieb mir – denken Sie nur 200."

³¹⁴ "Brief 75," *WB* 8, 39-40. (Okt. 1925 an (Frau) Guste Mayer): "Haben Sie und Herr Mayer das Vertrauen zur hebräischen Balladendichterin?"

³¹⁵ See: Skrodzki, Karl Jürgen. "Die Bücher von Else Lasker-Schüler. Mit Hinweisen zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption," *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_030.htm>. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki lists 10 reviews of the first edition. See also: *Ibid.* "Else Lasker-Schüler. Beiträge zu Leben und Werk. Ein Verzeichnis für die Jahre 1903-1945." Here Skrodzki lists a further lauding of the work in a call for donations on her behalf, originally published in: Stern, Josef Luitpold. "Paul Zech: »Das schwarze Revier.« Verlag A. R. Meyer, Berlin-Wilmersdorf," in: *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (Vienna), v. 25, nr. 87 (Mittagsblatt, 31 Mar. 1913), 5.: "Wir benützen den Anlaß, um von einer dichterischen Kraft zu reden, die jeden packen muß, der an sie herankommt. Else Lasker-Schüler, eine sprachschöpferische Dichterin, ist in der genannten Sammlung mit »Hebräischen Balladen« vertreten. Es sind wunderschöne Gedichte darunter, wie gleich das Leitgedicht. In anderen hinwieder scheint uns der Ausdruck über den Inhalt hinauszugehen, aber auch hier ist der Klang der Worte fortreißend. Else Lasker-Schüler, die durch ihre Kunst über die meiste Lyrik unserer Tage hinausgehoben wird, ist in Not und auch für sie muß gesammelt werden – ein einsames Dichterherz verlangt, seine Gaben ausströmen zu lassen; soll die Not dauernd einen Damm bilden dürfen?"

expanded edition in 1914 – and why she not only included the *Hebräische Balladen* in her *Gesammelte Gedichte*, but also named an entire volume of the two-volume edition after them. The *Hebräische Balladen* were also, of course, an absolutely necessary part of her collected works; Lasker-Schüler once referred to them as the heart of her body of work: “Nehme ich die hebräischen Balladen von den Büchern fehle das Herz.”³¹⁶ As previously mentioned, Cassirer fought Wolff for the rights to re-publish the two-volume *Gesammelte Gedichte*, which was also highly reviewed when it was first released in 1917,³¹⁷ as part of Lasker-Schüler’s *Gesammelte Werke*, published in 1919/1920.

Special new editions of previously published work titles were, it is at this point clear, another source of potential income and a way of maximizing profit from previously published work titles. The changes across publications could furthermore be seen as a way of maintaining interest, since each edition is a unique publication rather than a simple reissuing of the same work. Of the collected works edition from Cassirer in 1919/1920, Grete Fischer, who at the time worked as a *Lektorin* for Paul Cassirer, writes in her memoirs:

Die Aufgabe war, aus einem Haufen früherer Bücher, die entweder im Krieg aus dem Handel gekommen oder vergessen waren, eine Gesamtausgabe ihrer Werke zusammenzustellen. Es gab wohl noch die ›Gesammelten Gedichte‹ bei Kurt Wolff, denn sie hatte ein kleines Vorrecht, ihre an sich schmale Produktion an verschiedene Verleger zu verhandeln, wenn sie in Not war; und sie war immer in Not. Die Gesamtausgabe war eine Gelegenheit, ihr eine Monatsrente auszusetzen, obwohl die Aussicht auf einen geschäftlichen Erfolg gering war. Die Redaktion machte Else Lasker-Schüler [...] selbst, sehr gewissenhaft. Sie feilte an jeder Zeile, änderte allerdings oft ihre Meinung, die jedesmal als endgültig respektiert werden mußte.³¹⁸

³¹⁶ “Brief 387,” *WB* 9, 223-4 (An Emil Raas. <Zürich,> 6. Mai. 35. <Montag.>).

³¹⁷ Karl Jürgen Skrodzki lists 17 reviews of this edition. See: Skrodzki, “Die Bücher von Else Lasker-Schüler. Mit Hinweisen zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption.”

³¹⁸ Fischer, Grete. *Dienstboten, Brecht und andere Zeitgenossen in Prag, Berlin, London*, (Olten / Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, 1966), 134. Compare to: Skrodzki, “Die Bücher von Else Lasker-Schüler. Mit Hinweisen zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption.”

That a work(-group) such as the *Hebräischen Balladen* garners attention and appreciation, unfortunately, does not necessarily indicate that the books are selling well enough or that the author is earning well from the publication. Literary critics and fellow authors, after all, are not one in the same with the reading public. In response to the many calls for donations to help Else Lasker-Schüler in 1913, Kurt Tucholsky writes:

Das Papier errötet nie. Es trägt mit der gleichen Geduld, daß Hebbel ›ein dichtendes Tölpelchen‹ geschimpft und Blumenthal als ›Denker‹ geehrt wird. Sie werden erwidern, daß Sie ja zur Entschädigung sogar Else Lasker-Schüler dem Volke haben erklären lassen. Die Schande ist, daß Sie das erst taten, als für die Dichterin gesammelt werden mußte. Hätten Sie jedes ihrer Bücher sofort mit demselben Feuereifer, an derselben sichtbaren Stelle und mit derselben Ausführlichkeit besprochen, wie jede Feuilletonsammlung von Felix Philippi, so wäre der Dichterin die Not und uns der beschämende Anblick dieser Not und Ihres Linderungsversuches erspart geblieben. Aber ob so oder so, ob früher oder später: es ist völlig wertlos, die Lasker-Schüler und ihresgleichen überhaupt zu erwähnen, solange sich für die Philippis noch eine Feder rühren darf. Denn ein Publikum, dem abwechselnd dies und das zum Kauf angepriesen wird, hat allerdings recht, daß es zu Philippi greift, weil es sich bei ihm fürs erste besser unterhält.³¹⁹

As far as Tucholsky is concerned, it is shameful and scandalous that the publisher in question waited until the public cries for aid for Lasker-Schüler, until she found herself in such an intense state of poverty and need, to step into the public eye and defend her as a great poet. Tucholsky not only believes that this is not enough but that, in fact, the responsibility for her situation lies squarely with the publisher in the first place for not having so fervently and publicly lauded her as a poet before, with every book she ever published, instead taking the easy route and spending such advertising efforts on authors whose works sell and find popularity more easily because their works more quickly and immediately entertain the public than those of an author such as Lasker-Schüler, whose works are more complex and ahead of their time.

³¹⁹ Tucholsky, Kurt. "Dem siebzigjährigen Mosse," in: *Die Schaubühne* (Charlottenburg), v. 9/1, nr. 19 (8 May 1913), 514-519. Compare to: Skrodzki, "Die Bücher von Else Lasker-Schüler. Mit Hinweisen zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption."

The Cassirer collected works edition (1919/20) in particular, which held the last publication in the work-group of the *Hebräische Balladen*, did not appear to sell as well as was hoped, given that years later in *Ich räume auf!* (1925), Lasker-Schüler writes: “Die zehn Bücher meiner gesammelten Ausgabe und die zwei nachfolgenden liegen im Verlage Cassirer [...] und haben, mich scheint’s vergessen, schon Jahre.”³²⁰ She had been trying to buy the rest of her books from Cassirer since 1924.³²¹ In 1925, the remaining copies of the ten-volume collected works edition as well as *Der Wunderrabbiner von Barcelona* and *Briefe Peter Hilles an Else Lasker-Schüler*, published by Cassirer in 1921, totaled 9500.³²² These copies were passed along to Bruno Cassirer when the Cassirer Verlag was sold in 1926,³²³ and Lasker-Schüler spent much of that year trying to get the money together to buy these copies from the publishing house, asking many people to help her raise the money,³²⁴ before the rest of her books were finally given to her free of charge by Hugo Simon.³²⁵ She spent the years 1932 to 1935 trying to sell these books to second-hand bookstores³²⁶ and individual buyers, and asking for assistance from friends

³²⁰ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 83.

³²¹ See the following letters: “Brief 572,” WB 7, 572. (From February 1924): “Nur von Kurt Wolf bekam ich Januar das Geld.”; “Brief 608,” Ibid., 311. (From July 1924): “Cassirer giebt meine versammelten Bücher für 9 tausend 500 Mk. accordieren wohl möglich 1000 sind von jedem Buch noch da nur Wupper ausverkauft.”; Commentary in Ibid., 584: “Die „Gesamtausgabe in zehn Bänden“. [...] Else Lasker-Schüler wollte die Restauflage vom Verlag Paul Cassirer übernehmen.”

³²² See the commentary for “Brief 629,” found in: WB 8, 572.

³²³ “Brief 192,” WB 8, 91-92. (December 1926 to Hans Paret): “Vorgestern erhielt ich Ihre Nachricht, der Verlag: Paul Cassirer befände sich wieder: Victoriast. 2. Heute, nachdem ich meine Abrechnung forderte, sind Sie ausgetreten: Verlag Bruno Cassirer. Also befänden sich meine Bücher ohne meine Erlaubniß bei Bruno Cassirer. Ich komme bald nach Berlin und lasse die ganze Geschichte mal auf Eid nehmen. Mein Anwalt will in Berlin orientiert sein. Daß Ihnen meine Wupper leid tut, die nicht wieder in Ihrem „noblen“ Verlag gedruckt werden wird, schmerzt mich!! Ich rate Ihnen die Finger davon zu lassen, denn heute passen wir wie die Spürhunde auf. So eine Gemeinheit, einer armen Dichterin die letzten paar Pfennige nicht zu senden, werde ich als 11. Brochure in die Welt senden. Nun habe ich 12 Bücher bei Ihnen, Ihr verdammten Menschen, und nehme nichts ein. Mein Kind tot-krank! Der Fluch soll Euch treffen falls Sie im Spiel sind. / Else Lasker-Schüler”

³²⁴ See for example: “Brief 75,” Ibid., 39-40. (Okt. 1925 an (Frau) Guste Mayer). Lasker-Schüler writes asking to borrow 300 Mk in order to be able to buy some of the books back from Cassirer.

³²⁵ “Brief 145,” Ibid., 73. (From May 1926): “Meine 12 Bücher den Rest haben mir unter Leitung von dem lieben Hugo Simon, geschenkt das heißt: überlassen. Unentgeltlich.”

³²⁶ Refer, for example, to: “Brief 586,” Ibid., 305-306. (From July 1932); “Brief 596,” Ibid., 313-314. (August 1932); “Brief 626,” Ibid., 330-331. (January 1933); “Brief 334,” WB 9, 192-193. (January 1935 to Martin Buber): “Sie glauben nicht den Gefallen, den Sie mir täten wenn Sie Herrn Schokken schreiben würden, er möchte doch

who might know interested parties: “Ich habe den Rest der Bücher selbst im Verkauf. Wollen Sie mir helfen, daß ich mal wieder in der Lage bin, ein Buch zu schreiben und zu zeichnen und mich nicht an Zeitungsdinge verflattere?”³²⁷

Even producing as a *Fabrikant* in the literary market ultimately does not earn an author much if an author is not writing specifically according to what sells well, but rather with the aim of creating art for art’s sake, in the inverse economy of the literary field which specifically privileges a disinterest in earning money from literary works in exchange for the possibility of recognition in the long-term. As previously determined, furthermore, while works of poetry are highly symbolically valued, they are also the least economically valued and tend to be the least economically successful. These are works of luxury that do not address an existing popular demand, and even though the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group was appreciated, especially by other authors, it also appeared in a historical market that saw most people buying fewer books during (and between) times of war and the resulting affected economy and, if they were buying books at all, tending to buy popular literature for leisure and amusement.

Lasker-Schüler was producing and publishing at quite high rates during her lifetime, and doing as much as she could to earn an income from authorship in a society that requires everyone to work in order to survive, but in a field that promises the possible reward of an immortal name if one is specifically not writing with the aim of producing bestsellers and making a good profit, and which typically does not compensate authors for their labors in the same way that other types of workers earn a living wage from their work. Ultimately, she was still an avant-garde author struggling to maintain a decent living. One result of this situation was, conclusively, the multiple

antiquarisch so ungefähr à Buch 50 Pfg. Illustriert meinen Rest der 12 gesammelten Bücher von Paul Cassirer – damals herausgegeben kaufen.? [...] 8000 Bücher Rest à 12 Stück gesammelte Bücher – erschienen im Paul Cassirer Verlag fast die Hälfte auch innen illustriert und aber alle Einbände von mir. Ungefähr für 50 Pfg à Buch. Geh auch was herunter.”

³²⁷ “Brief 93,” *WB* 8, 46-47.

publications of the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group, in terms of the multiple book editions of the cycle (which form the particular focus of this dissertation) as well as the multiple publications throughout her lifetime of individual poems related to the work-group (and other cycles that shared some of these titles) in newspapers, literary magazines, and similar formats. The need for income contributes in this case not just to creating and publishing entirely ‘unique’ works as often as possible, but also to multiple publications and editions, in part because these are opportunities for maximizing potential profit from the fruits of one’s labors as well as for maintaining and expanding readership.

Ich bin Else Lasker-Schüler – leider: Author as Sufferer

“Ich bin Else Lasker-Schüler – leider.”³²⁸

The image of authors as sufferers and others in their own societies is both derived from and contributes to how authors are paid for their labor and cultural products – recalling in particular Bourdieu’s description of the inverse economy of the literary field and the related romanticization of the *artiste maudit* over those who see great commercial success and earn well during their lifetimes. Authors are special cultural figures, and suffering is the price to pay for their special status and the chance at an immortal name. The possibility of earning a name justifies suffering and exploitation; it gives hope to those who see little to no success in their lifetime and justifies low profits in the short term – and low payments from the side of a publisher, who is taking a risk on a work and may base royalty amounts primarily on potential or

³²⁸ See: Vanderbeke, 47. (Letter from Lasker-Schüler to Georg Landauer, 21 Feb. 1941).

actual sales. An author's suffering (in more grounded terms, the life of financial instability and lack of appreciation) that results from writing works that are not immediate successes, that may instead turn out to be 'before their time,' is, furthermore, romanticized as enabling that author's special perspective and status and serving as proof of their unique genius. The narrative of author as sufferer ultimately promotes the notion that suffering and outsider status contribute to the special perspective of authorship and are intrinsic to it, but internal structures of the literary market, the way that works are published, how (and how much) authors are paid for their works, and the relationship among author (who creates the works in question), publisher (who is paid for the service of printing and promoting the works), and reader (who buys the work and, more often than not, pays more toward the profit of those who sell the works than those who write them), are also a significant source of an author's suffering and outsider status.

All of this is illuminated by the details of Lasker-Schüler's struggles to make a living as an author and the fact that she lived a life of poverty – all despite the fact that work(-group)s such as the *Hebräische Balladen* earned recognition and praise and led to her eventual official acknowledgement through canonization and literary prizes. Her financial instability, resulting from the systems in place that affect authors in their economic role as those who write and publish works for an income, even while they may necessarily appear disinterested in the money over creating for the sake of creating, in turn directly contributed to her producing and (re)publishing as much and as often as possible, including the multiple publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*, all for low financial return.

Lasker-Schüler has served as a specific example of the predicament of the author as income-earner and has been given an in-depth look in this chapter, but this problem was by no means limited to her own life and career. Both Lasker-Schüler and many other authors living around the same time period both viewed and publicly staged themselves as sufferers and

outsiders, and often identified with imagery such as authors as secular saviors, prophets for the masses, and martyrs.³²⁹ Authors who saw their role and purpose as one who creates works that impart truth or beauty in some way (by no means always both), an exceptional role and duty, often saw and depicted themselves as sacrificing themselves or earthly comforts for their greater cause and purpose.³³⁰

When one acknowledges how little (non-commercial) authors like Else Lasker-Schüler have typically earned during their own lifetimes from their work, despite how much they produce and publish, writing works that are seen as having high symbolic value among fellow authors and literary experts but which ultimately do not sell well and are therefore seen as having low economic value, it is indeed not difficult to find the basis for such self-representation. This is especially fathomable given that a life of “Askese”³³¹ and little to no recognition and success during one’s lifetime was typically explained away as the price paid for the potential of immortality in the afterlife through one’s name and body of works. The aforementioned idea that writing is divine work and a special calling lends further support to authors maintaining such a self-image, because if the work is divine, it is above and could potentially even be made profane by monetary payment, as though it were merely an ordinary type of labor or the product mundane (trivial or merely popular), rather than highly valuable in a lasting symbolic way.³³² In general, it is no wonder that the imagery of sacrifice – *Opferer*, *Geopferter* – is so prevalent in

³²⁹ This self-representation saw a revival beginning in modernism and is still visible with authors such as Lasker-Schüler in the early 20th century. For more on this, refer to Marx. See also: Woodmansee / Jaszi (Esp. 400: “säkuläre Prophetie”).

³³⁰ Both Arno Holz and Brecht also fit into this description in their own ways, with Brecht focusing on the aspect of imparting harsh satirical truths and Holz focusing on the role of the author as one who the history and future of the universe flows through, so that he might depict it. This will be handled more in depth in later chapters.

³³¹ Lasker-Schüler, *Ich räume auf!*, WB 4.1, 57.

³³² As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Bourdieu specifically makes the comparison from authorship to religious work, and further relates the relationship between author and publisher to that of sacristan and priest, describing how a sacristan essentially volunteers their labor (and is therefore technically exploited) because the work is considered divine; accepting payment would therefore also be profane, as though a sacristan’s work were tantamount to that of someone who cleans for a living. For more on this, see: Bourdieu, *Practical Reason*, 111-118.

literary theory and analysis, including (but certainly not limited to) the idea that an author sacrifices one's self to create a work.³³³

Some theorists go so far as to say that, if one is an avant-garde author whose works are not selling because the author is not primarily concerned with catering to the wants of a reading public and specifically writing works they know will sell, then authorship must be redefined:³³⁴ “Nicht im Werk, sondern im Leben bezeugt sich das ‘Künstlertum.’”³³⁵ This type of claim bases itself on the fact that in the case of many non-commercial authors, the lifestyle (for example, the bohemian existence) of the author becomes the focus over the works produced, or is at least considered equally as interesting, or as proof of their uniqueness and creative genius – and this is, for Lasker-Schüler, very much the case, discernable both in the accounts of those who knew (of) or encountered her as an individual and author during her lifetime³³⁶ and of many of those writing about her life and works post mortem.³³⁷ These accounts very often focus on eccentricities that further serve to prove that the author is a special Other (such as the alter egos of Lasker-Schüler, like *Prinz Yussuf von Theben*) and narratives of personal pain and suffering (such as poverty, divorce, difficult childhood, and surmising the possibility of mental illness). This thinking, moreover, falls directly in line with the notion that, where books were once “ein Element der Rede unbeschadet dessen, daß andere damit handelten,”³³⁸ the modern work is “ja die persönlichkeitsgeladene Ware.”³³⁹ The danger in focusing on person over work (either outside of the work, or within it) is particularly prevalent where such interpretations of the

³³³ For example, Barthes, *The Death of the Author*. Refer also to: Marx; and: Teuber, Bernhard. “Sacrificium auctoris. Die Anthropologie des Opfers und das postmoderne Konzept der Autorschaft,” in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, 121-141.

³³⁴ Reiß-Suckow, 42.

³³⁵ See: Ibid.

³³⁶ Refer, for example, to: “Zeugnis und Erinnerung,” in: Ginsberg (ed.), *Dichtungen und Dokumente*, 565-612.

³³⁷ As seen in the many Lasker-Schüler biographies by Sigrid Bauschinger, for example, and Reiß-Suckow, to name a few.

³³⁸ Bosse, 124.

³³⁹ Ibid.

biography of an author like Lasker-Schüler serve as the primary or even sole lens through which her works are interpreted – interpretations, for example, that may claim that every poem Lasker-Schüler wrote can be traced back to her bad childhood, or which suggest that her signature blending of fact and fiction in works such as *Mein Herz* might be the result of mental instability and the inability to tell fantasy and fact apart, or of an insufficiently masked overreliance on her own biography as a source due to a lack of imagination, rather than as the result of artistic license.

It is typical for the outsider status and suffering of an author to be romanticized, viewed as legitimizing their true and pure role as an author, and read in the content of the works an author produces. Atypical, on the other hand, is that this condition of the author be linked precisely and explicitly to authorship as a line of work, which is an economic role within a system that offers cultural producers the possibility of recognition as late as in the afterlife in lieu of a stable or significant source of income, that moreover constructs an explicit opposition between what is considered art and what makes money, and that demands high levels of productivity and publication for financial survival if one is not writing works they know will sell because they cater to an existing market. A life of authorship (and therefore, quite likely, of financial instability) has the potential to affect not only the content of the works produced, but also the quantity, frequency, and manner in which they are written and published, as we have seen with the multiple publications of the work-group *die Hebräischen Balladen*.

V. Conclusion

Steffen Martus asserts that “die Marktförmigkeit [bestimmt] die literarische Kommunikation.”³⁴⁰ At this point it has become clear that publishing problems and low and inconsistent earnings from authorship as an occupation in a society in which everyone (without a source of financial means such as an inheritance) must work to earn money and survive had a heavy hand in the fact of the multiple publications of the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group.

The fact that such external factors had an influence in the creation and publication of these many different *Hebräische Balladen*, moreover, provides a strong argument against considering the publications of the work-group to be a series of versions and a teleology toward the most perfected and intended form, ‘the work.’ Through this lens of the economic role of authorship within the literary market, if financial struggles and the economic role of the author as both producer of cultural products and as income-earner in the literary market (which is set up to offer the chance to earn privilege and recognition, often in direct conflict with the chance to earn sufficient profits and economic reimbursement for labor and product, and which places higher symbolic value on works that do not earn well in the short-run but rather are long-term investments and do not cater directly to current interests and popular demands of the reading public or to existing markets) contributed to multiple published versions, then the related justification for choosing the final publication as the best representation for ‘the work’ *Hebräische Balladen* is illuminated as a less than ideal representation. While in this specific case it may be acceptable (in that it is the lesser of evils) to choose to represent the work group with the most highly received publication of the *Hebräische Balladen*, this decision, too, would not be

³⁴⁰ Martus, 22.

ideal, given that it is also true that the changes across versions are of such large scale. Each publication is equally valid in its own right because each was authorized in the context of Else Lasker-Schüler writing and publishing to earn a living. What other options for representation of such a work-group might there be, if not choosing one publication to stand in for all differing publications of work-groups such as *die Hebräischen Balladen*?

Before we can fully consider how these sets of interconnected but different, equally valid and authorized publications of work-groups like *die Hebräischen Balladen*, *Phantasmus*, and *Hauspostille* might be read and represented, we must first examine some other contributing factors involved in the creation of these multiple publications of poetry cycles. After all, publications are not only about earning an income, and it also needs to be considered that each of these work-groups fall within the genre of poetry and the form of the cycle. The next chapter means to investigate how the genre of poetry itself might lend itself to a unique relationship between parts and whole, and how the tradition of writing poetry and poetry cycles and collections might support the creation of work-groups with multiple differing but interconnected publications. We will continue to focus on Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* while keeping Holz' *Phantasmus* and Brecht's *Hauspostille* in the background as more normative instances of the phenomenon of the work-group. Those latter two work-groups are fairly straightforward, both with regard to the reasons they came to be and the changes made across their publications; something more complex and elusive appears to be happening with the *Hebräische Balladen*.

VI. Chapter Appendix

A. Lasker-Schüler's Hebräische Balladen Book Publications

Hebräische Balladen, (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: A. R. Meyer, 1913).

Hebräische Balladen. 2. vermehrte Auflage, (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: A. R. Meyer, 1914).

Hebräische Balladen, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte*, (Leipzig: Verlag der Weißen Bücher, 1917), 9-27.

Hebräische Balladen, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte. 2. Auflage*, (Leipzig: Wolff, [1919]), 9-28.

Hebräische Balladen, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte. Sechstes bis zehntes Tausend*, (Munich: Wolff, 1920), 9-28.

Hebräische Balladen, in: *Hebräische Balladen. Der Gedichte erster Teil. Mit einer Einbandzeichnung der Verfasserin*, (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1920), 7-26.

B. Order of Poem Titles in the Hebräische Balladen Book Publications

1912/13

Mein Volk
David und Jonathan
Eva
Abraham und Isaak
Jakob
Esther
Pharao und Joseph
Zebaoth
Jakob und Esau
Abel
Sulamith
An Gott
Ruth
Boas
Versöhnung

1914

Mein Volk
Abraham und Isaak
Jakob
Esther
Pharao und Joseph
An Gott
Ruth
David und Jonathan
Eva
Zebaoth
Jakob und Esau
Abel
Sulamith
Boas
Versöhnung
Moses und Josua
Im Anfang

1917

Versöhnung
Mein Volk
Boas
Esther
An Gott
Jakob und Esau
Abel
Pharao und Joseph
David und Jonathan
Ruth
Saul
Moses und Josua
Im Anfang
Zebaoth
Abraham und Isaak
Eva
Sulamith
Jakob

1919 + 1920 Wolff

Versöhnung
Mein Volk
Boas
Esther
An Gott
Jakob und Esau
Abel
Pharao und Joseph
David und Jonathan
David und Jonathan
Ruth
Saul
Moses und Josua
Im Anfang
Zebaoth
Abraham und Isaak
Eva
Sulamith
Jakob

1920 Cassirer

Versöhnung
Mein Volk
Boas
Esther
An Gott
Jakob und Esau
Abel
Pharao und Joseph
David und Jonathan
David und Jonathan
Ruth
Saul
Moses und Josua
Im Anfang
Zebaoth
Abraham und Isaak
Eva
Sulamith
Hagar und Ismael
Jakob

C. Other Works by Lasker-Schüler Including Hebräische Balladen – Related Poems

Styx, (Berlin: Axel Juncker Verlag, 1902).

Includes the shared titles: “Sulamith”; “Im Anfang”

Der siebente Tag, (Berlin: Verlag des Vereins für Kunst, 1905).

Includes the shared titles: “Eva”; “Ruth”; “Mein Volk”; “Zebaoth”

Meine Wunder, (Karlsruhe and Leipzig: Dreililien-Verlag, 1911).

Includes the shared titles: “Versöhnung”; “Pharao und Joseph”; “David und Jonathan (In der Bibel stehn wir geschrieben)”; “Eva”; “Ruth”; “Mein Volk”; “Zebaoth”; “An Gott”

Theben. Gedichte und Lithographien. (Frankfurt a. M. / Berlin: Querschnitt-Verlag, 1923).

Includes the shared titles: “Mein Volk”; “Versöhnung”

Das Hebräerland [prose], (Zürich: Verlag Oprecht, 1937).

Includes: “Sulamith” (serves as the end of the book, without title); “Versöhnung” (with the title “Versöhnungstag”)

D. Lasker-Schüler’s Hebräische Balladen – Related Publications in Newspapers,

Literary Magazines, Anthologies, etc.

The following is a list of newspaper, literary magazine, almanac, anthology, annual, catalogue, and playbill publications of versions of poems that also appeared in some form in the publications of *Hebräische Balladen*. (Refer to footnote 199). Note that versions of some of these titles were also included in other poetry cycles, such as *Styx* (1902) and *Meine Wunder* (1911). This information was compiled from two extensive lists of Lasker-Schüler’s non-book publications, both by Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, an editor of the Lasker-Schüler critical edition. (See: Skrodzki, “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Zeitschriften und Zeitungen,” and “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Almanachen, Anthologien, Jahrbüchern, Katalogen und Programmheften.”). It should be noted that Lasker-Schüler may not necessarily have received monetary payment for all of these publications, and that some of the publications included are translations. Potentially non-paid publications and translations are both included in this list, first and foremost because it is not possible to trace which publications in such a forum were compensated (or for how much) and which were not, and second, because publication in such forums (including newspapers or anthologies in foreign countries or in the country in which one is living in exile) is in every case an opportunity for widening one’s potential audience and therefore a long-term investment, at the very least, even where it does not always result in financial compensation. (Of course, in a list examining the changes across publications of poems with the same titles, translations would necessarily be excluded).

1907

“Sulamith,” “Mein Volk,” in: *Hebräische Melodien. Eine Anthologie*, ed. Julius Moses, (Berlin und Leipzig: Curt Wigand, 1907), 200 f.

1908

“An Gott,” in: *Das Magazin*, v. 77.5, (Feb 1908), 77.

1909

“Zebaoth” (in English translation), in: *Contemporary German Poetry*, selected and translated by Jethro Bithell, (London, Felling-on-Tyne, New York: The Walter Scott Publishing Co., 1909), 107–113.

1910

“Pharao und Joseph,” “David und Jonathan” (In der Bibel stehn wir geschrieben), in: *Der Sturm*, v. 1.4, (Berlin, 24 Mar 1910), 27.

“Eva,” “Mein Volk,” in: *Deutsche Lyrik seit Liliencron*, ed. Hans Bethge, (Leipzig: Hesse & Becker, 1910. [Spring 1910], 169–175.

“Versöhnung,” in: *Der Sturm*, v. 1.23, (Berlin, 4 Aug 1910), 181.

1911

“Mein Volk,” in: *Der Sturm*, v. 2.58, (Berlin, 8 Apr 1911), 461. [The text follows the version printed in *Meine Wunder* (1911)].

“Abel,” in: *Der Sturm*, v. 2.72, (Berlin, Aug 1911), 574.

1912

“Esther,” in: *Der Sturm*, v. 2.103, (Berlin, Mar 1912), 821.

“Boas,” in: *Der Sturm*, v. 3.110, (Berlin, May 1912), 41.

“David und Jonathan” (In der Bibel stehn wir geschrieben), in: *Der Kondor. Verse von Ernst Blaß, Max Brod, Arthur Drey, S. Friedlaender, Herbert Großberger, Ferdinand Hardekopf, Georg Heym, Kurt Hiller, Arthur Kronfeld, Else Lasker-Schüler, Ludwig Rubiner, René Schickele, Franz Werfel, Paul Zech*, ed. Kurt Hiller, (Heidelberg: Richard Weißbach, 1912. [End of May 1912]), 98–107.

“Jakob und Esau,” in: *Simplicissimus*, v. 17.17 (Munich, 22 Jul 1912), 264.

“Versöhnung,” in: *Der Sturm*, v. 3.125/126, (Berlin, Sep 1912), 134.

1913

“Esther,” in: *Prager Tagblatt*, v. 38.45 (Morgen-Ausgabe), (Prague, 15 Feb 1913), 5 [“Theater”]. [The text follows the version printed in *Hebräische Balladen* (1913)].

“Abraham und Isaak,” in: *Deutsche Montags-Zeitung*, v. 4.6/7 (2. Beilage. Literarische Beilage), (Berlin, 17 Feb 1913).

“Jakob,” in: *Saturn*, v.3.4, (Heidelberg, Apr 1913), 118.

“Jakob und Esau,” in: *Die Bücherei Maiandros. Eine Zeitschrift von 60 zu 60 Tagen*, v. 4/5 (Der Mistral eine lyrische Anthologie), (Berlin-Wilmersdorf, 1 May 1913), 31 f.

“Pharao und Joseph!,” “Ruth,” “Boas,” in: *Die Freistatt*, v. 1.2 (Eschweiler, 15 May 1913), 116 f. [The text follows the version printed in *Hebräische Balladen* (1913)].

“Abraham und Isaak,” “Esther,” in: *Das literarische Echo*, v. 15.18, (15 Jun 1913), column 1269 f. [The text follows the version printed in *Hebräische Balladen* (1913)].

“Moses und Josua,” in: *Simplicissimus*, v. 18.16 (Munich, 14 Jul 1913), 258.

1916

“Zebaoth,” in: *Vom jüngsten Tag. Ein Almanach neuer Dichtung*, (Leipzig: Kurt Wolff, 1916 [Appeared at the beginning of 1916]), 62 f.

“Zebaoth,” in: *Vom jüngsten Tag. Ein Almanach neuer Dichtung. 2., veränderte Ausgabe*, (Leipzig: Kurt Wolff, 1917 [Printed November 1916]), 64 f.

“Ruth,” “An Gott,” in: *Kölner Tageblatt*, v. 54.624 (Sonntags-Ausgabe), (12 Nov 1916). [Insert:] *Blätter für Kunst und Kritik*, v. 1.4.

1917

“Mein Volk,” in: *B. Z. am Mittag*, v. 41.225, (Berlin, 25 Sep 1917). [The text follows the version printed in *Die gesammelten Gedichte* (1917)].

1918

“David und Jonathan” (O Jonathan, ich blasse hin in deinem Schoß), in: *Die weißen Blätter*, v.5.1, (Zurich, Jul 1918), 11.

“David und Jonathan” (O Jonathan, ich blasse hin in deinem Schoß), in: *Berliner Börsen-Courier* (1 Oct 1918), Literatur-Beilage zur Jubiläums-Ausgabe, 22.

1919

“Versöhnung,” in: *Schlemiel. Jüdische Blätter für Humor und Kunst*, v.8, (1919), 118.

“David und Jonatan” (O Jonatan, ich blasse hin in deinem Schoß), in: *Das junge Deutschland*, v. 2.4/5, (Berlin, Apr/May 1919), 128 f.

“An Gott,” “Jakob und Esau,” “Versöhnung,” “Esther,” in: *Das Kestnerbuch*, ed. Dr. Paul Erich Küppers, (Hannover: Heinrich Böhme, 1919 [Printed in winter of 1919]), 70-73.

1920

“Versöhnung,” “Ruth,” “Pharao und Joseph,” “David und Jonathan” (In der Bibel stehn wir geschrieben), in: *Lyrische Dichtung deutscher Juden. Druckleitung und Einband von Menachem Birnbaum*, (Die Weltbücher. Eine jüdische Schriftenfolge, v. 15/16), (Berlin: Welt-Verlag, 1920), 61–71.

“Versöhnung,” “An Gott,” “Zebaoth,” “Abraham und Isaak,” “Mein Volk,” in: *Menschheitsdämmerung. Symphonie jüngster Lyrik* (also: *jüngster Dichtung*), ed. von Kurt Pinthus, (Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt, 1920), 151, 198-199, 269.

1921

“Eva,” “Mein Volk,” in: *Deutsche Lyrik seit Liliencron*, ed. Hans Bethge, (Leipzig: Hesse & Becker, 1921), 143-150.

“Zebaoth,” “David und Jonathan” (In der Bibel stehn wir geschrieben), “Jakob,” “Esther,” in: *Verkündigung. Anthologie junger Lyrik*, ed. Rudolf Kayser, (Munich: Roland-Verlag Dr. Albert Mundt, 1921), 158–162.

1922

“Im Anfang” (printed as a facsimile under the text “Else Lasker-Schüler / Berlin 1922”), in: *Für unsere kleinen russischen Brüder! Gaben westeuropäischer Schriftsteller und Künstler für die notleidenden*

Kinder in den Hungersnotdistrikten Rußlands, (Geneva: Hohes Kommissariat Professor Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, 1922), 110.

1923

“Reconciliation” (“Versöhnung”), in: *Contemporary German Poetry. Chosen and Translated by Babette Deutsch and Avrahm Yarmolinsky*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1923), 103-111.

1924

“An Gott,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 26.1, (Hamburg, 3 Jan 1924), 2.; “Mein Volk,” in: *Deutsche Lyrik. Vom siebzehnten Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Ernst Aepli, (Frauenfeld und Leipzig: Huber & Co., 1924), 286–288.

1925

“Esther,” in: 1925. Ein Almanach für Kunst und Dichtung aus dem Kurt Wolff Verlag, (Munich: Kurt Wolff, 1925), 262.

“Esther,” in: *Badische Presse*, v. 41.3 (Morgen-Ausgabe), (Karlsruhe, 3 Jan 1925), 2. [The text follows the version printed in the anthology 1925].

1926

“Esther,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 28.8, (Hamburg, 25 Feb 1926), 12.

“Mein Volk,” in: *Das jüdische Echo*, v. 13.11, (Munich, 12 Mar 1926), 174.

“Abraham und Isaak,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 28.25, (Hamburg, 24 Jun 1926), ([Insert:] *Jüdische Bibliothek der Unterhaltung und des Wissens*. Nr. 36).

“Jakob und Esau,” in: *Prager Presse*, v. 6.264, (26 Sep 1926), ([Insert:] *Dichtung und Welt* Nr. 39), 3.

1928

“Pharao und Joseph,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 30.28, (Hamburg, 12 Jul 1928), ([Insert:] *Jüdische Bibliothek der Unterhaltung und des Wissens*. Nr. 143).

“Zebaoth,” in: *Uhu*, v. 5.3, (Berlin, Dec 1928), 76-78.

“An Gott” (without title), in: *Brücken zum Ewigen. Die religiöse Dichtung der Gegenwart*, ed. Wilhelm Knevels. 7. ed., (Braunschweig: Hellmuth Wollermann, 1928), 122–124.

“Mein Volk,” in: *Frauengenerationen in Bildern*, ed. Emmy Wolff, (Berlin: F. A. Herbig, 1928), 172.

1929

“Mein Volk,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 31.9, (Hamburg, 28 Feb 1929), ([Insert:] *Jüdische Bibliothek der Unterhaltung und des Wissens*. Nr. 176).

1930

“Versöhnung,” in: *Deutsche Dichtung unsrer Zeit. Von der Sinnenkunst zur Seelenkunst (1880–1930). Ausgewählt und mit Einleitungen versehen von Ernst Rose. / Contemporary German Literature. From Sensuous to Spiritual Poetry (1880–1930). An Anthology with Introductions by Ernst Rose*, (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1930), 282-284. [The text follows the version printed in *Die gesammelten Gedichte (1920)*].

1931

“A Dieu” (“An Gott”), “Esther,” “Booz” (“Boas”), “Mon peuple” (“Mein Volk”), “Réconciliation” (“Versöhnung”), in: *Illustration juive. Revue trimestrielle*, v. 3.12, (Alexandria, Dec 1931), 32. (“Quelques Ballades Hébraïques d’Else Lasker-Schuler. Traduction de Raymond-Raoul Lambert”).

1934

“עמי” (“Mein Volk”), “אסתר” (“Esther”), “שולמית” (“Sulamith”), in: דבר (*Davar*), nr. 2743, (Tel Aviv, 25 May 1934), Sabbath and Holy Day Insert (ולמועדים לשבתות מוסף), 2. [“From the *Hebräischen Balladen*” (“העבריות הבלדות” מתוך”), trans. J. Lichtenbaum (י. כטנבוים לי.).]

“Sulamith,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 36.43, (Hamburg, 25 Oct 1934), ([Insert:] Jüdische Bibliothek).

1935

“Esther,” in: *Israelitisches Familienblatt*, v. 37.11, (Hamburg, 14 Mar 1935), ([Insert:] Jüdische Bibliothek).

1936

“Esther,” in: *L’Univers Israélite*, v. 91.24, (Paris, 6 Mar 1936), 377.

“Caïn et Abel” (“Abel”), “Ruth,” in: *L’Univers Israélite*, v. 91.39, (Paris, 19 Jun 1936), 617. (“Quelques ballades hébraïques d’Else Lasker-Schüler,” trans. J. Milbauer).

1937

“My People” (“Mein Volk,” trans. Babette Deutsch), in: *A Golden Treasury of Jewish Literature. Selected and edited by Leo W. Schwarz. Illustrations by Lionel S. Reiss*, (New York, Toronto: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1937), 625 f.

1938

“Abraham und Isaak,” in: *Stimmen der Völker. Die schönsten Gedichte aller Zeiten und Länder*, ed. Alfred Wolfenstein, (Amsterdam: Querido, 1938), 441 f.

1940

“Mein Volk,” in: *The European Press*, v. 1.3, (London, 21 Mar 1940), 5.

1941

“Esther,” in: *An Anthology of German Poetry 1880–1940*, ed. Jethro Bithell, (London: Methuen & Co., 1941), 111–113.

1943

“My People” (“Mein Volk,” trans. Babette Deutsch), in: *Heart of Europe. An Anthology of Creative Writing in Europe 1920–1940*, ed. Klaus Mann and Hermann Kesten, (New York: L. B. Fischer, 1943), 661.

1944

“Mein Volk,” in: *Deutsche Blätter*, v. 2.9/10, (Santiago de Chile, 1944), 32 f.

1945

“My People” (“Mein Volk,” trans. Babette Deutsch), in: *The Best of Modern European Literature (Heart of Europe). An Anthology of Creative Writing in Europe 1920–1940*, ed. Klaus Mann and Hermann Kesten, (Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1945 [editing of the book finished in 1943]), 661.

Chapter Two: Sampling, Remixing, and the Genre of Poetry

I. Sampling, Remixing, and Originality.

Referentiality, Originality, and Work-Groups

Literature and other forms of art are always self-reflexive, full of references, quotes, and repurposed material and forms, whether deliberately or through unconscious influence. Authors use and react to pre-existing forms and content and morph them, weave them into something new. What does it mean to create something new or original if all works are weavings made up of forms and content and ideas that already exist, or reactions to forms and content and ideas that already exist? Since nothing can truly be original, originality could be understood as follows: “If you really manage to be influenced or borrow or copy without making it a carbon copy, something that truly provides its own experience, its own thing for the listener, it is original. It does sound like nothing else that came before.”³⁴¹ This statement comes from a discussion on originality in works of music, but it can also easily be applied to literary work-groups. Each publication in these work-groups is an original work. Moreover, if all texts are inescapably innovatively interwoven references to other texts, here we have a more extreme, apparent, self-reflexive version of that phenomenon. These work-groups are references to other works in direct ways – but they go one step further, as well, because the publications within a work-group are also a sampling and remixing of themselves and each other.

³⁴¹ “Why Would More Than 500 Artists Sample the Same Song?” *NPR / TED Radio Hour*. 27 June 2014. Web version. 31 July 2017. <<http://www.npr.org/2014/06/27/322721353/why-would-more-than-500-artists-sample-the-same-song>>.

To write literature is to both keep and break with tradition, in one way or another, to varying degrees. Works deviate from, build off of, and react to one another within a genre or subgenre, implicitly and explicitly, and gradually, this transforms the genre or subgenre.³⁴² This is occurring with Else Lasker-Schüler's work-group *Hebräische Balladen* on a micro-level, with regard to the multiple publications, but it is occurring on a macro- or meta-level as well, since to create something that breaks with the tradition of a form or genre is to create a work that also contains, implicitly, the entire tradition and history of the genre or form with which the work means to create tension.³⁴³ These publications bear a closer look, both because what she is doing is less straightforward or apparent than what we see, for example, with Brecht's *Hauspostille* or Holz's *Phantasmus*, and because the factors contributing to the creation of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen* are less transparent than they are with either of these other work-groups.

For Brecht it has already become clear in the previous chapter that his work-groups arose largely out of a historical context that presented issues publishing (private publication, war and destruction of publishing house, censorship and expatriation, revisiting the work later in life); they were also created alongside his appreciation for the writing process and *Werkstatt* in and of themselves.³⁴⁴ His work-groups maintain and embody the mentality: "Wie lange / dauern die Werke? So lange / als bis sie fertig sind. / So lange sie nämlich Mühe machen / verfallen sie nicht."³⁴⁵ Brecht treated "den Text als veränderlich und veränderbar"³⁴⁶ even after its publication

³⁴² See for example: Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, 161, 242-243.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, 242, 248.

³⁴⁴ See: Fisher, Clara. "Workshop as a Work: Nietzsche's *Hefte* and Brecht's *Notizbücher*," in: *The Future of Philology*, ed. Hannes Bajohr et al., (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 73-95.; Villwock, 9-103. From page 13: "[D]er Produktionsprozess war ihm offensichtlich nie nur Durchgangsstadium, sondern ihm auch ›die Sache selbst‹: nicht nur Weg und Mittel, sondern selbst schon das Eigentliche; Werkstatt als Werk."

³⁴⁵ *GW*, v. 10, 31*. Compare to: Fisher, 82.

and demonstrated through the very fact of his work-groups a “Prinzip des Änderns, des Ändern-Könnens und des Ändern-Wollens.”³⁴⁷ Hans Mayer explains that Brecht’s relationship to tradition within his writing and his works is not to be understood in a conventional or standard sense, but rather in a dialectical way:

Von Hegel übernahm er den dialektischen Begriff der „Aufhebung“. Das deutsche Wort hat dreifache Bedeutung. Aufheben ist Konservieren, ist Beendigen, ist Emporheben. Grundeinsicht in die Veränderbarkeit der Welt, in die notwendige Entsprechung von Erkenntnis und verändernder Praxis bestimmt auch das Verhalten zu aller Überlieferung. Die großen Schöpfungen der Vergangenheit sind nicht, wie man gemeint hatte, überzeitlich und geschichtslos. Sie stehen nach wie vor im Prozeß: in der sich ständig verändernden Beziehung eines sich verändernden Beziehung eines sich verändernden heutigen Subjekts zu den gleichfalls nicht statischen Werken der Vergangenheit. Vor allen Werken der Tradition muß also gleichzeitig das Dreifache geleistet werden: Konservierung, Annihilierung, Umgestaltung. Brechts rastlose Tätigkeit des *Bearbeitens*, die den wesentlichen, vielleicht den entscheidenden Teil seines Werkes ausmacht [...], läßt sich nur aus diesem dialektischen Verhalten zur Tradition erklären. Tradition bedeutet für den Schriftsteller und den Theoretiker Brecht stets aufgehobene Tradition.³⁴⁸

For Lasker-Schüler as well as for Holz, financial instability very likely played a role in the creation of the work-groups *Hebräische Balladen* and *Phantasmus*, as we have seen, especially in comparison to the financially quite successful Brecht – but Lasker-Schüler and Holz both also appear to have had a similar understanding to Brecht’s of what it is to write and publish works, or more especially and specifically, to write and publish poetry.

With regard to Holz, the drive to publish for financial reasons was in conjunction with an idealistic striving for totality and perfection in a linear way, which mirrors the idea that works grow from seed into the plant that was always already intended and contained within the seed.

³⁴⁶ BFA, *GBA Registerband*, 807. As cited in: Wizisla, Erdmut. “Brecht-Editionen,” in: *Editionen zu deutschsprachigen Autoren als Spiegel der Editionsgeschichte*, ed. Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth / Bodo Plachta, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2005), 7. Compare to: Fisher, 83.

³⁴⁷ Hans Bunge, 1958, as quoted in: Wizisla, 5. Compare to: Fisher, 87.

³⁴⁸ Mayer, Hans. *Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition*, (Pfullingen: Günther Neske, 1961), 12-13.

Holz was very clear about this motivation in his theoretical writings (as mentioned in the previous chapter); he wrote about the changes he was making and his goals for *Phantasmus* alongside his writing and publishing of the work-group *Phantasmus*. This theoretical approach was an extremely significant and central factor in the creation of this work-group.

Lasker-Schüler's theoretical basis for the writing of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen* remains unclear, on the other hand, perhaps first and foremost because typically, expressionists (one of the groups among which Lasker-Schüler has been counted) shirk theory, or at least do not explicitly occupy themselves with it.³⁴⁹ There is no question, however, that there are more factors that led to the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group beyond the financial aspect, and to imply any differently would be a gross reduction. To explore this further, we need to look to the idea of 'sampling and remixing' within literature and consider the genre of poetry as deeply involved in the process. We will examine the traditions and history of this genre and the forms of the cycle and the collection for answers. What is it about poetry as a genre, with its tradition and history of writing poems and arranging them into larger wholes, that leaves itself especially open not only to 'sampling and remixing,' that is to say the broader, Barthesian sense of the weaving together of preexisting texts to create something new, but to a more extreme application of the same: the creation of work-groups?

References to Other Works

Referentiality is not to be escaped, even when it is not employed overtly or intentionally. All authors are also readers – of others' works as well their own. They are inevitably influenced,

³⁴⁹ Compare to: Gerhard, Cordula. *Das Erbe der ‚Großen Form‘. Untersuchungen zur Zyklus-Bildung in der expressionistischen Lyrik*, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1986), 136.

both consciously and subconsciously. The Text, which can refer to a literary text as well as musical or visual, is always a *Gewebe*: a dynamic and innovative weaving together of things that already exist, of old and new.³⁵⁰

All writing is in essence an act of ‘sampling and remixing,’ sometimes very directly quoting or referencing, sometimes much more subtly or subconsciously. This can be done in a conventional way that uses and builds off of pre-existing content or formal traditions within a genre without drastically diverging from these, or it can be done in a way that means to be a direct and clear break from, for example, another author’s work, expected ways of composing verses and stanzas, or expected content for a particular form such as an ode. In the case of the latter, the text is still necessarily referencing the content, forms, or other traditions with which it is breaking.

Texts that specifically and intentionally break with tradition in a genre, by way of reinvented use of old forms or themes, abandonment of these in favor of forms and themes that intentionally break the rules, etc., not only reference tradition in the very act of breaking with it; they are, even more so than more traditional texts, embedded with the entire history of a genre.³⁵¹ In order to understand and interpret this aspect of such a text, the reader must be familiar with the genre’s history, and with the traditions and rules that are being broken, in ways they need not be to understand and interpret texts that more diligently follow the rules and align themselves with established traditions.³⁵²

As far as the *Hebräische Balladen*, as well as *Phantasmus* and *Hauspostille*, are concerned, perhaps the most apparent kind of sampling and remixing within these work-groups is that all of

³⁵⁰ Refer to: Barthes, *The Death of the Author*.

³⁵¹ Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art*, 161, 242.

³⁵² *Ibid.*, 161, 248.

them quite explicitly reference works from other authors, in both title and content. Holz' *Phantasmus* is a collection of poems that are meant to contain the totality of time and existence as experienced through the author, and the collection is a reference to Ludwig Tieck's *Phantasmus*, a 3-volume collection of "Mährchen, Erzählungen, Schauspielen und Novellen,"³⁵³ and a poem of the same name included in the first volume,³⁵⁴ in which *der Knabe Phantasmus* is "[d]er kundige Erläuterer der Allegorien, der Führer durch das Reich der Poesie"³⁵⁵ and "steht im Gedicht für dichterische Inspiration."³⁵⁶ The title of all of these is in turn a reference to the god of surreal dreams in Greek mythology³⁵⁷ and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.³⁵⁸ Brecht's *Hauspostille* are a collection of poems meant for daily critical reflection on society as a satirical reference to Martin Luther's *Hauspostille*, which is a book of prayers for the home. Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* are a reference to both Heinrich Heine's *Hebräische Melodien*³⁵⁹ and stories from the Hebrew Bible. (These poems are called ballads, moreover, but as will be discussed shortly, they are certainly not that, at least in any traditional sense).

If Holz' *Phantasmus* publications are a collection of moments, moods, and experiences from all of time and existence in reference to a collection of dramas and narrative texts and a poem embedded within in which Phantasmus symbolizes poetic inspiration and leads readers through the realm of poetry, and furthermore were composed in an attempt at reaching totality in this poetic expression of the universe as it flows through the author, and if Brecht's *Hauspostille*

³⁵³ Tieck, Ludwig. *Phantasmus. Eine Sammlung von Mährchen, Erzählungen, Schauspielen und Novellen*, 3 vols., (Berlin: In der Realschulbuchhandlung, 1812-1815).

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, (Berlin: In der Realschulbuchhandlung, 1812), 150-164.

³⁵⁵ Meißner, Thomas. *Erinnerte Romantik. Ludwig Tiecks "Phantasmus,"* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2006), 137.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁸ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, originally published in 8 AD.

³⁵⁹ Refer for example to: "Lasker-Schüler, Else," in: Kilcher, Andreas B. (ed.). *Metzler Lexikon der deutsch-jüdischen Literatur*, 2nd ed., (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2012), 328.

work-group is an irreverent and satirical socio-critical reference to a book of prayers and reflections for the home, with multiple differing publications due both to historical political circumstances (addressed previously) and an approach to writing that values not only the end-product but also the *Werkstatt* itself and the changeability and changing of works (addressed shortly), what is Lasker-Schüler's work-group *Hebräische Balladen*?

The work-groups *Phantasmus* and *Hauspostille* will be examined a bit more in depth first with regard to how their publications reference and break from traditions in the genre's history and in consideration of specific contents and forms, so that Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* might be illuminated in comparison to these.

Conventional Forms and Unexpected Content

The idea of sampling and remixing, or of works always being weavings made up of texts that came before, is generally quite visible across works within subgenres (as with specific types of poems such as odes, types of dramas like the tragedy, etc.), in which conventional forms could be seen (albeit simplistically) as basic formulas which authors use to express different content. A kind of sampling and remixing is also apparent, however, where traditional forms are coupled with nontraditional or unexpected content to express ideas which are not at all associated with such forms, in order to be humorous, critical, or satirical, which would apply, for example, to Bertolt Brecht's *Hauspostille* publications and many of his other works.

Brecht's *Hauspostille* adopts a traditional form and name specifically to give the reader associations and expectations with regard to the **use** of the poems, as well as expectations about the type of content or the message embedded within them. His *Hauspostille* should be used in the

same way as Martin Luther’s – for daily reflection – and he specifies this with an “Anleitung zum Gebrauch der einzelnen Lektionen.”³⁶⁰ Brecht writes, “diese Hauspostille ist für den Gebrauch der Leser bestimmt. Sie soll nicht sinnlos hineingefressen werden,”³⁶¹ and he gives readers specific instructions such as, the first lesson should only be read by “ganz gesunde Leute”³⁶² due to its emotional nature and the second should be read “langsam und wiederholt, niemals ohne Einfalt.”³⁶³ Further, “[b]ei einem Vortrag der Chroniken empfiehlt sich das Rauchen”,³⁶⁴ the third chapter of these should be read “in Stunden der Gefahr,”³⁶⁵ while the fifth chapter is to be read on light nights in June – although the second half can also be sung in October “soweit er den Untergang behandelt.”³⁶⁶ At the same time as the reference to Martin Luther’s daily prayers and the introduction create associations and expectations for how these poems are to be used, Brecht turns the expectations and associations of content or message on their heads, through content that demands socio-critical rather than pious reflection. *Die Hauspostille* also employ “die literarischen Formen, vor allem die Sprachmelodien der Luther-Bibel.”³⁶⁷ Familiar elements and references are used to create a work full of “Blasphemie, Anspielung, Verfremdung.”³⁶⁸

The *Hauspostille* are not the only example of his satirical and blasphemous repurposing of and references to specifically religious forms and texts; Brecht did this rather regularly,

³⁶⁰ This introduction appears in all *Taschenpostille / Hauspostille* publications. For the purpose of this chapter, the following edition of the 1927 *Hauspostille* publication will be cited: Brecht, Bertolt. “Anleitung zum Gebrauch der einzelnen Lektionen,” in: *Hauspostille*, 14th ed., (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1996), 7-9.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

³⁶² *Ibid.*

³⁶³ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 8.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁶⁷ Mayer, 53.

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

writing works such as the *Vier Psalmen*³⁶⁹ and the prayer-style poem *700 Intellektuellen beten einen Öltank an*.³⁷⁰ His impious approach to religious texts is even evidenced through his answer to the prompt “Der stärkste Eindruck” printed in a newspaper called *Die Dame* from October 1928: “Sie werden lachen: die Bibel.”³⁷¹ Brecht’s use of religious forms goes well beyond simple irreverence; to repurpose the language and the form of such texts is to acknowledge their significance, use, and power within the culture, and to coopt this for one’s own is to suggest one’s own text is of the same cultural importance and usefulness.

Brecht was, however, generally known to reference and repurpose well-known forms and content of all sorts; he was even accused of plagiarism of the 25th verse of the Ammersch translation of Villon in his *Dreigroschenoper*,³⁷² which, according to Hans Mayer,

berührte natürlich Brechts Verhältnis zur Tradition und zum “geistigen Eigentum”. Brecht war nicht traditionslos, sondern stellte Überlieferung gegen Überlieferung. Einem Begriff der geistigen Originalität, der erst seit Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts, seit dem bürgerlichen Individualismus, dem Aufkommen einer Literatur der Selbstaussage und Selbstdarstellung zur Herrschaft gelangt war, setzte er eine frühbürgerliche, teilweise vorbürgerliche Kunstauffassung entgegen, die alle bereits vorhandenen Stoffe und Formen als Material für die handwerkliche Kunst des nachlebenden Schreibers betrachtet.³⁷³

Unconventional Forms and Traditional Ideas Taken to an Extreme

Borrowing and transforming forms and ideas in literature is also observable, though possibly less immediately, in situations where traditional ideas are expressed in new ways and

³⁶⁹ Mayer, 53.

³⁷⁰ Brecht, Bertolt. *700 Intellektuelle beten einen Öltank an*, originally published in: *Prisma im Zenith. Der 10. Kostüm-Künstler-Karneval am 3., 4., 6., 7., 8. Februar 1928. Fest-Almanach*, ed. Erich Engel and Paul Hamann, (Hamburg: Johannes Asmus Verlag, 1928). Also printed one year later in *Simplicissimus*, v. 46, (Munich: Simplicissimus-Verlag, 11 Feb. 1929).

³⁷¹ As quoted in Mayer, 49.

³⁷² *Ibid.*, 46.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*

forms. The *Phantasmus* publications are an example of this, first and foremost in that this work-group can be viewed as a more extreme manifestation of an idea of authorship that pre-dates Holz' lifetime. In these publications, Arno Holz takes on the, by this point in history, old-fashioned or at least well-established idea that life and the universe and all of time flows through an author, who is able to depict pieces of these for readers.³⁷⁴

He takes this concept of authorship to an extreme in terms of volume of content, attempting to create a total *Weltbild*³⁷⁵ that would contain snippets of all of life, time, and the world. This attempt itself is atypical, even though the idea of the author as a medium is not. The forms Holz uses throughout the multiple publications to strive for this *Weltbild* are furthermore nontraditional, not only in the fact that he ends up with multiple publications named *Phantasmus*, (the last of which is a fragment over 1500 pages long), but also in that he plays with abandoning rhyme in favor of another kind of rhythm (eventually letting it back in here and there, though not in typically structured schemes), increasingly employs onomatopoeia in his later publications, and, after the *Phantasmus* publication from 1886, which is 13 traditionally rhyming poems anchored to the left side of the page published in his *Buch der Zeit*,³⁷⁶ sets everything on the middle axis of the page.

Especially the two-volume publication from 1898 and 1899 were groundbreaking with regard to the entire history of German poetry:

Eine Sammlung von Gedichten in freien Versen gibt es in der deutschen Lyrik erstmals am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts: es ist der 1898 und 1899 in zwei Bänden erschienene "Phantasmus" von Arno Holz. Diese zweite von insgesamt sechs bis heute veröffentlichten Fassungen ist zumindest formal die bedeutendste von

³⁷⁴ Initially this author concept involved authors (and artists of other kinds) serving as a medium through which God works and expresses, and later shifted to authors and artists as gifted mortal but god-like creators themselves. Refer to concepts such as *Besonnenheit* and *Genie*.

³⁷⁵ Holz, *Die neue Form*, 136.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, *Phantasmus 1-13*, 391-422.

allen, weil sie qualitativ Neues bringt – im Werk des Autors ebenso wie in der Geschichte des deutschen Verses: der Unterschied zwischen der ersten und der zweiten Fassung kann zugleich für den Unterschied zwischen formal traditioneller und formal moderner deutscher Lyrik stehen.³⁷⁷

Holz therefore managed to compose a series of cycles based on a traditional idea, and simultaneously, to take this to an extreme and break with well-established traditions of how poems are to be written at all.

Nontraditional References to Traditional Content and Forms

Else Lasker-Schüler extends the practice of referencing content, ideas, and forms from other texts and works to her own. She takes content from the Hebrew Bible and keeps it recognizable, writing poems about Ruth, Esther, David and Jonathan, but she simultaneously uses this content to create something quite different and new; her poems are not a poetic retelling of the stories she is referencing. Neither are they a satire of the religious texts they reference, as was the case with Brecht. She is not striving for a total *Weltbild*, nor is she referencing an authorial concept through a titular reference to another author's collection and use of a mythological figure as is Holz.

As for the work-group's relationship to Heinrich Heine's *Hebräische Melodien*, "ihre *Hebräischen Balladen* [gelten...] als eine Auseinandersetzung mit Heines *Hebräische Melodien*."³⁷⁸ Lasker-Schüler calls these poems ballads despite the fact that they do not formally meet the criteria, appearing to take on a traditional form without actually doing so (and this is

³⁷⁷ Lamping, Dieter. *Das lyrische Gedicht. Definitionen zu Theorie und Geschichte der Gattung*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 182.

³⁷⁸ Gelhard, Dorothee. "Mit dem Gesicht nach vorne gewandt": *erzählte Tradition in der deutsch-jüdischen Literatur*, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008), 84. See also: Leuenberger, Stefanie. *Schrift-Raum Jerusalem: Identitätsdiskurse im Werk deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, (Köln / Weimer: Böhlau, 2007), 119.

moreover perhaps a further play on the musical nature of Heine's title, given that ballads are typically songs of a folk, a people). She is not the only author of her time period to do this:

Man kann im deutschen Expressionismus mindestens sieben Gedichtsammlungen und eine ganze Reihe von Einzelgedichten finden, welche in ihrem Titel bzw. Untertitel die Gattungsbezeichnung „Ballade“ tragen. Doch sind beispielsweise nur drei oder vier Gedichte aus Lasker-Schülers *Hebräischen Balladen* (1913) [...] als echte Balladen zu bezeichnen, während mindestens eine Hälfte der Einzelgedichte nicht einmal die minimalen Gattungserforderungen erfüllt. Das Etikett „Ballade“ ist also kein verlässliches Indiz der Zugehörigkeit eines Gedichts zur hypothetischen Klasse „expressionistische Ballade“. Seine relativ häufige Verwendung im Expressionismus, wenn auch nur als metaphorische Bezeichnung, bleibt doch ein signifikantes Zeichen des potentiell produktiven Bewusstseins von der ununterbrochenen Kontinuität einer außerordentlich reichen Überlieferung.³⁷⁹

Ballads are poems that tell dramatic stories³⁸⁰ and typically “handeln von Mord und Totschlag, von Geistern, Helden, Liebenden und Verbrechern, von großen historischen und kleinen privaten Katastrophen.”³⁸¹ A ballad is “vor allem in ihrer Betonung des Heldenprinzips und der schicksalhaften Bestimmung des Menschen, Ausdruck eines genuine traditionellen Weltbildes. Bei ihr handelt es sich strukturell also um eine spezifisch traditionelle Gattungsform der Lyrik.”³⁸² Ballads have a “grundlegenden episch-fiktionalen Charakter”³⁸³ but diverge from other epic-fictional forms “durch ihre spezifische teleologische Vorgangsstruktur.”³⁸⁴ They usually include the “wichtigen Formmerkmalen des Reims, des strophischen Baus und des

³⁷⁹ Bogosavljević, Srđan. “Die Ballade im Expressionismus,” in: *Die deutsche Ballade im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Srđan Bogosavljević and Winfried Woesler, (Bern: Peter Lang / Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2009), 51-52.

³⁸⁰ Segebrecht, Wulf (ed.). *Deutsche Balladen. Gedichte, die dramatische Geschichten erzählen*, (Munich : Carl Hanser Verlag, 2012), 5.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*

³⁸² Andreotti, Mario. *Die Struktur der modernen Literatur*, 3rd ed., (Bern / Stuttgart / Wien : Paul Haupt, 2000), 326.

³⁸³ “Ballade” in: Knörich, Otto (ed.). *Lexikon Lyrischer Formen*, (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1992), 21-27. Here 22.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 22-23.

Refrains,”³⁸⁵ characteristics which make clear the fact that the ballad “ursprünglich ein (gesungenes) Erzähl lied war, stark lyrisch gestimmt, mit Nähe zum Volkslied.”³⁸⁶

Lasker-Schüler’s ‘ballads’ do not tell dramatic stories in a linear or teleological way, they are not expressly song-like in nature, they do not have explicit heroes, nor are they epic in length. They also do not rhyme; Lasker-Schüler uses free verse rather than rhyme throughout this work-group, which not only breaks with the form of the ballad, but was quite nontraditional at the time of these publications in general – so non-traditional in fact, that according to Dieter Lamping,

[i]n der Form wie in der Rede-Weise moderne Gedichte finden sich in der deutschen Lyrik erst nach der Jahrhundertwende, und sie finden sich, soweit ich sehe, erstmals bei Else Lasker-Schüler. Schon ihr zweiter Gedichtband „Der siebente Tag“ von 1905 enthält einige Gedichte in freien Versen, die der Ich-Form zum Trotz die Rede-Konventionen der Erlebnislyrik weit hinter sich lassen.³⁸⁷

Why, then, give these poems that name? According to Mario Andreotti,

[d]ie Lyrik ist bekanntlich, stärker noch als Epik und Dramatik, durch einen Reichtum an Gattungsformen (Ballade, Elegie, Epigramm, Spruch, Lied, Sonett usw.) bestimmt, die sich seit der Antike herausgebildet haben. Die Entwicklung des Gedichts wurde wesentlich von diesen Formen geprägt, jedenfalls bis zu jener Zäsur, die durch die Entstehung der lyrischen Moderne markiert wird. Spätestens seit dem Expressionismus werden die traditionellen Gedichtformen, für die fast ausnahmslos die (metrisch gebundene) Reimstrophe konstitutiv ist, mehr und mehr zurückgedrängt. Doch sind diese Formen nie völlig verschwunden.³⁸⁸

What part of this form or tradition is being evoked even as she veers away and breaks free from it? Peter Sprengel writes that *Die Hebräische Balladen* (specifically the publication from 1913)

stellen wahrscheinlich den bedeutensten Beitrag des Expressionismus zur Geschichte der Ballade dar, gerade weil sich hier der Zugang der Moderne zur

³⁸⁵ Knörich, 23.

³⁸⁶ Ibid.

³⁸⁷ Lamping, 191. He talks about Holz here as well, but differentiates because of his use of the *Mittelachse*, which “hat sich als Schreibweise für freie Verse nicht durchgesetzt.” (See pg. 192).

³⁸⁸ Andreotti, 159.

Gattung nicht auf die Schauerthematik und den pseudodidaktischen Gestus der Moritat beschränkt, sondern die Sage als traditionelles Zentrum der Ballade ernstgenommen wird. In der poetischen Verdichtung und Anverwandlung alttestamentlicher Gestalten sucht die jüdische Dichterin – darin dem Freiherrn von Münchhausen, dem Begründer der Balladen-Renaissance, gar nicht so unähnlich – eine Antwort auf die Frage nach ihrer Identität.³⁸⁹

Sprenkel evaluates these poems as ballads despite their lack of traditional characteristics. If ballads are typically an epic or long poem with a song, a singular hero, and a teleology toward a destiny with order restored at the end, and if they are not usually cycles composed of short poems, then it is certainly significant that Lasker-Schüler calls these short poems, which have no obvious hero, no obvious Handlung or destiny, and no obvious melody or even rhyme, ‘ballads.’ What, then, makes them qualify? More specifically, Sprenkel refers to these poems as Expressionism’s contribution to the history of the ballad. The most pertinent questions here are, what are modern ballads compared to traditional ones, and how do Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* perhaps fit in with the more modern definitions and forms, if they do at all?

According to Winfried Woesler, modern ballads move from “naiven Erzählen” to a more reflected story-telling³⁹⁰ and “sind keine schlicht linear erzählten Gedichte mehr wie in alter Zeit. Die Autoren bedienen sich moderner Techniken wie Montage, Collage, Zitate”³⁹¹ – both of which Lasker-Schüler could certainly be said to do in her *Hebräische Balladen* publications. Bogosavljević’s account of the expressionist ballad’s ‘heroes,’ too, is fitting, especially when the reader considers the fact that Lasker-Schüler’s ballads have been described as a search for Jewish identity and furthermore that they use figures from and associations with biblical stories in order

³⁸⁹ Sprenkel, Peter. *Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Literatur 1870-1900. Von der Reichsgründung bis zur Jahrhundertwende*, (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1998), 602.

³⁹⁰ Woesler, Winfried. “Zur Einleitung,” in: *Die deutsche Ballade im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Srdan Bogosavljević and Winfried Woesler, (Bern: Peter Lang / Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2009), 6.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

to paint a feeling or mood, and not to (re-)tell the stories with which these well-known figures are associated:

Dem expressionistischen Balladenhelden ist nicht nur das Gefühl des Umschlossenseins von geheimnisvollen Naturmächten, nicht nur der Sinn für die Geschichte als Schauplatz menschlicher Größe, sondern auch jegliche heroische Geste abhanden gekommen. Er ist in der Regel passiv, vielmehr hilfloses Objekt unpersönlicher Geschichtsmächte, einer „naturalistischen“ Umgebung, aber auch der eigenen Triebe, der eigenen nicht expressionistischen „Psychologie“. Der typische expressionistische „Balladenheld“ ist weder der Ideologie des „Neuen Menschen“ noch der Utopie des allgemeinen Menschenbrüderlichkeit gewachsen; **er ist einfach ein Wesen, das leidet, allein.**³⁹²

This new profile of the main figures that appear in expressionist ballads, which traditionally would have been heroes with a teleological narrative and a destiny, arises because,

[v]on dem – wenn auch unbequemen – Bewusstsein der Traditionsverbundenheit durchdrungen, fächerte die expressionistische Ballade ein breites Spektrum von verschiedenen thematischen und formalen Möglichkeiten aus, welche einerseits an die vorher realisierten Möglichkeiten anknüpfen, andererseits sich – vielfach modifizierend – von ihnen absetzen, indem sie radikale Änderungen des Welt- und Lebensgefühls widerspiegeln.³⁹³

As addressed previously in this chapter, certainly using the term for a type of poem without adhering to the rules or form typically associated with that type of poem is yet another kind of sampling and remixing. The fact that all of literature is in essence sampling and remixing itself, however, and that Lasker-Schüler, too, borrows from tradition while morphing, transforming, changing, rearranging, reimagining, creating something else out of pre-existing parts and forms, is not in and of itself an answer to the question of multiple publications – nor does it answer the question: why **ballads**? What might this nontraditional employment of the term ‘ballad’ and the divergent use of Hebrew stories have to do with the fact that this is a work-group with multiple publications?

³⁹² Bogosavljević, 52. Emphasis mine.

³⁹³ Ibid.

Ballads are, for one thing, an oral tradition: “anonyme, mündlich tradierte und nur bruchstückhaft überlieferte, vielfach zersungene, in breiten Schichten rezipierte und die Grenzen der Nationalliteraturen überschreitende Volksdichtung.”³⁹⁴ The *Hebräische Balladen* publications exist in the multiple, each made up of smaller arrangeable pieces, some with embellishments and extra poems that do not exist in other publications, each with a different order – and therefore could also be said to be ‘bruchstückhaft überliefert[]’ and ‘vielfach zersungen[].’ A ballad “fasziniert durch ihre Lust an der Grenzüberschreitung, durch ihre Vielseitigkeit und ihre Wandlungsfähigkeit.”³⁹⁵

Folk ballads in particular, furthermore, are stories about the identity of a people – “Man empfand sie als authentischen Ausdruck der Volksseele [...]”³⁹⁶ So, too, are the stories from the Hebrew Bible referenced in the *Hebräische Balladen* publications. Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* publications could indeed be interpreted as a search for a collective identity and destiny; while the following chapter will address interpretations of these ballads and publications more in depth, this is a thought to keep in mind. Lasker-Schüler’s Hebrew ballads, however, abandon the traditional elements of the form of the ballad and the linear and destiny-driven storytelling **even though she is referencing content that specifically addresses the identity and destiny of a people.** This could suggest a reaching back toward history and mythology in search for an identity that is perhaps now in flux, evasive, unstable. What happens if an identity of a group is in crisis, diaspora? In this light, the fact that the order of the poems is different in each of the *Hebräische Balladen* publications – (which poem is first, which is last, how are poems coupled together or separated in different publications?) – is quite significant, because it

³⁹⁴ Knörich, 24.

³⁹⁵ Segebrecht, 6.

³⁹⁶ Knörich, 24.

changes the way the pieces, these Hebrew Ballads, fit together and react to one another, and therefore ultimately, the entire narrative as a whole and how each publication is received and interpreted.³⁹⁷

II. Poetry: Compositions of Wholes and Combinations of Parts

Quite significantly, in each publication of the *Hebräische Balladen*, Lasker-Schüler changed the context of the poem titles she includes across the *Hebräische Balladen* publications, altering the arrangement of the poem titles and the paratext around them – and thereby renewing and changing poems even when they are themselves typographically identical to those appearing in previous publications; Lasker-Schüler ‘samples and remixes’ here in the atypical way of releasing multiple publications that are both distinctly different and intimately similar and connected, and she does this with regard to both poems and cycles that share titles with their counterparts but are changed, rearranged, and released in different contexts, such as (though not limited to) the work-group *Hebräische Balladen*. As seen in the appendix of the previous chapter, Lasker-Schüler frequently published single poems in anthologies, which renew and transform a poem through different contexts even where the poem itself, as composed of a title, words, verses, and stanzas, has not been altered at all. At this point the investigation of this work-group turns to the following question: How might the genre of poetry and the ways poems are traditionally written and arranged into larger wholes (such as cycles and collections) have contributed to the creation of a work-group such as the *Hebräische Balladen* in the first place?

³⁹⁷ This will be the topic of the following chapter.

It should be noted here that, although perhaps one might expect that theory on the composition of poetry collections and cycles and the arrangement of smaller wholes (poems) into larger ones (namely, cycles and collections) would already exist, surprisingly, there is not much on this subject matter. This means one of two things. Firstly, something is attempted in this chapter which does not quite work and which needs to be rethought; the existing theory texts on the composition of cycles and collections and on the genre of poetry are quite basic and, more importantly, quite normative – and Lasker-Schüler’s multiple *Hebräische Balladen* cycles are anything but. The existing theory is therefore not well suited to answer the questions being asked – namely, what it is about the genre of poetry and its special part-to-whole relationship that could result in work-groups of poetry collections and cycles – and unfortunately, the outcome of attempting to apply these normative texts to a non-normative situation such as Lasker-Schüler’s multiple *Hebräische Balladen* cycles ultimately does not result in the revelations and connections one might hope. Secondly, the ill-suitedness of the existing theory on poetry and the composition of cycles and collections for illuminating a work-group of poetry cycles highlights the necessity of terminology and a concept within the field of literature for the phenomenon of work-groups altogether; if this were to exist, not only would it be easier to find and categorize other examples of work-groups including those of poetry cycles and collections such as those handled in this dissertation, but then also as a result, such theoretical work on composing, as well as **re-composing** and **rearranging**, poetry cycles and collections would be enabled, and this gap could be filled.

Lasker-Schüler is not only sampling and remixing content from other works and older forms; she is doing the same to her own publications. This point especially requires closer

examination in order to determine how this work-group fits into the context of its genre and how traditions embedded within the genre itself, either maintained or broken, have contributed to the phenomenon of a poetic work-group. What is happening on the level of selection and combination of poems in the publications belonging work-group *die Hebräischen Balladen*? In what ways is Lasker-Schüler building off of traditions and established ways of composing, combining, and publishing poems, and in what ways is she breaking with them, either in relation to the history of the genre of poetry as a whole, or in relation to her contemporaries? How is she approaching established forms and ways of composing, on the level of the individual poem (such as the ballad) and on the level of combination (such as the cycle or collection)? What is it about the genre of poetry and its special practice of combination and selection that might leave works of poetry peculiarly susceptible to a situation of work-groups with interconnected publications, each with their own distinct arrangements and combinations?

There is something particular about poetry that seems to lend itself to this phenomenon of work-groups more extremely or overtly than do other genres such as the novel or drama. The part to whole relationship in this genre is a unique one. Poems are themselves wholes, which are then combined and arranged as parts of a larger whole, and these components interact with each other in a special way that cannot really be attributed to other genres and their parts (novels and their chapters, acts in a play, etc.).³⁹⁸ The idea of sampling and remixing can be extended here to the tradition intrinsic to the genre of poetry of selecting, combining, and arranging poems, parts that are themselves already independent entities, into various types of larger wholes such as cycles and collections.

³⁹⁸ Perhaps the form that comes closest would be collections of aphorisms, but typically these are juxtaposed much more loosely than poems in a cycle.

Poetry collections and cycles are works composed of works. Each poem is an independent work that is also usable as a smaller moveable part, to be put together and arranged with others. That they are themselves whole entities, stand-alone complete works, is something that cannot be said of a novel chapter or an act in a play. Poems can be published individually in a variety of contexts (literary newspaper columns, literary magazines) or in a variety of combinations with other poems (in anthologies, collections, and cycles). They can be arranged in many ways, and their context and arrangement have an effect on how individual poems, the connections among them, and the entire publications in which they are embedded, are read and interpreted.

Lasker-Schüler published poems individually as well as in cycles and collections. The practice of publishing single poems in many different contexts, laid out in detail for Else Lasker-Schüler in the appendix of the previous chapter, was not specific to Lasker-Schüler alone. Around the span of time during which Lasker-Schüler was writing and publishing, other authors, for example Ernst Stadler, “stellte 1914 seinen Gedichtband ‚Der Aufbruch‘ neu zusammen; 31 der 57 Gedichte waren vorab schon einzeln in Zeitschriften [...] veröffentlicht worden.”³⁹⁹ For expressionist poets in particular, the practice of publishing individual poems in various contexts such as newspapers and literary magazines was so popular that a common perception in scholarship on this movement has been that “[d]em Einzelgedicht, ja der einzelne Zeile, gelte das Interesse; Zusammenhangslosigkeit sei das auffallende Merkmal dieser Dichtungen.”⁴⁰⁰ Cordula Gerhard also notes, however,

daß es unvermindert wichtig bleibe, „diese Zusammenhangslosigkeit durch Verknüpfung in einer höheren Einheit des Sinns, des Bildes oder des Rhythmus“

³⁹⁹ Gerhard, 12.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

zu einer – nach einem Worte Valéry's – „harmonischen“ zu wenden, um ein willkürliches Auseinanderbrechen der Zeilen zu verhindern.⁴⁰¹

Gerhard explains that “die expressionistischen Dichter selbst neben den Einzelveröffentlichungen ihrer Gedichte auch eine zusammenhängende Ausgabe anstrebten,”⁴⁰² and that expressionists (to which he counts Else Lasker-Schüler)⁴⁰³ also displayed an “innewohnende Tendenz zur Anordnung von Einzelgedichten in eine innerlich zusammenhängende Großform.”⁴⁰⁴ Poets such as “Else Lasker-Schüler arrangierten ihre Gedichte zu einem mehr oder minder umfangreichen Ganzen.”⁴⁰⁵

Both individual poem publications and cycles and collections comprising previously published titles were therefore relatively common at the time that Lasker-Schüler was writing and publishing. Lasker-Schüler appears to follow the tradition or custom for her time period and within her ascribed literary movement(s) with regard to selection and combination of poems, both publishing poems individually and incorporating those titles into cycles and collections. What Gerhard does not explicitly address is the fact that Lasker-Schüler specifically was in the habit of arranging her poems in many different wholes, multiple times over, publishing many different works (both on the level of the poem and on the level of the cycle or collection) with the same title but with unique compositions (especially on the level of the cycle or collection).

Historical trends, movements, and general practices within a genre play a significant role in the ways works within that genre are published, and the kinds of contexts within which they appear. More specifically, contemporary practices and trends influence the ways poems are arranged and combined by their authors to make larger wholes (or not), and what kinds of

⁴⁰¹ Gerhard, 12.

⁴⁰² Ibid.

⁴⁰³ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid.

wholes result. Her contemporaries and their various practices and trends of arranging poems, especially those with counterparts published elsewhere, into collections and cycles in certain ways can certainly be considered to have had an impact on the creation of Lasker-Schüler's work-groups. Lasker-Schüler rather uniquely extended this practice not only to incorporating previously individually published poem titles into single cycle publications, however, but to incorporating previously individually published poem titles across multiple cycles and collections. Poem titles can be found individually in literary magazines and newspapers, in fully different cycles (such as *Styx* and *die Hebräischen Balladen*), and furthermore in multiple publications of cycles sharing a title but boasting a different arrangement, such as with the work-group *die Hebräische Balladen*.⁴⁰⁶

The combination of smaller, stand-alone parts to create a collection of some kind within the genre of poetry is of course not unique to Lasker-Schüler's time period, although perhaps the frequency with which authors published individual poems in literary magazines and newspapers and then incorporated these into larger wholes is a special marker of her contemporaries. The practice of combining poems in particular ways is at the very core of the genre of poetry, and has been since its recorded beginnings. This must be considered if we are to illuminate how the genre itself may have been a contributing factor in the creation of the work-group *die Hebräischen Balladen*.

The genre of poetry has a long-standing tradition of the composition and arrangement of smaller wholes into larger wholes. This can even be seen simply by looking at the etymological backgrounds of certain poetic terminology. *Ekloge*, for example, comes from the Greek for

⁴⁰⁶ See Chapter 1 Appendix.

“Auswahl”⁴⁰⁷ and “sind ihrer ursprünglichen Bedeutung nach ausgewählte Gedichte (so erstmals bei Vergil).”⁴⁰⁸ *Satire* stems from the Latin *satura*, for “Allerlei, Vermischtes,”⁴⁰⁹ and *satur*, for “satt, voll, reichlich, fruchtbar, ähnlich wie bei *farrago* = Mischfutter, das bei Juvenal [...] in Bezug auf das eigene Dichten gebraucht wird.”⁴¹⁰ Both of these terms denote a selection and mixture of parts. The selecting, compiling, arranging a ‘mixture’ of poems in order to compose a collection or cycle therefore dates back at least to Ancient Greece. The oldest known anthology, too, a “Sammlung von ausgewählten Texten, v. a. von Gedichten,”⁴¹¹ is the collection *Stephanos* “(= Kranz, meist Epigramme)”⁴¹² and dates back to “1. Jh. v. Chr.”⁴¹³ Peter Goßens calls the anthology one of the oldest forms of editions,⁴¹⁴ and specifies that the methodology of collecting and selecting in particular are more characteristic of this form than the name ‘anthology,’ since these collections of texts can be, and frequently are, referred to by many other names, including just ‘collection.’⁴¹⁵

Of course, while anthologies are a type of collection, they differ greatly from a single author’s collection of poems. Goßens describes the historical significance of the cycle or collection published by, and including poems by, a single author in particular:

Neben der verstreuten Publikation von Lyrik in Anthologien und Periodika ist der Gedichtband als Einzelausgabe in kulturhistorischer wie gattungsspezifischer Hinsicht von großer Bedeutung. [...H]ier stellt der Autor ein Korpus von

⁴⁰⁷ “Ekloge” in: Knörich, 49-50. Here pg. 49.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁹ “Satire,” in: Burdorf, Dieter / Fasbender, Christoph / Moennighoff, Burkhard (ed.). *Metzler Lexikon Literatur. Begriffe und Definitionen*, 3rd ed., (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2007), 677-679. Here pg. 677.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹¹ “Anthologie,” in: Ibid., 28-29. Here pg. 28.

⁴¹² Ibid., 29.

⁴¹³ Ibid.

⁴¹⁴ Goßens, Peter. “Lyrikedition,” (266-276) in: *Handbuch Lyrik. Theorie, Analyse, Geschichte*, ed. Dieter Lamping, (Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2011), 269. “Auch die mittelalterlichen Liederhandschriften zeigen deutlich den Einfluss einer der ältesten Editionsformen, der Anthologie: In ihr wird eine bestimmte Gruppe von Werken gesammelt, ausgewählt und damit editorisch in einen anderen Kontext gebracht.”

⁴¹⁵ Ibid.

Gedichten selbst zusammen und bindet die einzelnen Gedichte in eine größer angelegte, komponierte bzw. strukturierte Form ein. Damit wird der Gedichtband als Ganzes zu einem vom Autor geschaffenen Kunstprodukt, bei der nicht nur das einzelne Gedicht, sondern die Edition der Gedichte in ihrem übergeordneten Zusammenhang als Produkt des künstlerischen Arbeitsprozesses verstanden werden können. In der Antike gab es bereits Gedichtbände dieser Art, etwa die Odenbücher des Horaz. [...] Im deutschsprachigen Bereich sind erste eigenständige Gedichteditionen schon mit den Werken von Martin Opitz zu finden, aber erst ab dem letzten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts wird dann der eigenständige Gedichtband auch zum Markzeichen einzelner Dichter [...].⁴¹⁶

Arranging stand-alone parts together is an act intrinsic to the very genre of poetry.

Winfried Woesler touches on this special ability of poems to both stand alone and be combined:

“Jedes Gedicht ist der Feind jedes anderen Gedichtes und sollte also allein herausgegeben und gelesen werden. Gleichzeitig benötigen sie einander, ziehen Kraft voneinander und können also vereint werden.”⁴¹⁷ “Ein Gedicht kommt selten allein,”⁴¹⁸ confirms Achim Hölder, and “die formale Umgebung lyrischer Texte sind zuallermeist lyrische Texte. Ob in Lyrikbändchen eines Autors oder in dessen poetischem »Gesamtwerk« [...], ob in Form von Zyklen, ob bei Lyrikwettbewerben oder in Anthologien [...].”⁴¹⁹

Else Lasker-Schüler is therefore following established practice of the entire history of the genre of poetry when she selects and combines poems into collections and cycles – but she breaks away again, or perhaps more accurately, takes the intrinsic ability of poems to appear in different contexts and combinations with other poems and applies it in ways that are unconventional, when she incorporates poem titles into multiple different cycles and across work-groups such as *die Hebräischen Balladen*. She is not simply following the ancient tradition

⁴¹⁶ Goßens, 271.

⁴¹⁷ Woesler, Winfried. “Einzelgedicht und Sammlung. Erörtert an Bertold Brechts “Svendborger Gedichten,” in: *Vom Gedicht zum Zyklus. Vom Zyklus zum Werk. Strategien der Kontinuität in der modernen und zeitgenössischen Lyrik*, ed. Jacques Lajarrige, (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2000), 95. Henceforth referred to as Woesler (2000).

⁴¹⁸ Hölder, Achim. “Kontexte der Lyrik,” in: *Handbuch Lyrik. Theorie, Analyse, Geschichte*, ed. Dieter Lamping, (Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2011), 102.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 102-103.

of combination of parts in the sense of poems arranged into a collection or cycle. She is not simply following the trend among her contemporaries of publishing single poems in various contexts and then later incorporating these titles into a cycle or collection.

Poems indeed not only have a special part-to-whole relationship and an ability to both stand alone and be combined, but also a special ability to be combined in several different contexts and groupings:

Es scheint, als könnten Gedichte nicht nur unbeschadet dem „Konvoi“ entnommen werden, in den sie ursprünglich eingegliedert wurden, sondern auch ohne Schwierigkeiten zu einem neuen Konvoi zusammengestellt werden. Sie gewinnen dadurch wieder an Aktualität und dienen [...] einer neuen Aussage, erhalten neues Sinnpotential.⁴²⁰

Lasker-Schüler takes advantage of exactly this characteristic of a poem and takes it further than other authors before or during her lifetime. She makes use of this intrinsic characteristic of the poem and pushes it farther than is typical; first, by publishing poem titles in a variety of contexts beyond the usual anthologies, literary magazines, and eventually a single collection of only the author's own works – instead also regularly taking previously published poem titles and combining them into multiple different collections, such as with *Styx* and *Hebräische Balladen*;⁴²¹ and second, by publishing multiple collections with the same title and different combinations of parts.

Lasker-Schüler is not just compiling and combining on the level of poem – collection, and she is not even merely extending this to poem – collection(s), which is already rather unique; she pushes this practice of compilation and combination to the meta-level of poem – collection – work-group, arranging parts to create extremely interconnected but separate and different wholes. Like the poems within them, the *Hebräische Balladen* collections each stand alone and

⁴²⁰ Woesler (2000), 95.

⁴²¹ See Chapter 1 Appendix.

simultaneously belong to a larger group. The poem, a whole, becomes a part of a collection, and the collection, a whole, becomes a part of another larger whole: the work-group.

This has always been a possibility within the realm of poetry, due to the very nature of its part to whole relationship and tradition of composition, combination, and arrangement, because a work-group of poetry collections like the *Hebräische Balladen* is an extension of this nature to a new level. While it was technically possible, however, and while it is rooted in characteristics of poems and the ways they can and have been selected and combined that have existed since the beginnings of the history of poetry as it is known to us, this particular way of combining and collecting was also previously unrealized. The *Hebräische Balladen* work-group inevitably builds off of and incorporates what came before it – and it does so in a way that elicits a phenomenon that is original and new. At the same time, it is important to note that this analysis of how the genre of poetry has contributed to the creation of this particular work-group would not necessarily apply to Holz' *Phantasmus* or to Brecht's *Hauspostille* – because where Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* publications differ greatly – and primarily – on the levels of paratext and arrangement and combination of parts, Holz' *Phantasmus* publications, for example, differ primarily on the level of the composition of individual poems and verses.⁴²²

Given that Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* have plural publications in which poems are added and rearranged and paratext is altered, what does this suggest about the parts and their relationship to the whole? Why rearrange? What is happening on this level of composition?

⁴²² Something else is going on there, driven by the goal to capture and collect everything, to depict a total *Weltbild*.

III. Composing and Arranging Cycles and Collections

The final section of this chapter means to address the following questions: what is a collection or cycle of ballads, how are they typically arranged, and how might this practice have contributed to the creation of a work-group like *die Hebräischen Balladen*? What are the ways that poems can and have typically been combined into larger wholes? Such wholes are more than the sum of their parts, with the relationship of a poem to the others and to its collection as a whole, but it bears repeating that the parts here are each also individual entities. Each publication in the work-group is not only more than the sum of its parts in this way, but so is the work-group itself, given the relationship of a collection to the others as well to the work-group as a whole, with each publication an individual entity, just as is every poem within each of them.

Reaching back to the etymology of the word, which comes from the Greek *kýklos*, meaning ‘circle’ or ‘Kreis,’ a cycle is in the traditional sense a

Gruppe von Werken, die als selbständige Gebilde zugleich Glieder eines größeren Ganzen sind. Das gilt für lit. Zyklen ebenso wie für Musik und Malerei. [...] Im *engeren Sinn* spricht man von Zyklus nur dann, wenn bestimmte strukturelle Bedingungen erfüllt sind: Die einzelnen Werke müssen um ein Grundthema zentriert sein und dieses von einem jeweils neuen Ansatz her so entfalten, dass es in seinen verschiedenen Aspekten und Perspektiven ‚kreisförmig‘ abgeschritten wird, um am Ende auf einer höheren Sinnebene den Anfang wieder aufzunehmen. Es können verschiedene verknüpfende Elemente hinzukommen: übergreifende narrative und dialogische Formen, Spiegelungen, Wiederholungen und Abwandlungen von Motiven, Bildern, Leitworten usw. Der Z. ist nicht an eine bestimmte Gattung gebunden, tritt aber in der *Lyrík* am häufigsten auf.⁴²³

In the broader sense, however, according to the same definition, “wird oft jede Sammlung von Gedichten, Erzählungen u. a. als ‚Z.‘ bezeichnet, die über eine zufällige oder nach rein

⁴²³ “Zyklus,” in: Burdorf / Fasbender / Moeninghoff, 844-845. Here pg. 844.

äußerlichen Gesichtspunkten zusammengestellte Folge hinaus einen formalen, thematischen und/oder atmosphärischen Zusammenhang erkennen lässt.”⁴²⁴

Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* publications each qualify as a cycle according to either of these accounts of the word’s meaning. They are centered around a theme, and though the order and number of poems change, it could certainly be argued that reading through the poems of each publication allows for the reader to come back to the beginning and read and interpret it again on a ‘higher level of meaning.’⁴²⁵

There was a significant “auffällige Häufung von Lyrikzyklen im 19. Jahrhundert, die am Fin de Siècle noch einmal zunimmt.”⁴²⁶ Precisely around the turn of the century (into the 20th), “[wurde] vornehmlich zyklisch gedichtet.”⁴²⁷ How did cycles and collections typically look during the timespan of Else Lasker-Schüler’s writing career? How had they shifted in form and style?

For some authors around this timespan, as for example with Stefan George and his *das Jahr der Seele*,⁴²⁸ the more specific definition of the word cycle was taken quite seriously, including the careful and thorough detail-oriented composition and arrangement from beginning to end, so that the beginning might be taken back up again on a new level. Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* publications could each be said to follow the more strict definition as well, but not to the same degree in the sense of permeation throughout an entire publication of meticulously composed gradual shifts in formal aspects such as rhyme and meter or even content, such as the gradual indications of the shifting of seasons. This level of meticulous

⁴²⁴ Burdorf / Fasbender / Moeninghoff, 844.

⁴²⁵ This will be addressed more in depth in the next chapter.

⁴²⁶ Martus, 553.

⁴²⁷ Gerhard, 18.

⁴²⁸ George, Stefan. *Das Jahr der Seele*, (Berlin: Verlag der Blätter für die Kunst, 1897).

composition in order to create a cycle that moves back into the beginning down to the level of the shifts in the *Hebungen* and *Senkungen* in a verse is an extreme example, however, and is neither necessary for a work to be considered a cycle, nor is it found in the works of most authors around this time period, including the *Phantasmus* and *Hauspostille* publications. Instead, these cycles and those of the *Hebräische Balladen* are arranged mostly around the level of theme, with possible interpretations including an examination of how each poem takes up the theme, the juxtaposition of poems with and against one another, and the choice of which begins and which ends the cycle. It is also true that unlike a cycle like *Jahr der Seele*, which is a cycle in the singular, the *Hebräische Balladen* publications are a *set* of multiple differing arrangements that can each be defined as cycles. What happens when each different arrangement creates a different ‘circle,’ and therefore, upon return to the beginning, a new ‘higher meaning’?

Generally, with regard to many of the poetry cycles and collections around this time, “an *Kreislauf*, an *regelmäßige Wiederkehr* oder *Ring*, die alte Bedeutung des griechischen Wortes „Kyklos“, brauchen wir wohl nicht mehr zu denken. „Zyklus“ als Bezeichnung für eine Gruppe von Texten, Bildern oder Musikstücken ist zur *Metapher* geworden.”⁴²⁹ It is not, however, that authors such as Lasker-Schüler have completely abandoned the traditional form or aspects of the cycle; “Das Erbe wird [...] nicht aufgehoben, sondern verformt.”⁴³⁰

Particularly concerning poets like Lasker-Schüler, there is a shift in the form of the cycle and the way that such collections are composed and arranged: “die expressionistischen Zyklen wollen keine Entwicklung, d.h. ein Zeitlich-Ablaufendes, Kohärentes, darstellen, sondern, dem beschriebenen symbolistischen Zyklustyp zuneigend, ein In- und Mit-, ja ein simultanes

⁴²⁹ Neumann, Peter Horst. “Zyklus-Probleme in experimenteller Lyrik, zum Beispiel bei Ernst Jandl,” in: *Vom Gedicht zum Zyklus. Vom Zyklus zum Werk. Strategien der Kontinuität in der modernen und zeitgenössischen Lyrik*, ed. Jacques Lajarrige, (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2000), 242.

⁴³⁰ Gerhard, 213.

Aufeinander abbilden.”⁴³¹ On the one hand, it is an over-simplification to lump authors such as Lasker-Schüler and their works into a category such as expressionism and expect that this will resolve matters and provide clear-cut answers, especially given the lack of self-authored expressionist theory:

Befragt man den Expressionismus, ob eine zyklische Gestaltung von seinen Prämissen her zu erwarten ist, so zeigt sich eine grundsätzliche Schwierigkeit: Der Interpret vermag kaum Aussagen über den Expressionismus mit einer Sicherheit zu machen, wie es für Naturalismus oder Symbolismus geläufig ist. Der Expressionismusbegriff als solcher ist nach wie vor heftig umstritten, nicht zuletzt deshalb, weil von den Expressionisten selbst verbindliche ‚Theorie‘-Entwürfe zu einer Poetik und Ästhetik abgelehnt wurden: „Nur die Unproduktiven eilen mit Theorie der Sache voraus“ erklärte Kasimir Edschmid 1918, und Paul Hatvani begründete den Theorieverzicht 1921 mit der Furcht vor ‚Erstarrung‘ und neuer Doktrinisierung. ‚Formel‘, ‚Regel‘ und Maßvolles widerstreben dem Expressionisten, der sich elementar aussagen will, ohne durch strikte Vorgaben für eine poetische Gestaltung reglementiert zu werden. [...A]uch Gottfried Benn konstatiert noch einmal ‚nach 40 Jahren‘ (1955): „(...) wissen Sie nun aber (...), was ein expressionistisches Gedicht ist? Ich meinerseits weiß es nicht, (...)“. Eine ‚Zykluserklärung expressis verbis‘ von Seiten der Expressionisten wird auf dieser Grundlage höchst unwahrscheinlich, und eine Durchsicht der wichtigsten Manifeste und Dokumentation, Erinnerungen und Selbstzeugnisse blieb daher in dieser Hinsicht unbefriedigend.⁴³²

On the other hand, it is also true that the previous description, i.e. that expressionist cycles typically do not depict a coherent teleological development, but rather a simultaneity, could easily have been written about any one of the *Hebräische Balladen* publications, which as aforementioned has been described as a significant contribution of expressionism to the ballad.

With the *Hebräische Balladen*, this depiction of simultaneity en lieu of teleological development means more and goes further, precisely given the fact of their multiplicity. This suggests that the arrangement and number of poems are both significant and arbitrary: arbitrary, because while they change the narrative for each publication, at the same time, the narrative is

⁴³¹ Gerhard, 142.

⁴³² Ibid., 136.

simultaneous rather than teleological; and significant, because the significance of the poems' arrangement lies in the juxtapositions rather than in the specific order parts of a story being told from beginning to end. This arbitrariness is therefore not synonymous with the (false) statement that each publication is in essence the same, or that their individual arrangements and composition do not matter. According to Cordula Gerhard, who counts Lasker-Schüler among the expressionists as others do,

es [ging] den Expressionisten offensichtlich nicht nur um die Bewahrung des in sich gebundenen Einzelgedichts [...], sondern [...] mittels einer „Verknüpfung in einer höheren Einheit des Sinns“ und – so darf man ergänzen – der Form [sollte] die Anordnung in Gedichtfolgen [sic] nach zyklischen Gesichtspunkten vor einem Zerfall in gleichgültige, zusammenhanglose Einheiten gesichert werden [...].⁴³³

On the level of the work-group, too, this supplies strong evidence to support the notion that even though these publications of course have a chronology in terms of when they were created and published, their order, too, is ultimately arbitrary, and somehow to be received simultaneously rather than teleologically – a problem that the following two chapters will address.⁴³⁴

In works around this time period such as any of the *Hebräische Balladen*, opposing forces seem to be observable, and this is easily extended to the fact of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen*. On the one hand, referring to Gerhard's work on expressionists and the form of the cycle,

[n]och fällt den Expressionisten eben nicht die Welt auseinander, denn verbindlich bleibt ihnen ein Gemeinsames, ein Zusammenhaltendes, ein durchgängig Mittelpunkt schaffendes motivisches Apriori: die Suche nach dem Wesentlichen, gepaart, ja in eins gebracht, mit einer bindenden Form. „Die Form

⁴³³ Gerhard, 136.

⁴³⁴ This is further bolstered by editions theory, since even when an author has intentionally developed a work from first draft to fully realized and perfected, all versions become equally relevant after the death of the author – and that is referring specifically to the case of unpublished drafts leading to a single final publication; here, we are dealing with multiple works rather than multiple versions, which puts each publication on a level field by default. Refer back to the introduction and its bibliography for specific texts on this subject.

wird beim Expressionismus zum Inhalt“ – so die provokante Feststellung Hatvanis.⁴³⁵

On the other hand, however, authors such as Gottfried Benn, lumped into this category of expressionism along with Lasker-Schüler, have made statements such as: “Zucht will er [der Expressionist], da er der Zersprengteste war; und keiner von ihnen, ob Maler, Musiker, Dichter, wird den Schluß jener Mythe anders wünschen, als daß Dionysus endet und ruht zu Füßen des klaren delphischen Gottes.”⁴³⁶ If these two opposing forces are indeed at work here, as they were in other movements around the turn of the century,⁴³⁷ a few years before Lasker-Schüler’s first *Hebräische Balladen* publication, then certainly one way to achieve synthesis of this dialectical pair would be to tame and contain chaos into order – and to do so repeatedly, so that many individual orders arise.

The tension and synthesis between order and chaos produced by multiple interconnected cycles is visible in work-groups beyond those of Lasker-Schüler. Arno Holz, whose writing career timeline sits more solidly at the turn of the century than Lasker-Schüler’s, has been explicit about wanting to create a final perfected totality and how this drive and desire led to the multiple publications of *Phantasmus*, but these themes of chaos and order are unquestionably present in the *Phantasmus* work-group. Less so for Brecht, who as we have established seems to have created the *Hauspostille* work-group largely as a result of historical and publishing circumstances – but he, too, had a habit of reworking previously published things and a reverence not only for a finished product, but for the working process, which often led to his

⁴³⁵ Gerhard, 139.

⁴³⁶ Ibid.

⁴³⁷ For more on this, refer, for example, to: Gay, Peter. *Modernism. The Lure of Heresy. From Baudelaire to Beckett and Beyond*, (New York / London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2008); Calinescu, Matei. *Five Faces of Modernity*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987); Abrams, M. H. *Natural Supernaturalism. Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*, (New York / London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971).

cracking these finished products back open post publication. These three are also not the only authors to have published a work-group of cycles around this general span of time. Joseph von Eichendorff has a publishing history similar to Lasker-Schüler's, though on a much smaller scale, specifically concerning ten poems under the name *Auf meines Kindes Tod*.⁴³⁸

Eichendorf hatte fünf dieser Gedichte bereits 1835 als Zyklus unter einem ähnlichen Titel publiziert („Auf den Tod meines Kindes“); zwei Jahre später verdoppelte er die Zahl der Gedichte, wobei er in einem Fall auf ein über zwanzig Jahre früher geschriebenes zurückgriff.⁴³⁹

What is it then, specifically, about the form of the collection or cycle that encourages this kind of multiplicity of arrangement and composition, beyond what we have already seen with the genre of poetry and its special relationship between part and whole? Peter Horst Neumann speaks of the “oftmals prekären *Werk-Charakter* von Zyklen,”⁴⁴⁰ and although this in many ways contradicts with our definition of *Werk-Charakter*, namely that a work is something that has been published by its author in a specific form, his understanding of the cycle is instrumental in beginning to ponder the answer to this question:

Sugeriert nun das Wort „Zyklus“ in seiner Bedeutung als Kreislauf und Wiederkehr einerseits eine gewisse formale *Geschlossenheit*, so bezeichnet es doch zugleich auch eine *offene Form*. Die Stellung des Einzeltextes im Ensemble ist im allgemeinen labil; Positionswechsel, Auslassungen oder Ergänzungen sind möglich. In welchem Verhältnis Geschlossenheit und Offenheit zueinander stehen, entscheidet wesentlich über den *Werk-Charakter*. Extreme Offenheit würde Beliebigkeit bedeuten und es verbieten, das Text-Agglomerat einen Zyklus zu nennen.⁴⁴¹

Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* could be said to display a certain ‘openness’ because of the varying arrangements and poems left out or added **and** because of the multiplicity of publications; because each publication, however, is precisely that – a publication –, this openness

⁴³⁸ See: Neumann, 242.

⁴³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid., 244.

can neither be called ‘extreme,’ nor can the arrangements be said to be arbitrary in the sense that these publications are not cycles or lack *Werk-Charakter*. Steffen Martus eloquently expands on the reason for this tension between what Neumann calls a cycle’s openness and closed-ness, namely:

Es werden Grenzen gezogen und überwunden, indem der Zyklus das Gedicht in eine seltsame Zwischenstellung bringt, in eine Position zwischen Autonomie und Abhängigkeit. Die zyklische Ordnung ist damit eine Form der Werkbildung, die stufenweise vom einzelnen Gedicht über die einzelne Gedichtsammlung zum Gesamtwerk führt. Sie ist ein Verfahren, den Sinn für Zusammenhänge zu schärfen oder auszubilden, und prägt eine Form der relationalen Aufmerksamkeit, die den „Stellenwert“ des Gedichts in dessen Beobachtung einbezieht.⁴⁴²

To compose and arrange a cycle is to work with a form both open and closed, to grapple with achieving “Ineinanderschachtelungen des Getrennten,”⁴⁴³ to create an ensemble out of individual pieces through juxtaposition,⁴⁴⁴ to examine possibilities for combination and connection. Chaos, openness, changeability, flexibility, that is to say, the fact that a cycle is an ensemble created from the combination of many smaller works and therefore could be arranged in many different ways to many different ends, meets planning and order, “die zyklische Form als Ausdruck eines artistischen Ordnungs- und Gliederungswillens (d. h. eines Stilbemühens), Kosmos gegen Chaos zu setzen, also Zerfallenes in Umgrenzung und Ineinanderbindung zu bringen.”⁴⁴⁵ To create a cycle is to create something that, in a stronger sense than for a simple collection of poems, emphasizes both the autonomy and the interdependency of the individual poems (works) from which the cycle is composed. In terms of a work-group, these dialectical attributes extend outward to apply to the collection of cycles that exist both separately and together, autonomously and interdependently, each with fixed arrangements of poems, but each existing precisely

⁴⁴² Martus, 553.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 588.

⁴⁴⁴ Neumann, 242.

⁴⁴⁵ Gerhard, 18-19.

because of the innate flexibility and changeability of arrangement of poems in a cycle in the first place.

IV. Conclusion

After examining the roles played by the book market, the genre of poetry itself, and the form of the cycle in the creation of work-groups such as *die Hebräischen Balladen*, in order to investigate how and why such a thing might have come about, we are left with a final question. How then shall we read? To read a cycle is to examine individual poems on their own and in relation to one another. To read a work-group is to do the same with the larger wholes, with each individual cycle and their relationship to one another. Especially given the previously established simultaneous rather than teleological nature of each of the *Hebräische Balladen* publications as compared, for example, to George's meticulously teleologically composed *Jahr der Seele*, how are we to read the poems of an individual *Hebräische Balladen* cycle simultaneously rather than teleologically? How are we, furthermore, to read the cycles of this work-group simultaneously rather than teleologically, with equal rather than simply chronological consideration? How are we to read the juxtapositions and arrangements, the changes that have been made?

It has already been established that each publication is a work on its own, not simply one interchangeable version of many on one abstract idea as the work:

„Inhalt“ und „Form“ dürfen nicht als zwei voneinander ablösbare Elemente betrachtet werden, die den literarischen Text gleichsam in zwei Hälften zerteilen: in einen ‚inneren‘ Inhalt und in eine ‚äussere‘ Form. Oder anders gesagt: Es gilt den traditionellen Inhalt/Form-Dualismus zu überwinden. An seine Stelle soll eine *ganzheitliche* Betrachtungsweise treten, die den literarischen Text als logische Organisation von Elementen begreift, in denen sich Inhaltliches und Formales untrennbar verbunden haben, die also die ‚alten‘ Begriffe „Inhalt“ und

„Form“ in sich einschliessen und damit im Grunde bedeutungslos werden lassen.⁴⁴⁶

Form **is** content, and each of these works is a different one. These publications are also not many sub-versions to one ultimate publication readers should receive as **the** work, for whatever justification may be given (first, last, most highly received, subjectively the best...) – these are all works. It is not enough, at least in an ideal sense, to read one of these publications, just as it is not enough to read a poem or a few from a cycle and say one has read the cycle, and just as it is not enough to read one work by an author and say you are familiar with their entire oeuvre.

In fact, the idea of reading and understanding a work in relation to an oeuvre, of approaching a part with the greater whole in mind and a greater whole through an intricate knowledge and experience of each individual part, could loosely apply to understanding a poem in relation to its cycle and a cycle in relation to each individual poem, and furthermore to understanding a work in relation to its work-group and vice versa – though the relation of a single work by an author to all of their others is decidedly much less intense. Martus writes: “Das Werk ist nicht nur in der Umgebung von Literatur identifizierbar, und umgekehrt sind Werke der Ort, wo Literatur in Erscheinung tritt. Ebenso wird das Einzelwerk im Gesamtwerk relevant und das Gesamtwerk über das Einzelwerk.”⁴⁴⁷ In each case, whether with regard to work – oeuvre, poem – cycle, or work – work-group, such a reading must be done without falling prey to the false assumption that the individuality of each work should be glossed over in favor of interpreting everything toward the whole. Rather, just as with the hermeneutic circle, the individual and the whole are both best illuminated through and by one another; essentially, one must understand one to better understand the other, and vice versa:

⁴⁴⁶ Andreotti, 21.

⁴⁴⁷ Martus, 21.

Das Gesamtwerk ist eine vom Einzelwerk aktivierbare größere Bezugseinheit, die gegebenenfalls das „Verstandenwerden“ des einbezogenen Textes begünstigt. Die Rede vom ‚Werk‘ im Singular scheint mir dabei legitim zu sein, weil das Einzel- und das Gesamtwerk sich wechselseitig bestimmen. Man kann dies daran sehen, daß das Interesse für ein Gesamtwerk sich über den besonderen Wert einzelner Werke bestimmt und daß dann das Gesamtwerk den Wert einzelner Werke zu bestimmen vermag.⁴⁴⁸

The first and perhaps biggest problem here, of course, is accessibility of editions.⁴⁴⁹

Another extremely significant problem is the expectation that an average reader would or even should read every single publication.

Before we can address issues of expectations, accessibility, and appropriate presentation, however, we need to turn to publications on the *Hebräische Balladen*, most often by literary scholars. How does one read a cycle, such as any single *Hebräische Balladen* publication – let alone an interconnected collection of cycles? How have people already read the publications of this work-group? Have individual poems been as highlighted examples? Have entire cycles, with each poem within as well as the whole they create together, been considered thoroughly? Has anyone looked at the changes across publications or considered the entire work-group? If so, how? If not, how could something like this be done?

⁴⁴⁸ Martus, 18-19.

⁴⁴⁹ As the next chapter will show. This problem includes difficulty accessing first editions, the issue of the posthumous Ginsberg edition, and all others that followed until the historico-critical edition in the 90's, which is too expensive for most and which addresses the multiple versions through a series of symbols difficult to decipher and recreate entire works from even to an academic highly versed in such edition shorthand.

Chapter Three: Reading and Interpreting *Hebräische Balladen*

I. Introduction

After an examination of some contextual factors in the creation of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen*, including authorship, earnings, and the book market during the time of Else Lasker-Schüler's career, and the role of the genre of poetry and its traditions of composition of parts into larger wholes (all while both adhering to and breaking rules), a few facts are left to consider: 1) the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group is very much about the question "how are collections and cycles of poems composed?"; 2) individual cycles are complex things, and they are especially complex to read and interpret, because of the part-to-whole relationship and the need to consider individual poems, order and placement, juxtapositions, and the context of the greater whole, as well as the need to acknowledge the possibility of both teleology and simultaneity of poems within a cycle; 3) the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group is made up of collectible publications, all of which are works in their own right and deserve equal attention and acknowledgement. We are essentially left with a major question in two parts, which will form the basis of this chapter: "How does one read and interpret a poetry cycle?" and "How can one read a work-group of poetry cycles?"

To expand on the first point, what does it mean to say that the *Hebräische Balladen* embody the question of how to compose collections and cycles of poems? The more normal, or at least expected (and simplified), teleology for a cycle or collection of poems is that an author writes poems, edits and re-works them, and arranges and rearranges them, until they are satisfied and authorize the cycle or collection for publication in a very specific form. Both Arno Holz and Bertolt Brecht did this with their respective *Phantasmus* and *Hauspostille* work-groups (multiple

times), but the statement that these work-groups are also about how to compose collections and cycles would not be as fitting as it is for *Hebräische Balladen*. This is precisely because in the *Phantasia* publications, the poems themselves (and number of poems) are altered drastically in the attempt to create a perfect and ideal final form that both represents and is a totality, and in *Hauspostille*, there are only a few changes to order and inclusions, and these are mostly the result of the fact that the first publication (*Taschenpostille*) was a private one and that historical context affected later publications in terms of ability to publish (and what could be published). Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, on the other hand, vary mostly in terms of the order and inclusion of poems, not in terms of the forms of the individual poems themselves as with *Phantasia*, and they also involve much more variation across publications than the *Hauspostille*; the reasons for this are, furthermore, much less clear or straightforward than the explanations applicable to, and even self-asserted by, either Brecht or Holz. The *Hebräische Balladen* work-group is therefore, more than is the case for either *Phantasia* or *Hauspostille*, a study, an implicit theory, on the effect of the choices made about position and juxtaposition when cycles and collections are composed, and what possibilities for meanings and interpretation these choices create (and also take away).

This is intimately related to the second aforementioned fact to be considered, namely that individual cycles are complex things, and they are especially complex to read and interpret, as a direct result of their special part-to-whole relationship; readers need to consider individual poems, order and placement, juxtapositions, and the context of the greater whole, as well as the possibility of both teleology and simultaneity of the poems in a cycle. How can or should a single poetry cycle or collection be read?

Dieter Burdorf explains, “Bei Lyrik genügt es [...] nicht, sich editorisch und interpretatorisch auf den Einzeltext zu konzentrieren. Vielmehr ist die Reflexion über größere Einheiten unabdingbar.”⁴⁵⁰ Rolf Fieguth expands on this idea:

Gedichte wollen und sollen zwar immer auch und immer wieder als einzelne gelesen werden, wie Tropfen, die eine ganze Welt in sich enthalten. Aber sie werden eben von den AutorInnen fast immer in mehr oder weniger geordneten Gruppen oder ganzen Büchern dem lesenden Publikum vorgelegt. In der Gesellschaft mit anderen Gedichten bilden sie dann oft neue Zusammenhänge, neue Bedeutungs- und Sinndimensionen, die ein neues Lesen oder Wiederlesen der Gedichte erfordern – ein Lesen in Bezug auf die anderen Gedichte, aber auch ein neues Lesen des einzelnen Gedichts für sich selbst.⁴⁵¹

New connections and dimensions of meanings are created depending on which poems are included in a cycle and how they are arranged together; new readings or re-readings of the poems in connection with one another and with the greater whole in mind **and** as individual poems are necessary.

The *Hebräische Balladen* are, furthermore, not just a single cycle, but rather a work-group made up of collectible publications – which becomes especially clear when one considers not only all of the differences in terms of poem inclusion and arrangement, but the changes in paratext, such as inclusions of dedications and drawings by the author, which also make each cycle something special. Each of these publications is a work in its own right and deserves equal attention and acknowledgement. The question is: How can one read a work-group of poetry cycles?

When Fieguth’s statement on reading a single cycle is applied to multiple distinct but related cycles boasting multiple different inclusions and arrangements of poems, this type of

⁴⁵⁰ Burdorf, Dieter. “Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin. Zur Einleitung,” in: *Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin*, ed. Dieter Burdorf, *editio / Beihefte*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 14.

⁴⁵¹ Fieguth, Rolf. “Architektur der Wolken. Einleitungssessay,” in: *Architektur der Wolken. Zyklisierung in der europäischen Lyrik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Rolf Fieguth and Alessandro Martini, (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 12.

reading becomes exponentially more complex – but not impossible to achieve – since one must essentially concentrate on and read individual poems for themselves, then again in connection with the others and in consideration of the greater whole, and then one must repeat this process with each cycle for itself, and then read those cycles once more with the greater whole of the work-group in mind, examining the effect that the changes across cycles in inclusions and (juxtapositions) have on the possibilities of meaning for each whole – which is to say, for each individual poem **and** each entire cycle **and** the work-group as such.

Here we must return briefly to the question: Why not just read one publication? It is apparent from most interpretations of the *Hebräische Balladen* that this is what many have done and continue to do. For quite some time, however, the one publication that people were reading and interpreting was one of two publications that did not stem from Lasker-Schüler herself (as will be explained in detail shortly). Others have tended to read the 1914 “zweite vermehrte Auflage,” which is arguably the most well received publication, especially since the appearance of Lasker-Schüler’s historico-critical edition *Werke und Briefe*,⁴⁵² for which the editors chose the 1914 publication as the only one to present in full.⁴⁵³ Still others might argue that the first or one of the last should be the one that readers consider.

Norbert Oellers, who wrote an essay in the 1980s addressing the fact of multiple publications,⁴⁵⁴ would later go on to release an edition of a handwritten manuscript version of the *Hebräische Balladen* that Lasker-Schüler gifted to Lucie von Goldschmidt-Rothschild in

⁴⁵² *WB*, 11 vols.

⁴⁵³ *WB* 1.1, 155-167.

⁴⁵⁴ Oellers, Norbert. “Else Lasker-Schülers »Hebräische Balladen« - auch für die asiatische Prinzessin Leila,” in: *Zeit der Moderne. Zur deutschen Literatur von der Jahrhundertwende bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Hans-Henrik Krummacker / Fritz Martini / Walter Müller-Seidel, (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1984), 363-376. Henceforth: Oellers (1984).

1915/16,⁴⁵⁵ and would also later become one of the editors of the historico-critical edition, has argued that the publications of the *Hebräische Balladen* are not to be considered individual works or even *Fassungen* specifically because the order and number rather than the composition of the poems themselves is what changes across publications.⁴⁵⁶ Oellers describes how the 1912/13 was reissued in 1914 “in unveränderter Reihenfolge und mit kaum nennenswerten Veränderungen”⁴⁵⁷ despite the fact that “zwei Gedichte angehängt wurden.”⁴⁵⁸ He also believes that the third publication of the *Hebräische Balladen* is essentially only changed by the addition of the poem *Saul*, downplaying the fact that the order is entirely different and simultaneously asserting:

Doch weder dieser Zuwachs noch die – insgesamt unerheblichen – Varianten gegenüber den früheren Ausgaben führen dazu, daß sich der Zyklus in einer veränderten Fassung präsentiert; die Veränderung wird vielmehr durch die gänzlich neue Anordnung der Gedichte bewirkt, von denen kein einziges in dem ursprünglichen Zusammenhang mit den vorangehenden und nachfolgenden Gedichten geblieben ist.⁴⁵⁹

Oellers, furthermore, considered *Die gesammelte Gedichte* from 1917 to be a sort of forerunner to an *Ausgabe letzter Hand* of the *Hebräische Balladen*.⁴⁶⁰

Zwar kam in dem 1919 (nicht 1920, wie immer wieder angegeben wird) bei Kurt Wolff erschienenen Band der gesammelten Gedichte noch ein weiteres *David und Jonathan*-Gedicht (»O Jonathan, ich blasse hin in deinem Schoß«) hinzu, und der ein Jahr später von Paul Cassirer verlegte Band *Hebräische Balladen. Der Gedichte erster Teil* enthält als letzten Zuwachs des nun auf 20 Balladen

⁴⁵⁵ Oellers (2000).

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid. (1984), p. 364: “Die Anordnung der Gedichte erfolgte weder nach entstehungsgeschichtlichen Prinzipien noch nach solchen der biblischen Chronologie (*Sulamith*, das früheste Gedicht [1901], findet sich als drittletztstes, *Jakob* rangiert vor *Eva* [1905] und *Abel* [1911], beispielsweise); auch wenn nicht vermutet werden sollte, daß der Dichterin Willkür die Zusammenstellung besorgt hat (ganz sicher bilden das erste Gedicht, *Mein Volk*, und das letzte, *Versöhnung*, eine Art Klammer, unter die sich die »eigentlichen« hebräischen [Personen-] Gedichte gefügt finden), so ist die Reihenfolge doch keineswegs zwingend; die Interpretation einzelner Gedichte wird, so scheint es, nicht in jedem Fall entscheidend von den jeweiligen Kontexten mitbestimmt.”

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., 365.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., 366.

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., 367.

gebrachten Zyklus das Gedicht *Hagar und Ismael*, aber an der für die Ausgabe von 1917 festgelegten Reihenfolge der dort 18 Gedichte änderte sich nichts mehr.⁴⁶¹

Of course, this is not entirely true: the 1919/20 Wolff publications include the new *David und Jonathan* and therefore also a slightly different order, there is another and different publication in 1920 from Cassirer including another new poem and therefore also a slightly different order, and it is arguable that even the final 1920 Cassirer should be considered an *Ausgabe letzter Hand*.

Ultimately, Oellers would have a hand in the decision to publish only the 1914 publication in full and to put all other poems included only in later publications of *Hebräische Balladen* in chronologically organized sections of all of Lasker-Schüler's poems for the edition *Werke und Briefe*. It is also worth mentioning that in these same volumes of this edition, the publications of *Die gesammelten Gedichte* are given space only in encoded charts in the *Anmerkungen* volume accompanying the *Gedichte* volume,⁴⁶² and are otherwise not handled as valid or noteworthy collections of poetry, despite the fact that Oellers previously explicitly (and debatably) considered one of these volumes to contain a sort of *Ausgabe letzter Hand* for the *Hebräische Balladen*.

As was established in the first chapter, one of the reasons Lasker-Schüler brought out *Die gesammelten Gedichte* editions was economical. When she published these, partially due to issues with previous publishers, partially in order to make it interesting and collectible enough that people would want to buy it even if they already owned a previous copy, and of course also because she was already in the practice of changing the order and inclusions and releasing new *Hebräische Balladen* cycle compositions, she rearranged and changed her *Hebräische Balladen*.

⁴⁶¹ Oellers (1984), 367.

⁴⁶² Refer to: "Selbstständige Buchveröffentlichungen," in: *WB 1.2 (Gedichte – Anmerkungen)*, ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki and Norbert Oellers, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1996), 13-44.

None of these *Hebräische Balladen / Die gesammelten Gedichte* publications are *Ausgabe letzter Hand* in the typical sense, however, although they do present three new *Hebräische Balladen* cycle compositions in the span of a few years, and yes, one of them was chronologically last and contains one more poem (Cassirer 1920) than the one before it that came out in the same year (Wolff 1920). These *Die gesammelten Gedichte* publications are ultimately something quite different than those that came before, despite the fact that they remain intricately connected to the previous *Hebräische Balladen* publications; they are not *endgültig* in the way an *Ausgabe letzter Hand* would be, and they also seem to be a new step taken, rather than a next or final step (implying a teleological progression). *Die gesammelten Gedichte* are different books that also contain different publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*. They are poems collected and rearranged, collections re-composed and republished, three further times to be exact, and furthermore, the *Hebräische Balladen* in these publications are different things from the first two in that those are publications in which the work titled *Hebräische Balladen* is on its own, and in the collected poems, it is not. This could certainly make for a further difference in the way the *Hebräische Balladen* in each publication is read – and it should. Barbara Hahn asserts that

with this collection of poems [*Die gesammelten Gedichte*], Else Lasker-Schüler created a new type of book. It is a masterpiece of the art of poetic arrangement, of contriving new and surprising constellations of poems. Reading poems, so its message, calls for plenty of time. Each and every poem needs to be read in its own right, so to speak; and they all need to be read in their constellation with others.⁴⁶³

The idea that the publications of *Hebräische Balladen* are neither different versions nor different works goes against what was laid out in the introduction of this dissertation concerning publication in a form authorized by the author as the defining trait of a work, diminishes the

⁴⁶³ Hahn, Barbara. “The Politics of Dedication: Else Lasker-Schüler’s Poems,” in: *MLN*, v. 132/3 (April 2017), ed. Andrea Krauss, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), 722.

significance of order and (juxta-)position in the way collections and cycles are both composed and read or interpreted, and furthermore downplays the effect the addition of new poems has on the order and juxtapositions within a cycle. At the same time that Oellers is a purveyor of the perspective that the *Hebräische Balladen* publications are essentially neither different versions nor different works in his 1984 essay, however, he does admit:

Die Gründe für die Umstellungen aufzudecken, erforderte eine sorgfältige Interpretation aller Gedichte, die hier nicht geleistet werden kann. Nicht überall liegen die Intentionen der Dichterin so greifbar nahe wie im Falle der *Versöhnung*: Indem das ursprünglich (in der ersten Auflage) letzte Gedicht an den Anfang rückt [in the third publication], wird aus der Verheißung für spätere Zeit [...] die Ankündigung einer durch die Poesie unmittelbar erreichten Erfüllung des Versöhnungs-Versprechens – dabei blieb es auch in den späteren von der Dichterin autorisierten Ausgaben der *Hebräischen Balladen*. Was, zum Beispiel, der Untersuchung wert wäre: ob durch die neuen Plazierungen und die damit geschaffenen neuen ›Umgebungen‹ der Texte semantische Konsequenzen gezogen werden müßten, von denen dann sogar einzelne Verse betroffen sein könnten. Der Schlußvers des Gedichts *Eva* [...] bleibt als Text identisch, mag auf ihn das Gedicht *Zebaoth* [...] folgen oder das Gedicht *Sulamith* [...]. Doch der poetische Vers, der nicht alle seine Bedeutungen in sich trägt und aus sich herausziehen läßt, verändert sich durch den Wechsel seiner Position im Ganzen des Zyklus.⁴⁶⁴

Despite the fact that he makes this point in 1984, this is a job that has still not been accomplished by any interpreter of the *Hebräische Balladen* to date, as will be demonstrated in this chapter's examination of the ways the publications of this work-group have been read, nor was it made possible by the *Werke und Briefe* edition's presentation choices for *Hebräische Balladen*.

In the end, these *Hebräische Balladen* are all similar but different things, and while it is clear that it would certainly be quite a job to interpret a work-group made up of connected but separate, individual but related poetry cycles, it cannot be argued that each is not different than the other, or that each is not a work (because after all, they were all published and authorized),

⁴⁶⁴ Oellers (1984), 366-367.

nor that it makes no difference to an interpretation how many poems appear in each or in what order they have been arranged.

II. Reading and the Question of Presentation and Access

A final issue must be kept in mind when looking into how the *Hebräische Balladen* have been read and interpreted to date and how one might more sufficiently and appropriately interpret the multiple cycles making up a work-group and the changes across publications. The problem is specifically one of access and editions; **how we read is directly related to how works are presented to us and what publications or editions we have access to.**

Under more average circumstances concerning a single cycle, readers usually have access to a work in the form it was authorized for publication by its author (more or less): this often means the first edition (if it is still accessible or available anywhere), reprints (possibly with supplementary information, a new cover image, different pagination, and/or different typography), as well as, perhaps, posthumous editions, which may come in the form of editions geared toward students or historico-critical editions meant largely for scholars, both of which often provide supplementary information in the form of commentary, introductions, and appendices, usually concerning philology, text genesis, publication history, and context, and which may, for example, illuminate words that are either no longer in use today or which have shifted in meaning, and explain references with which readers during the author's lifespan may have been familiar but which today's readers would most likely not recognize or understand.

Unfortunately, the situation of editions and access to the works of the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group is not so straightforward as that, and is in fact so problematic that it has

had extreme and lasting consequences on the reception of the cycle(s) and the near-total lack of viable scholarship on the cycle(s), even into the 21st century and to date, and despite the appearance of the historico-critical edition, much to the surprising discovery of the writer of this dissertation! During Lasker-Schüler's lifetime, as already apparent, there were six individual and distinct publications of *Hebräische Balladen*, each with varying publishers and print runs, with the first editions of each dated 1912/13, 1914, 1917, 1919, and two in 1920. The most highly received of all first editions seems to have been the 1914 publication, the "zweite vermehrte Auflage" through A. R. Meyer. This is already a complex situation, but things became infinitely more complicated in 1951, when Ernst Ginsberg released a posthumous *Hebräische Balladen* in his edition dedicated to Else Lasker-Schüler's memory, *Dichtungen und Dokumente*.⁴⁶⁵ As an editor, Ginsberg created and released a corrupted version of *Hebräische Balladen*, a *Mischtext* which took a form never authorized by Lasker-Schüler herself; Ginsberg not only changed the order of the poems in a way that diverged from any existing authorized publication of *Hebräische Balladen*, to follow the order of stories in the Hebrew Bible to be precise, but also removed *Eva* and *Zebaoth*, two poems included in every single authorized publication of *Hebräische Balladen*, and added *Abigail* and *Joseph wird verkauft*, two poems appearing in exactly zero authorized publications of *Hebräische Balladen*, because for him, these more accurately fit what he interpreted as the theme of the cycle(s). The editor Friedhelm Kemp later followed in Ginsberg's footsteps, releasing multiple editions of Lasker-Schüler's works (in 3 and 8 volumes respectively),⁴⁶⁶ each of which took Ginsberg's corrupted version of *Hebräische Balladen* and mostly maintained his order and choices of poems, but replaced *Im Anfang* (a poem appearing in every authorized publication of *Hebräische Balladen* since 1914) with *Zebaoth* and

⁴⁶⁵ *Hebräische Balladen*, in: Ginsberg (ed.), *Dichtungen und Dokumente*, 9-32.

⁴⁶⁶ Refer to: Kemp, *Gesammelte Werke in 3 Bänden*, v. 1; *Ibid*, *Werke in 8 Bänden*, v. 1.

then switched the order of the last two poems (in Ginsberg, *An Gott* and *Sulamith*; in Kemp, *Sulamith* and then *An Gott*). Compare the following corrupted arrangements to all of Lasker-Schüler's own *Hebräische Balladen* cycle compositions (as listed in the Chapter One Appendix):

Ginsberg Edition (1951)

Versöhnung
 Mein Volk
 Abel
 Abraham und Isaak
 Hagar und Ismael
 Jakob und Esau
 Jakob
 Joseph wird verkauft*
 Pharao und Joseph
 Moses und Josua
 Saul
 David und Jonathan
 David und Jonathan
 Abigail*
 Esther
 Boas
 Ruth
 Im Anfang
 An Gott
 Sulamith

Kemp Edition (1959, 1986)

Versöhnung
 Mein Volk
 Abel
 Abraham und Isaak
 Hagar und Ismael
 Jakob und Esau
 Jakob
 Joseph wird verkauft*
 Pharao und Joseph
 Moses und Josua
 Saul
 David und Jonathan
 David und Jonathan
 Abigail*
 Esther
 Boas
 Ruth
 Zebaoth
 Sulamith
 An Gott

467

For the most part, it is these two corrupted versions of *Hebräische Balladen* that dictated and grossly misled the reception and interpretation for decades. They have, even more unfortunately, continued to have lasting effects despite the appearance of the historico-critical edition *Werke und Briefe's Gedichte* volume in 1996. As will become apparent in this chapter, the writer of this dissertation expected viable scholarship to both be enabled by and to begin appearing after the publication of the poetry volumes of *Werke und Briefe*. This chapter was meant to be a study on how the *Hebräische Balladen* have been read and a consideration of how one might take this further, but research proved that there is little viable scholarship at all, and in fact, no thorough scholarship that fully considers any single *Hebräische Balladen* publication as a whole, in and for its context and composition. In order to consider how one might read this

⁴⁶⁷ Asterisks mark the poem titles Lasker-Schüler herself never included in any one of her *Hebräische Balladen* publications (or unpublished manuscripts, for that matter).

work-group, we must first diagnose the problem: accessibility of corrupt editions, and inaccessibility of viable ones.

As previously mentioned, the *Gedichte* volume of *Werke und Briefe* specifically presents readers with the 1914 publication of the *Hebräische Balladen*, and then also separately presents all individual poem titles featured in the *Hebräische Balladen* publications in chronological sections throughout the volume, alongside other non-*Hebräische Balladen* poems, in the form and order of their first publication (which as seen in the Chapter One appendix was more often in literary magazines than in cycles). It bears repeating that this means the poems Lasker-Schüler **included** first in post-1914 *Hebräische Balladen* publications appear only in this manner, i.e. excised from any and all cyclical contexts and divorced from any and all cyclical orders. Further information on the multiple publications and cyclical orders is presented to readers in the accompanying *Gedichte - Anmerkung* volume, largely in the form of charts and *Siglen*, in order that the editions-savvy scholar, at least, after quite a bit of intentional and focused decoding and piecing together, might get a sense for the publication history and the make-up of the other *Hebräische Balladen* cycles. The edition does not, however, seem to strive to make the issue with the previous posthumous editions explicit in order to repair the damage done; in the *Editorische Nachbemerkung* of the *Gedichte* volume, posthumous editions are listed, including Ginsberg's and Kemp's, without any explicit mention of their contribution of corrupted versions of the *Hebräische Balladen* and the domination of these *Mischtexte* in all ensuing reception of this work(-group).⁴⁶⁸ Let alone does *Werke und Briefe* present the differences between the poem inclusion and order in those editions compared to the publications from Lasker-Schüler herself.

⁴⁶⁸ "Editorische Nachbemerkung," in: *WB* 1.1, 380.

Instead, the problematic reception history caused directly by these two posthumous editions is wholly ignored.

Werke und Briefe, furthermore, does not present the fact of the multiple publications or the differences across Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* in an accessible manner. In the same *Editorische Nachbemerkung* at the end of the poetry volume, the reader is given the following information:

Else Lasker-Schüler brachte zu Lebzeiten sieben Sammlungen ihrer Gedichte heraus: 1902 »Styx«, 1905 »Der siebente Tag«, 1911 »Meine Wunder«, 1913 »Hebräische Balladen«, 1917 »Die gesammelten Gedichte«, 1920 als der »Gedichte erster« und der »Gedichte zweiter Teil« »Hebräische Balladen« und »Die Kuppel«, 1942 »Mein blaues Klavier«. Die 1913 erschienenen »Hebräischen Balladen« wurden Anfang 1914 als »zweite vermehrte Aufg.« ohne Jahresangabe neu aufgelegt; »Die gesammelten Gedichte« erschienen 1919 ebenfalls ohne Jahreszahl in einer »zweiten Auflage« und 1920 als »sechstes bis zehntes Tausend«.⁴⁶⁹

This certainly begins to clue the reader in to the multiple publications of *Hebräische Balladen*, but selectively and vaguely, rather than giving all the information concisely and clearly. The *Anmerkungen* volume that accompanies the *Gedichte* does include several charts and pieces of information with regard to the multiple publications and differences across them. These are, however, by no means intuitive to read, even if, via extensive previous research, the reader is already aware of the multiple publications and posthumous edition and reception issues, knows what information to look for, and is familiar with historico-critical editions. Finding and deciphering the information as it is presented involves searching across several widely dispersed sections of the annotations volume for pieces of information encoded into symbols, including a few charts in different locations in the volume. The first is on page 9, with poem names listed in the order, as the reader is to deduce from the sequential order of the numbers in the first column

⁴⁶⁹ *WB* 1.1, 379.

with this scribal abbreviation (*Sigle*) at the top, from “HB^H.” Each poem title is preceded by its assigned number in the *Gedichte* volume. Numbers 1-17 in the other columns labeled HB² and HB³ appear out of sequence to show the order of poems in these publications. The numbers in the first two columns are enclosed in triangular brackets.⁴⁷⁰ Information about the manuscript HB^H is found on the previous page, explaining that HB^H refers to the 1915/16 unpublished manuscript gift version of *Hebräische Balladen*.⁴⁷¹ Bibliographic information illuminating the *Siglen* HB¹ and HB², however, is found first on page 21, along with a chart beginning on the bottom of this page and continuing onto the next.⁴⁷² This second chart lists poems in order from the 1914 publication of *Hebräische Balladen* a.k.a. HB², again preceded by their assigned numbers in the *Gedichte*, but here a few poem numbers in parentheses are listed with no title, providing for two visual gaps in the list of poem titles.⁴⁷³ The chart compares this order to HB¹ and HB³ using the same numbers and columns system, but the smallest number in the third column is 7, whereas both of the other columns begin with their smallest number, 1. Only the numbers in the first two columns are enclosed in triangular brackets, as was the case with the first chart. A third chart on page 25 lists poem titles in the order from the 1919 and 1920 Wolff publications, labeled only as GG² and GG³ according to the numbers in the second and third columns, using numbers 10-24 meant to illustrate the poem orders in GG¹⁻³ where GG¹ (i.e. 1917) is missing the second *David und Jonathan* appearing in the later publications; page 23 gives the bibliographic information for these *Siglen*.⁴⁷⁴ The scribal abbreviation HB³ is finally illuminated with bibliographic information

⁴⁷⁰ *WB* 1.2, 9.

⁴⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*, 21-22.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*, 21. (195), (196), which refer to *Abraham und Isaak* (also number 210) and *Jakob* (also number 211) respectively, the titles underneath which they are listed, with the duplicated poems corresponding to the numbers in parentheses found on page 144 in the “1906 bis 1913” section of chronologically listed poems.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

on page 32; a fourth chart on the same page lists poems in the order from 1920 Cassirer (HB³) and compares these to GG² using the numbers 7-26.⁴⁷⁵

Aside from these scattered and encoded charts, the *Anmerkungen* volume provides information in the individual poem annotations, with sections on *Überlieferung* and *Varianten und Lesarten*, also heavily encoded. If the reader attempts to go directly to the *Anmerkungen* for poem numbers 209-225, i.e. the 1914 *Hebräische Balladen*, they are given brief entries in each case directing them to the poem's first publication number, all appearing in different sections of the annotations.⁴⁷⁶ The reader must then also know which poems appeared in later publications in order to look for those poems individually in the chronology of Lasker-Schüler's entire poetic oeuvre.⁴⁷⁷ All of this information proves nearly impossible to piece together into a clear overview of the situation, even for those well versed in such editions and the reading of such *Siglen* and charts, the fact of Lasker-Schüler's multiple publications, and the issues surrounding the posthumous editions by Kemp and Ginsberg.

One might easily assume – despite the *Mischtex*te and the ensuing and incredibly pervasive faulty reception history they caused, and despite the already originally challenging fact that there are six different authorized publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*, (most of which have largely been, until recent digitization efforts, impossible or nearly impossible to come by, and many of which continue to be out of reach for anyone not affiliated with an institution such as a university), not to mention one posthumously published manuscript version – that anything, or at least most things, published on this cycle-group after the appearance of the poetry volume

⁴⁷⁵ *WB* 1.2, 32.

⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 200-206. From here the reader is referred to pages 134-138, 150-152, 158-160, 166-168, 183-184, 184-186, 187-193.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 209-211 (*Saul*, poem nr. 234); 244-245 (*David und Jonathan*, poem nr. 276); 248-249 (*Hagar und Jsmäel* [sic], poem nr. 280). Refer to footnote 46 for a note on the spelling of *Hagar und Ismaël*.

and accompanying *Anmerkungsband* of a historico-critical edition would be a **viable interpretation or analysis**. That is to say, it would seem to be a reasonable assumption that scholarship appearing after the publication of such an edition would not be a reading of the corrupted versions published by Ginsberg or Kemp, but of one of the publications from Lasker-Schüler herself, and that they would also potentially contain an explicit statement, at least, on the fact of the multiple publications. This assumption, it turns out, would be wrong.

It was an extremely surprising discovery to make while researching scholarship on the *Hebräische Balladen* that the effects of Ginsberg's and Kemp's corrupted versions on reception have persisted beyond the historico-critical edition's appearance – though perhaps, it is also no wonder why. Misinformation, misinterpretation, and the overall astounding lack of viable scholarship on Lasker-Schüler's actual, authorized publications, in the forms in which she created them, also persist despite the *Werke und Briefe* editor Norbert Oellers' pre-edition 1984 essay explaining the situation of these *Mischtex*t*e* in conjunction with Lasker-Schüler's own multiple publications and condemning Ginsberg's and Kemp's editorial decisions as “befremdlich und nicht zu entschuldigen,”⁴⁷⁸ as well as his 1986 edition of her handwritten manuscript version of *Hebräische Balladen* in which his *Nachwort* addresses the same problem,⁴⁷⁹ and even Christine Radde's 1998 thorough post-edition interpretation of *Hebräische Balladen* using *Werke und Briefe* and once more laying bare all the problems with previous editions and interpretations.⁴⁸⁰

⁴⁷⁸ Oellers (1984), 367

⁴⁷⁹ “Nachwort,” in: Ibid. (2000), 51-61.

⁴⁸⁰ Radde, Christine. *Else Lasker-Schülers Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Schriftenreihe Literaturwissenschaft*, v. 44, ed. Heinz Kosok and Heinz Rölleke, (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1998). Radde's book will feature heavily in the next section of this chapter.

As a matter of fact, these reception issues continued to prevail into the early 2000's, largely because most scholars (1) continue to lack a basic knowledge of the fact that multiple publications exist, of their compositional orders and the differences across publications (even on the rare occasion that they are aware that more than one exists), and of the problematic posthumous editions and the fact of their corrupted texts, **and** (2) have unknowingly continued to refer to interpretations and other scholarship that were based on readings of Ginsberg and Kemp. Too often, even after the publication of the historico-critical edition's poetry volumes, whether writers referred to *Werke und Briefe* or not, most gave no indication they were aware that Lasker-Schüler had published multiple *Hebräische Balladen* or that *Mischtexte* of her works existed. A few scholarly publications even quite paradoxically cited *Werke und Briefe* – which ideally would have made clear that there were many publications of *Hebräische Balladen* and set the record straight on Ginsberg and Kemp's damage to the reception of this cycle(-group) – and then went on to make statements about the order of the cycle following the order of the Hebrew Bible and refer to *Abigail* and *Joseph wird verkauft* as Hebrew Ballads, because their research bibliographies also included pre-*Werke und Briefe* articles, essays, and books by well-known and trail-blazing Lasker-Schüler scholars who had themselves previously only had access to the corrupted editions (and in one case, even released a corrupted version in an edition themselves).⁴⁸¹

One such (mis)interpretation stems from an Else Lasker-Schüler-Almanach (*Fäden möchte ich um mich ziehen*) from 2000; a chapter called “Buntumschlungen in der Bibel. Else Lasker-Schülers *Hebräische Balladen*” from Frederike Haberkamp⁴⁸² is largely a short edition

⁴⁸¹ Bauschinger, Sigrid (ed.). *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Werke. Lyrik, Prosa, Dramatisches*, (Munich: Artemis und Winkler, 1991), 40-51. This corrupted version of *Hebräische Balladen* follows Kemp's reordering. (Refer to p. 11)

⁴⁸² Haberkamp, Frederike. “Buntumschlungen in der Bibel. Else Lasker-Schülers *Hebräische Balladen*,” in: *Fäden möchte ich um mich ziehen. Ein Else Lasker-Schüler-Almanach*, ed. Hajo Jahn / Hans Joachim Schädlich, (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 2000), 116-122.

history in which the author addresses the fact of different publications, does not interpret the changes across multiple publications but summarizes this history, considers the final publication from Cassirer in 1920 to be the *Ausgabe letzter Hand*, and ultimately is still affected by Ginsberg *Mischtext*. She quotes Sigrid Bauschinger and, as a result, perpetuates the misinformation that the poems all deal with significant figures in the Bible and appear in the exact order as they do in the Bible, for example. Moreover, while Haberkamp seems aware that there were multiple publications of *Hebräische Balladen* and even cites poems from *Werke und Briefe*, she appears to believe that these multiple publications all follow the order of the Bible and only involve insertions of new poems in line with this overall static arrangement schema. She also argues that attention and interpretation should be directed toward the individual poems because of the changes in all of the publications – a direct result of the texts she cites from Norbert Oellers and his ensuing influence on the historico-critical edition’s arrangement and presentation of the poems from the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles. Haberkamp’s interpretation is further led astray by her acceptance of another statement from Bauschinger, who regards only the poems initially written after 1910 as the “eigentlichen *Hebräischen Balladen*.”⁴⁸³ The confusion here seems to stem from an unfortunate conglomeration of outdated and obsolete scholarship based on corrupted versions, statements from Norbert Oellers about the nature (and supposed lack of significance) of differences of the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles made in conjunction with his acknowledgement of the fact of multiple publications and corrupted versions, and the fact that there is still no edition to date that accessibly presents the necessary information about reception

⁴⁸³ Bauschinger, Sigrid. *Else Lasker-Schüler: Ihr Werk und ihre Zeit*, (Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm Verlag, 1980), 170. As quoted in: Haberkamp, 120.

and edition history together with all of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* publications – or even a clear and accessible chart presenting the changes across publications.⁴⁸⁴

Ultimately, the reason the Ginsberg and Kemp editions had such an effect on reception in the first place is a matter of access. These *Leseausgaben* were very easily accessible to most readers after Lasker-Schüler's lifetime, whether academic or non-, as they were specifically meant to be. They were certainly more easily accessible than any one of the six first editions of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, and they continued to be the most accessible versions even with the existence of a historico-critical edition – editions which are typically very expensive and contain appendices full of charts and *Siglen* which attempt to illustrate publication history in short-form, but which can be difficult and tedious to interpret into a big picture or overview of, let alone a detailed understanding and conception of, all (unpublished versions and) publications, even to those well-versed in edition practice and theory. The Ginsberg and Kemp editions have made an enormous and un-erasable mark on the reception of the poetry cycles called *Hebräische Balladen*, in that they left most people unknowingly reading and referring to one of two corrupted versions rather than one of any of the six legitimate works, and led to multitudes of circulating scholarship and translations of the *Hebräische Balladen* based on the corrupted editions, all of which continue to pervade and persist and contribute to this enormous problem despite the publication of the *Werke und Briefe* edition.

This reception history is both impossible to undo and irresponsible to ignore. The best approach with regard to this chapter seems therefore to be to acknowledge this problematic reception history and to mention the fact of, but otherwise disregard as inadmissible, all

⁴⁸⁴ Also noteworthy here, from Hahn, *Politics*, 732: “According to the editors [of *Werke und Briefe*], only four of Else Lasker-Schüler's poetry books count as “in sich geschlossene Textformen”; *Die gesammelten Gedichte* is explicitly excluded.”

interpretations based on the Ginsberg and Kemp versions. Surprisingly, practically, and quite unfortunately, this means that only a few interpretations will be considered in this chapter. Those that are, however, will be examined for the following criteria: Is this a book, chapter, or article on *Hebräische Balladen*? Which publication(s) or edition(s) are being used? Is the interpreter analyzing only select poems as representative of an entire cycle, are they interpreting all poems of an entire cycle, or are they interpreting both the poems **and** the entire cycle as a whole? What is the overall thematic context of the interpretation? Is there mention of the fact of multiple publications and awareness of the differing orders and inclusions of poems across the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles? Is there an attempt to interpret multiple *Hebräische Balladen* cycles and the changes across these cycles, and if so, how is this done?

III. Interpretation History: How Have the *Hebräische Balladen* Been Read?

In order to consider how one might read the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles in a way that is fitting to what they are, both individually and together, we must first look at how they have been interpreted to date. As previously clarified, this will only include more recent readings of Lasker-Schüler's own authorized publications, meaning (1) those appearing after the historico-critical edition that (2) do not continue to mistakenly interpret either Ginsberg's or Kemp's corrupted texts as Lasker-Schüler's work – a set of criteria for viability which unfortunately drastically cuts down the size of available interpretations.

In terms of themes, the reception history of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, and in fact her oeuvre on the whole, has mostly been interpreted through the lens of Lasker-Schüler's

biography, including, but not limited to, (frankly often reductive) considerations of, for example, how men in her life have influenced her work and how personal hardship and trauma in her lifetime may have informed her writing. There are readers who focus on her penchant for blending fiction and reality in her works, her letters, and her life (which applies to the *Hebräische Balladen* particularly in that she included hand-drawn depictions of Yussuf von Theben – an alter ego who appeared in other works, and as whom Lasker-Schüler sometimes appeared in public and referred to herself in letters – in many of the publications).⁴⁸⁵ Others concentrate on how historical circumstances – such as the unstable era of the Weimar Republic, conditions in Germany surrounding either of the World Wars, or Lasker-Schüler’s time in exile – are depicted or reflected in her works. Many more read her works (perhaps especially *Hebräische Balladen*, but also others such as *Wunderrabiner*) as statements on her personal understanding of and relationship to Judaism, and as a construction or portrait of her understanding of and vision for Jewishness as an identity. Due to the nature of Lasker-Schüler’s own *Hebräische Balladen* publications as poems influenced heavily by stories in the Hebrew Bible, as well as both Ginsberg’s and Kemp’s misleading corrupted texts inappropriately overemphasizing the order of stories in the Hebrew Bible through their edits, of course, these cycles have quite heavily been analyzed and interpreted in direct comparison to the biblical stories the poems reference, especially in terms of how *textnah* Lasker-Schüler’s poems are. Her works are also frequently read through the lens of gender, including considerations of works as possible statements on Lasker-Schüler’s own gender identity, whether one is reading Lasker-Schüler as a woman who writes, or chooses to focus on the androgyny of her presentation and her alter egos, which included both men (Yussuf von Theben) and women (Tino von Baghdad)

⁴⁸⁵ One image is used for the cover for 1912/13 and 1914, *Prinz Jussuf mit der Stadt Theben*, and another for *Die gesammelten Gedichte* (1917, and Wolff’s 1920, for example).

and which appeared frequently in both her letters and her literary writing (not necessarily two distinct genres for Lasker-Schüler). Other gender-focused readings concentrate on how gender is constructed and portrayed in her works in general. Still others interpret her work through her historical existence as an avant-garde author in Berlin contributing to modernist movements and active in author circles (which often also leads back to the first point about the influences of men on her work).

As far as the scale and scope of interpretations of the *Hebräische Balladen* go, most are (understandably) rather narrow due to the limits of confining an interpretation of an entire cycle (let alone six entire cycles, though even the fact of their existence is most often not addressed at all) to a book chapter, essay, or article. Usually, this involves a focus on only a few poems and then some sweeping statements about the cycle as a whole.

One chapter comes from Markus Hallensleben, whose book from 2000 seeks to address and interpret Else Lasker-Schüler's oeuvre with regard to her *Avantgardismus und Kunstinszenierung*.⁴⁸⁶ The chapter in question is called "Das avantgardische Ich als jüdisches 'alter ego': *Der Wunderrabiner von Barcelona und Hebräische Balladen*," and in it Hallensleben uses the historico-critical edition for all poem citations, refers to *Hebräische Balladen* as a single work or cycle, mentions the changes and multiple publications in passing, and refers the reader elsewhere (namely to Oellers' texts) for more information on that subject. Hallensleben quotes in full and considers only the poems *Mein Volk*, *Esther*, and *Versöhnung* (which he states was originally called "Der Versöhnungstag"⁴⁸⁷ – a remark that can be considered an unequivocal result of the fact that he is using the historico-critical edition, which lists such information and

⁴⁸⁶ Hallensleben, Markus. "Das avantgardische Ich als jüdisches 'alter ego': *Der Wunderrabiner von Barcelona und Hebräische Balladen*," in: Else Lasker-Schüler. *Avantgardismus und Kunstinszenierung*, (Tübingen / Basel: Francke Verlag, 2000), 215-236.

⁴⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 231.

gives special emphasis to first publications of individual poems rather than to poems as they appear in each cyclical context). In his chapter, Hallensleben draws connections from these three poems taken from the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles to Lasker-Schüler's other works and then also to their respective inspirational biblical sources. For *Mein Volk*, he takes up a drawing that appeared alongside *Mein Volk* in *Theben* (1923),⁴⁸⁸ and then goes on to consider biblical sources such as *das Hohelied Salomos* and *Lied des Mose* as "Hauptquelle für die Metaphorik in den *Hebräischen Balladen*."⁴⁸⁹ When writing about *Esther*, conclusions and comparisons are drawn about body metaphors also found in *Mein Herz* (1912).⁴⁹⁰ After finally quoting *Versöhnung* in full, Hallensleben then connects back to *Wunderrabiner* (1921),⁴⁹¹ the work with which he opens the chapter as the focus. Ultimately, his examination of these works in conjunction with one another leads him to the following conclusion:

Die sinnzerstörenden Elemente der Sprache [...] präsentieren sich bei Lasker-Schüler als eine Art von *multiplen Ganzen*. Die Vieldeutbarkeit des Einen ist aber letztendlich eine Haltung, wie sie auch die jüdische Bibelauslegung und Schriftradtition kennt. Wenn die Avantgardekreise daran anknüpften, dann, weil sie nur eine Religion kannten, nämlich die der Kunst. Es ist das Wissen um die „Unmöglichkeit der Identität des Einen und des Vielen“, wie es Adorno dann als „konstituive [sic] Kategorie der Kunst“ formuliert hat. Bei Lasker-Schüler kann dieses Phänomen erschlossen werden über die Vorstellung, daß das Gedicht ein zeitgeschichtlicher *Event* sein soll, eben ein „Versöhnungstag“, wie die Titelvariante zeigt. Es geht um die Inszenierung des Kunstwerks als *Event*, um das alltägliche Ereignis der Kunst als Gebet, abgeleitet vom Ritual eines Feiertagsgebets.⁴⁹²

Hallensleben's chapter is essentially an interpretation of a few poems excised from the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles in conjunction with an interpretation of *Wunderrabiner*, and the

⁴⁸⁸ Hallensleben, 226

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 229.

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 233-4.

⁴⁹² *Ibid.*, 235. See also: Adorno, Theodor W. *Ästhetische Theorie* (1970), ed. Gretel Adorno / Rolf Tiedemann, (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1993), 278. This argument further supports the idea that the *Hebräische Balladen* publications are equal in their own right and suggests that the changes across publications and the fact of multiple publications could be considered *events* in line with avant-garde approaches to art as experience.

overall intention and goal is not a close reading or thorough interpretation of either, but a use of these works together as examples in order to illustrate Lasker-Schüler's use of a literary "I" in terms of avant-gardism and Jewishness (exactly as the title suggests).

In the same year, Vivian Liska takes up select poems from the *Hebräische Balladen* and compares them with others from different bodies of work from Lasker-Schüler with similar themes – specifically, those having to do with biblical women.⁴⁹³ Liska cites poems out of *Werke und Briefe* and refers to *Im Anfang* as the last poem of the cycle,⁴⁹⁴ meaning she is presumably using the 1914 publication of the *Hebräische Balladen* (although this is not something she herself addresses at any point). She reads *Boas* and *Ruth*,⁴⁹⁵ *Jakob und Esau*,⁴⁹⁶ *Hagar und Jsmaël* [sic],⁴⁹⁷ and *Sulamith*,⁴⁹⁸ as well as the poem *Abigail*,⁴⁹⁹ which both Ginsberg and Kemp included in their *Mischtexte*, and which has therefore been read in conjunction with *Hebräische Balladen* poems many times before. Because Liska uses the historico-critical edition and calls

⁴⁹³ Liska, Vivian. "Biblische Frauen in der Lyrik Else Lasker-Schülers," in: *Else Lasker-Schüler-Jahrbuch zur Klassischen Moderne*, ed. Lothar Bluhm und Andreas Meier, (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2000), 36-54.

⁴⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 48-49.

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 44-47.

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 47-48. A note about the spelling of this poem: All *Hebräische Balladen* publications used *Fraktur*. In the 1917, 1918/19, and 1920 Wolff GGs, in which this poem is not included, the J and I are the same, with both capital letters descending below the baseline. In 1920 Cassirer where this poem title appears, the J is very similar to the I but slightly longer; it descends below the baseline where the I does not. In Cassirer 1920, the poem is definitively titled "Hagar and Ismael." So while the font style might initially seem to be the source of confusion, it clearly is not, and interestingly, for all publications where the J and I are the same, nobody writes "Jsaak" or "Jm Anfang." Even in the corrupted editions, the poem title is spelled "Ismael" – also with no umlaut. For some reason, however, both Liska and Radde use the spelling "Jsmaël." Where does this come from? Upon further examination, the culprit is the historico-critical edition, which lists the poem as *Hagar und Jsmaël* (1.1 Nr 280, p. 208; 1.2 *Anmerkungen* p. 248). The *Anmerkungen* provide a difficult-to-decipher list of *Siglen* in "Varianten und Lesarten" to attempt to show the variations in spelling, which read: *Ti*: Hagar und Ismael. *t* Hagar und Ismaël. (*in eckigen Klammern eingeschlossen*) *D1* Hagar und Ismael *D2* Hagar und Ismaël *D3* W: (Max Reinhardt gewidmet) *D3* o. *W t D1-2* 2 ließen/ liessen *t* 3 den Jsmaël] Ismael *t* Jsmaël] Ismaël. *D1* Ismael *D2* Ismaël *D3* [...]. Under "Überlieferung" we find that: *t* (*Abschrift Grete Fischers*): *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Wien* (*Ser. nov. 19.402*). – *E*: *Die weißen Blätter*. *Jg. 6, H. 11 vom November 1919. S. 495. D1*: *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt. Jg. 64, Nr. 227 (Erstes Morgenblatt) vom 25. März 1920. S. 2. D2*: *HB3 (1920). S. 25. D2A*: *JNUL, ELS (11:7). Mit Blei korrigiertes Exemplar von D2. D3*: *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters. Jg. 7, H. 6 von Dezember/Januar 1920/21. S. 3*. The critical edition is therefore spelling the poem's title after its first individual publication in a literary magazine, and because of this, those using this edition to read the *Hebräische Balladen* spell the poem this way.

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 43-44.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 50-52.

her text “Biblische Frauen in der Lyrik Else Lasker-Schülers” rather than specifically in *Hebräische Balladen*, she is presumably aware that *Hagar und Ismael* is a part of the later *Hebräische Balladen* publications and that *Abigail* was never included in any publication by Lasker-Schüler, but she never makes either of these facts explicit, nor does she comment on the fact of multiple publications. Liska interprets *Abigail* without clarifying that it is the only poem mentioned that is not part of the *Hebräische Balladen*, and then segues into a final paragraph about a motif in the poem that “kann auch in anderen Gedichten der *Hebräischen Balladen* erkannt werden.”⁵⁰⁰ Here she addresses a motif found in *Moses und Josua*, *Abigail*, *Esther*, and *Im Anfang*. Ultimately, this essay, too, is not a literary interpretation of the (1914) *Hebräische Balladen* as an entire cycle, but one that uses example poems from this publication in conjunction with one poem from a later publication and one poem from another body of work entirely, without clarifying this, toward the ultimate goal of examining biblical women in Lasker-Schüler’s lyrical oeuvre.

Such book chapters, and other texts of similar length and scope, for example in almanacs and literary journals, are rather typical. Most often, where scholars and interpreters take up the task of interpreting and considering *Hebräische Balladen*, only a few example poems are highlighted rather than an entire cycle (let alone all of the publications). The goal is ultimately one of using specific poems (and perhaps also general statements about the cycle –always in the singular, regardless of whether mentions of multiple publications are made) to bolster what is usually a more abstract or interdisciplinary thesis than one of a thorough literary interpretation of those poems for themselves or of the *Hebräische Balladen* cycle(s) as a whole. Very often, the specific publication being used is not addressed, nor is the corrupted edition history or the

⁵⁰⁰ Liska, 53.

multiple publications of *Hebräische Balladen*. Other bodies of Lasker-Schüler's works are also quite often taken up in comparative interpretations alongside the author's choice of select poems from *Hebräische Balladen*.

Christiane Miller's examination of the *Hebräische Balladen*⁵⁰¹ differs from that of either Liska or Hallensleben in that she takes up an entire publication in her text (1914, as well, because she is also using *Werke und Briefe*) and furthermore makes it the main focus of her investigation. Miller does address the fact of multiple publications in the footnotes,⁵⁰² very much to her credit, and in her text, she uses the entire 1914 cycle to investigate the political nature of this particular publication of *Hebräische Balladen*, considering historical context and Lasker-Schüler as an authorial self, as gleaned through the fact of her gender, letters, and general biographical information. Miller employs this contextual and supplementary information alongside her reading to argue that "in particular the 1914 *Hebrew Ballads* constructs an implied social structure pointedly alternative to that of Wilhelmine Germany,"⁵⁰³ noting that "both the poet's supporters and defamers regarded *Hebrew Ballads* primarily as a volume of otherworldly spiritual and lyric expression that distanced its author from modern daily life rather than constructing her response to it."⁵⁰⁴ While this is still ultimately not a literary close reading of this *Hebräische Balladen* publication as and for itself, the author does consider the cycle as a whole, or at least all of the poems in it (to varying extents, with some only warranting brief mentions in comparison with others, and without necessarily addressing juxtapositions or general placements of poems in the publication beyond her considerations of the emphasis in meaning given to *Mein*

⁵⁰¹ Miller, Christiane. "Reading the Politics of Else Lasker-Schüler's 1914 *Hebrew Ballads*," in: *Modernism/Modernity* 6.2 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 135-159.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, 136 (footnote 4), 138 (footnote 16).

⁵⁰³ *Ibid.*, 138.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 137.

Volk and *Im Anfang* as the cycle's beginning and end),⁵⁰⁵ in order to interpret it through a sociopolitical, historical lens.

The most thorough interpretation of *Hebräische Balladen* to date is, unsurprisingly, the only existing monograph on the cycle(s) and the only (viable) book-length interpretation. Christine Radde's *Else Lasker-Schülers Hebräische Balladen* from 1998 provides a close reading, the only non-obsolete interpretation of this kind, which also covers all poems ever having appeared in *Hebräische Balladen* publications. Radde addresses the multiple-publication history immediately, informing the reader that there are "unter Einschluß jener handschriftlicher Zusammenstellung"⁵⁰⁶ seven total "autorisierte Ausgaben"⁵⁰⁷ (rather than six publications, because she includes the handwritten gift manuscript from 1915/16, which was never published by the author herself). Radde is also very quick to outline the posthumous editions problem and the "fatalen Folgen für die weitere Rezeption der Hebräischen Balladen,"⁵⁰⁸ specifically with regard to Ginsberg's and Kemp's choice to alter the order (and inclusions, though this is not specifically acknowledged here) of poems in favor of "die Reihenfolge der ihnen zugrundeliegenden Bibelbücher,"⁵⁰⁹ which Radde (through Oellers) regards as "ebensowenig maßgeblich"⁵¹⁰ as "die Chronologie ihrer Entstehung für die Anordnung der Gedichte."⁵¹¹

⁵⁰⁵ Refer to: Miller, 138-141. On p. 140: "Both "My People" and "In the Beginning," with their isolated speakers and historical perspectives of loss or nostalgia, remind readers of the "decaying" social fabric or "cliff" of the present world and these speaker's isolation in it, thereby framing the rest of the volume's representations of the past with this starkly inadequate present. In some ways the loss expressed in these poems remains the dominant note of the volume." Note that while Miller uses English titles, she is using *Werke und Briefe* and translating most of the poems she cites in part or in full herself.

⁵⁰⁶ Radde, 11.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid., 13.

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁵¹⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹¹ Ibid.

It becomes clear rather quickly that this book bases itself heavily off of *Werke und Briefe* in both presentation choices and analysis. The introduction includes a chart meant to illuminate the differing orders and inclusions of poem titles across the *Hebräische Balladen* publications and the gift manuscript, this time in one place, which is an improvement on the multiple diffuse charts in *Werke und Briefe*, but which unfortunately still uses the historico-critical edition's charts as a model; poem titles are listed chronologically according to date of first appearance and then the reader is given numbers in 7 columns to indicate where the title is positioned in each of the publications and the gift manuscript. This is a space-saving choice for publication purposes to be sure, but one that continues to leave the work of decoding and constructing a tangible and concrete, easily read list of poem orders across the cycle-group up to the reader – that is, at least, any reader with the time and motivation.⁵¹²

In the intro text itself, Radde makes some brief general comments acknowledging the position of certain poems across publications in her introduction, especially *Mein Volk*'s positioning at the beginning of the cycle⁵¹³ (only in 1912/13, 1914, and the gift manuscript, though this is not specified here; it appears to be implied that it is at the beginning in every publication) and the fact that “[d]en Schluß bilden erwartungsgemäß in allen Auflagen ebenfalls Gedichte, denen von Else Lasker-Schüler offensichtlich ein besonderes Gewicht beigemessen wurde; allerdings variieren sie im Laufe der Jahre.”⁵¹⁴ As an example Radde addresses that *Im Anfang* “ab 1917 von seiner herausragenden Stellung verbannt wird”⁵¹⁵ (namely, from its position at the end, a position which it holds solely in the 1914 publication, not in the first, in which it was not yet included), and speculates that this *Verbannung* “mag für das wachsende

⁵¹² Radde, 12.

⁵¹³ Ibid., 13.

⁵¹⁴ Ibid., 13.

⁵¹⁵ Ibid.

stilistische Urteilsvermögen der Dichterin sprechen”⁵¹⁶ and that *Im Anfang* “mit seinem Inhalt – einer auf den ersten Blick naiven Paradiesimagination – sollte es zuvor den Zyklus vermutlich mit erbaulichen Worten ausklingen lassen.”⁵¹⁷ Radde goes on to acknowledge that *Jakob* is positioned at the end after 1917, which she interprets as “auch [...] eine nachvollziehbare Entscheidung, den im Verlauf dieses Textes bildet sich die Figur des „wilden Juden“ heraus, die Else Lasker-Schüler ihren Lesern als Vorbild mit auf den Weg gibt.”⁵¹⁸ In the rest of this single paragraph, Radde explains that she addresses the connection of the two *David und Jonathan* poems as well as between *David und Jonathan* and *Pharaoh und Joseph* in the analysis section. Generally, this is about the extent to which Radde interprets the meanings behind the positions and juxtapositions of certain poems across the *Hebräische Balladen* publications.

After addressing such major issues and basic information in her introduction, Radde goes on to describe her approach and methodology. This is the other quite significant way in which this monograph models itself after the *Werke und Briefe*’s presentation of the *Hebräische Balladen* poems and cycle(s). Poem order and juxtaposition within a single publication or across publications do not factor into Radde’s interpretation, it becomes clear here, because Radde is ultimately not approaching the *Hebräische Balladen* as a composed cycle or a group of cycles, that is to say as wholes which in every case include the compositional aspect of poem order and juxtaposition. She explains:

Abgesehen von den Anfangs- und Schlußgedichten und möglicherweise weiteren bewußten Placierungen in Einzelfällen folgt die Anordnung der Gedichte keinem erkennbaren Prinzip. Deshalb spricht von Seiten der Autorinnen-Intention eigentlich auch nichts dagegen, für die Interpretationen der Einzelgedichte die

⁵¹⁶ Radde, 13.

⁵¹⁷ Ibid.

⁵¹⁸ Ibid.

chronologische Reihenfolge ihrer Erstveröffentlichung zugrundelegen, auch wenn dadurch ihre Ordnung im Rahmen des Zyklus verdeckt wird.⁵¹⁹

In Radde's line of thinking, which she justifies through and bases heavily on Norbert Oellers' previously quoted statements purporting the idea that the order of the poems across publications is not of any particular significance,⁵²⁰

[e]ine chronologische Betrachtung der Hebräischen Balladen läßt Einsichten über Else Lasker-Schülers Selbstverständnis als Künstlerin, ihre Kunstauffassung und künstlerischen Strategien erhoffen, die entsprechende Befunde der jüngeren Forschung aus der Prosa sinnvoll ergänzen könnten – dies vor allem, weil in den Hebräischen Balladen Einstellungen zur Dichtkunst besonders eng mit Einstellungen zur Religion und zum jüdischen Glauben gekoppelt sind.⁵²¹

It is noteworthy that Radde justifies a chronological reading of individual poems via previously quoted statements Norbert Oellers made in multiple essays prior to the appearance of *Werke und Briefe*⁵²² while also acknowledging (in a footnote):

Oellers warnt allerdings eindringlich vor diesem Verfahren [...]: „[...] wenngleich eine Reihenfolge nicht in Betracht gezogen werden sollte: die nach den Entstehungsdaten der Gedichte. Wenn die Dichterin in ihrer präzise zu beschreibenden ‚Entwicklung‘ von ‚Sulamith‘ (1901) bis ‚Saul‘ (1915) präsentiert würde, wenn die Veränderungen von Sprache, Ton und Bildern erscheinen, als seien sie Funktionen einer Lebensgeschichte, dann könnte der Zyklus nicht nur die Bedeutung seiner Struktur einbüßen, sondern auch den Sinn des Nichtgesagten verlieren: daß entschlüsselte Geheimnisse zum Leben so wenig taugen wie nichterkannte. Die Ordnung durch Zahlen, die leicht Kolonnen werden, war der Dichterin unerträglich.“⁵²³

The most major consequences of this structuring and interpretation decision are that the reader is not provided with a solid or clear grasp of the composition of any of the cycles as wholes, nor

⁵¹⁹ Radde, 14.

⁵²⁰ Refer, for example, to Oellers (1984), 364: “[...] auch wenn nicht vermutet werden sollte, daß Willkür die Zusammenstellung besorgt hat [...], so ist die Reihenfolge doch keineswegs zwingend; die Interpretation einzelner Gedichte wird, so scheint es, nicht in jedem Fall entscheidend von den jeweiligen Kontexten mitbestimmt.” As quoted in: Radde, 15 (footnote 13).

⁵²¹ Radde, 14-15.

⁵²² Refer to footnote 519.

⁵²³ Oellers (2000), 55-56. See also: Radde, 15 (footnote 14). (Radde refers to Oellers (2000), 55-56 as Oellers (86), 32. 1986 was the year that the handwritten manuscript was found in Marbach in the archives.)

changes made across publications, nor of the ways in which positions and juxtapositions affect the reading and interpretation of the poems in question.

The introduction is followed by two sections that serve as a thorough debriefing on contemporary (to Lasker-Schüler) and post-1945 critique and scholarship on the *Hebräische Balladen*.⁵²⁴ After this comes a section exploring and considering the “Titel der Sammlung,” with reflections and analysis on both the “Gattungsbezeichnung „Balladen“” and the “Attribut „Hebräische.“”⁵²⁵ This is finally followed by her chronological reading, wherein each poem is given its own chapter – at least, that is, through *Moses und Josua* (1913), after which all subsequent poems (namely, *Saul* [1915], *David und Jonathan* [1918], and *Hagar und Ismaël* [sic]⁵²⁶ [1919]) appear together in a chapter called “Hebräische Balladen aus späteren Auflagen des Zyklus.”⁵²⁷

Overall, Radde’s reading of the *Hebräische Balladen* poems is unparalleled, especially with regard to its thorough analysis of every poem ever included in a *Hebräische Balladen* publication. The one peculiar and problematic issue with this interpretation, however, is unfortunately quite significant and not without consequences: namely, that Radde’s approach is not to read one or multiple cycles or publications as composed wholes, but instead to consider each poem ever appearing in the *Hebräische Balladen* in chronological order of first appearance, with focus being directed for the most part only on each individual poem at a time (therefore displaying very little to no regard for juxtapositions or positions), and finally closing the reading, oddly, with a section that lumps all poems appearing after 1913 together.

⁵²⁴ Radde, 17-22.

⁵²⁵ Ibid., 23-47.

⁵²⁶ Refer to footnote 496.

⁵²⁷ Radde, 268-279.

There are pros to such an approach, especially if one is the first to have ever attempted such a reading, and the main tools at one's disposal are the *Werke und Briefe* edition and Oellers' texts, all emphasizing that the multiple different sequences of poems are of little to no importance. The cons and consequences, however, outweigh the pros, specifically because at this point it is rather clear that **there are no existing in-depth interpretations considering any single cycle from the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group in its entirety or as a composed whole, as Lasker-Schüler composed it.**

To date, nobody appears to have read and interpreted what Lasker-Schüler actually created, in any of the forms as she composed them, as wholes, even in terms of one of six existing authorized publications. We do not have scholarship based on the *Hebräische Balladen* as they actually are, nearly 100 years after the last publication in 1920 (!). It follows then, that there are, quite unsurprisingly at this point, also no existing interpretations that delve into a consideration of her multiple publications as well as the effect of the changes made across these publications.

The main culprit, as diagnosed in the previous section of this chapter, is a lack of accessible information, including: how many publications of *Hebräische Balladen* exist, the matter of the corrupted texts and the havoc they wreaked on *Hebräische Balladen* reception, easily read charts that make clear the differences between the Ginsberg and Kemp orders compared to Lasker-Schüler's own, and easily read charts that make clear the differences across Lasker-Schüler's own authorized publications. This dissertation, quite surprisingly, appears to be the first to provide the even the last two pieces of information, i.e. the charts regarding sequence, in an accessible and easily understandable way.

It is not up for debate here that a few scholars, perhaps especially Norbert Oellers in his publications prior to his work as editor on the *Gedichte* volumes as well as with the historico-critical edition *Werke und Briefe*, have done some groundbreaking work with regard to the *Hebräische Balladen*. What is missing in the historico-critical edition, however, is an easily accessed and understood, clear and concise collection and presentation of the aforementioned information, so that readers are able to grasp immediately what Lasker-Schüler created and what the sequences are, and are also made aware of the false versions of her work and problematic reception history. If an edition that provided this were to exist, it would be instantly apparent to any reader what publications exist and what those publications look like, and furthermore would be obvious to any interested scholar that, first, much of the scholarship out there on the *Hebräische Balladen* is inadmissible and perpetuates mistruths based on corrupted versions, and second, a thorough analysis of even a single publication, as it was created, and that is also to emphasize, in consideration of the composition and ordering of this creation, has yet to be executed.

This information is all out there, but it is extremely diffuse. Perhaps most importantly in terms of the field of German literature, an edition that would present all of the information in reader-friendly way would make possible the work of making up for this vast gap in scholarship without scholars first having to conduct years' worth of research, working closely with *Werke and Briefe*, piecing together that there are multiple publications as well as a manuscript, decoding charts on sequence and/or making their own, striving to locate and obtain copies of all individual first-edition publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*, reading all of Norbert Oellers' earlier texts on the *Hebräische Balladen* and seeking out the corrupted posthumous editions he mentions in those texts, delving back into scholarship on the *Hebräische Balladen* with this

knowledge and an assumption that viable scholarship exists, realizing that most of it is obsolete and corrupt and that the few that are neither of these are either not thorough analyses or only consider individual poems in the chronology of their first individual publications very loosely as a collection without regard for composition of sequences and juxtapositions, in order to finally arrive at the discovery that there is no admissible, thorough scholarship on any of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* as they were actually composed and that this still needs to be accomplished. The final chapter will consider what an accessible presentation of all of this information might look like. First, however, this chapter will conclude with a reflection on how such a reading of each and/or all publication(s) might be achieved in a way that is in line with what Lasker-Schüler herself has done.

IV. Interpretation Possibilities: How Could We Read the *Hebräische Balladen*?

We have not even begun to truly read this work-group, or any single author-authorized publication from it, for what they are – despite the fact that we now have a viable edition that does not contain corrupted versions. It is rather shocking that even an analysis that manages not to further disseminate falsehoods based on corrupt versions and also contains a mention or awareness of Lasker-Schüler's multiple publications and/or of the problem of editions and reception history is an extraordinary find in scholarship about the *Hebräische Balladen*. In an atmosphere of faulty reception based on multiple *Mischtexte* that continues to circulate, confusion as to what these cycles are and how they are structured, a lack of clear and consolidated information on and the resulting general lack of awareness of these issues, very few viable and even fewer thorough readings, which still disregard either the multiple publications or

the significance of their individual sequential compositions or both, as well as the lack of terminology or framework for such a (recurring!) phenomenon in the field of literature, where do we start?

Lesen: etymologically, this word means both “den Sinn von Schriftzeichen erfassen” **and** “sammeln.”⁵²⁸ *Lesen* is a matter of picking things up, of gathering them and **bringing them together**, of putting things “**in Ordnung**”⁵²⁹ and into context. According to J. Müller, on reading poems in a cycle:

Das Gedicht, das im „Zyklus“ erscheint, [...] wird [...] seinen ganzen „Sinn“ nur enthüllen, wenn es im Zusammenhang mit anderen Gedichten der betr. „Reihe“ gesehen wird.⁵³⁰

According to Rolf Fieguth, what makes a cycle of poetry is as follows:

Jedes Gedicht muss mit zumindest einigen Elementen seines Bedeutungsaufbaus und mit seiner Position unter den anderen Gedichten für das zyklische Ganze bedeutungstragend sein. Dabei muss sich eine Spannung zwischen dem Bedeutungsaufbau des Einzelgedichts und dem Bedeutungsaufbau des zyklischen Ganzen herstellen. Das zyklische Ganze muss die (wenngleich nicht unangefochtene) Autonomie seiner Einzelgedichte wahren; zum hierarchisch aufgebauten, um einen festen ästhetischen Kern angelagerten, mit soliden Grenzen ausgestatteten „literarischen Kunstwerk“ im Sinne des traditionellen, z.B. Ingardenschen, ästhetischen Werkbegriffs kann es daher nicht werden.⁵³¹

Furthermore:

Die Anordnung der Gedichte muss als Ganzes gelesen eine mehr oder weniger prägnante Kompositionsidee und eine darin verankerte, in den Einzelgedichten im Prinzip nicht enthaltene neue Sinngestalt (eine spezifische Situation, eine spezifisch angedeutete „Geschichte“, eine gedankliche Konzeption, oder ähnliches) ergeben, die nicht dominieren darf. Die Verbindung von Kompositionsidee und neuer Sinngestalt wird in der Regel in einer mehr oder weniger drastisch *negierten* Ganzheitsvorstellung münden. Die

⁵²⁸ “Lesen,” in: Pfeifer, Wolfgang et al. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen* (1993), digitalized and edited by Wolfgang Pfeifer for: *das Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2017). Web. 7. Feb 2017. <<https://www.dwds.de/wb/lesen>>.

⁵²⁹ Ibid. Emphasis mine.

⁵³⁰ Müller, J. “Das zyklische Prinzip in der Lyrik,” in: *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift* 20 (1932), 2.

⁵³¹ Fieguth, 413.

Ganzheitsvorstellung wird suggeriert, aber nie sanktioniert; da sie nicht dominieren darf, enthält der Zyklus immer auch zahlreiche Elemente, welche der Ganzheitsvorstellung widersprechen.⁵³²

These statements describing the nature and basic elements of a cycle of poetry apply to every publication of the *Hebräische Balladen*. It follows, therefore, that so do the statements regarding how poems in cycles need to be read: **together**, with the connections and the whole in mind. This is true for each publication regardless of the fact that their multiplicity is something quite non-normative indeed, and it is worth repeating here that Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* is not an isolated incident of the phenomenon that we have been referring to as a work-group.

In the first place, what is still needed in the field of German literature regarding Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* is a thorough reading of any one of her single authorized cycle publications – incredibly, also of the 1914 publication that *Werke und Briefe* presents in full – that also considers poems **together**, in the structure and composition of that cycle. As stated at the beginning of the chapter, this would require reading through the cycle while reflecting on the meaning of each individual poem for itself, and then reading the cycle again with more particular attention given to the cycle as a whole and how the whole is affected by the connections among the poems created through their sequence and juxtapositions. If one wants to include all poems Lasker-Schüler ever published in the context of her *Hebräische Balladen*, for example, the best practice approach for this would be to read and interpret the publication that includes all of the poems she ever published under the title *Hebräische Balladen* and to reflect not only on the meaning of each individual poem, but also on the way Lasker-Schüler arranged those poems and what this does for and to the meaning and interpretation of the whole cycle; of course this could and should include an acknowledgement, at least, of the multiple other existing publications, and

⁵³²Fieguth, 414.

could potentially also involve a discussion of the differences across publications. It bears repeating that even such an analysis **without** the last feature, of any one of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* cycle publications, does not yet exist. This scholarship could be made possible by a cohesive and accessible collection of all of the information that would enable it – as could analyses considering the whole of the work-group.

In order to achieve a reading of the work-group, to take this further, such interpretations would need to be made for each and every individual cycle, and then each publication would need to be considered again in the context of each other and the whole. What effect does position and juxtaposition have on how individual poems are read? What do the differences across versions in sequence and inclusion do to the way each cycle is read, to the meaning that can be taken from each whole? Composition changes each and every publication. Each must be read separately, all others forgotten – and they must also each be read with all others in mind. They must be read individually and simultaneously, separately and together, acknowledging difference and similarity without reducing all of these authorized publications to mere versions (and of what? Each other? There is no ideal, no idea outside of the publications – works – that exist on which all are an imperfect variation, no teleology here, no best or final perfected or most legitimate form.) The fact that this is a vast undertaking does not speak to a lack of its importance, and it certainly does not indicate that there is nothing to say, or that there is a possibility of saying too much. According to Rolf Fieguth:

Etwas überspitzt gesagt ist der Gedichtzyklus eine Kompositionsform, die eine prägnante Kompositionsidee in Verbindung mit einer gedanklichen Konzeption oder einer diegetischen Struktur andeutet und zugleich eine Meuterei der autonomen Komponenten (der einzelnen Gedichte) gegen die Dominanz des

Ganzen anzettelt. Der Interpret einer solchen Kompositionsform ist der Gefahr der Überinterpretation geradezu schutzlos ausgesetzt.⁵³³

Another concern must be addressed here, and it is one that returns to the matter of teleology, *Fassung letzter Hand*, and the fact that this work group boasts neither. It also certainly does not make the situation, or the question of how to read this work-group, any less complex. What to do with *die gesammelten Gedichte*? Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* ultimately include individual book publications containing only a cycle under this title **and** the cycles under this title included in the books of her collected poems. She reworks and restructures the *Hebräische Balladen* to integrate them into these books, and she does so each time a new publication of the collected poems comes out. Why do they need to be restructured to become part of these books? Why are these each also different? The sequence and number of poems continues to change with each and every publication of the *Hebräische Balladen*, but what makes the situation infinitely more complex is the fact that to read *Hebräische Balladen* as a cycle on its own, in any of the publications in which a cycle under this title stands alone, is a different matter than to read it as a cycle included in a book that is itself a constellation of poems and cycles. How do they read in the context of these books? This, too, must be considered. These are books in which Lasker-Schüler did not choose to include every poetic work she had ever written, but she did choose to include different publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*, and she also collected, **concentrated**, arranged, and dedicated her poetic work in specific and noteworthy ways – ways that also vary across these publications with the same name. *Die gesammelten Gedichte* therefore deserve special attention as a complex kind of continuation of the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group, where the *Hebräische Balladen* are positioned as wholes **within yet**

⁵³³ Fieguth, 11-12.

another set of wholes - but they also deserve inclusive, additional attention as separate-but-connected entities of their own, which no edition or consideration of her body of works, including the *Werke und Briefe*, has ever given them, as Barbara Hahn's article attests.⁵³⁴ That is to say, technically, the *Hebräische Balladen* (including those embedded within *die gesammelten Gedichte*) **and** *die gesammelten Gedichte* as whole works themselves are calling to be read in this complex way, both separately and together.

V. Conclusion

In the last few chapters, it has become apparent that a lot of work remains on the horizon when it comes to handling Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* the way they deserve to be handled:

(1) (a) We lack a technical word for the phenomenon of what we have here been referring to as a work-group – an extraordinary problem, given that this phenomenon is not singular to Lasker-Schüler, but is in fact a particular way of writing, with several variations in method and approach to be sure, found in the 20th century. 100 years later, the field of German literature as well as the field of editions still finds itself ignoring this phenomenon entirely, or packing away its complexity and ignoring it in favor of a single best 'version' of a work. In cases where there are multiple publications, this occasionally at least seems sufficient; with Arno Holz' *Phantasmus* work-group, for example, all publications are technically equal as works after the death of the author because they are publications, but it is also true that Holz himself explained quite explicitly and publicly, many times over, that he had a teleology in mind and was working

⁵³⁴ Refer to: Hahn, *Politics*, esp. 722-733.

toward the end goal of something as perfect and total as possible. It would seem appropriate, then, if one were to decide that the work that should be in the forefront were the final publication. Even in such apparently straightforward cases as this, however, as has been shown in previous chapters, editors and scholars disagree; some argue quite adamantly that, instead, it is the first that counts as legitimate and best, and still others are of the strong opinion that the work that was the most popularly received should be counted as the work. As is immediately visible upon a closer look, not naming this phenomenon and ignoring its complexity is not even adequate when one has statements from the authors themselves about their intentions, or when it is made fully apparent that there is a teleology in place; the terminology and framework for thinking about a situation of multiple differing but related publications is lacking even where work-groups appear to be points on a single line. When one turns to something infinitely more enigmatic, seemingly chaotic, and web-like as the work-group of the *Hebräische Balladen*, it becomes even clearer that the field of German literature and the field of editions require more thinking on this phenomenon beyond the traditional notions of work and authorship already in place. These are adequate when one is dealing with works as single publications – but they fail us here, where we are faced with a non-normative, complex web of publications creating what is editorially and officially a **set** of works both individual and connected. Rather than continuing to ignore this problem, theoretically challenging and groundbreaking work is necessary.

(1) (b) We also lack theory that addresses the ways that poems can be combined in collections and cycles that goes beyond the traditional conceptions of composing a work of poetry as something that occurs once and is completed forever. What is required here is a thinking-through of the multiple ways poems can be selected, collected, arranged, juxtaposed, and combined, and the consequences these decisions have on the possibilities of meaning for the

whole of the collection **and** for the individual poems embedded within it. This is something that, if we had the framework and terminology for the fact of the phenomenon of a poetic work-group, could easily prove exciting and enlightening, and could be done with such work-groups as the *Hebräische Balladen* in mind.

(2) The reason this theoretical work is necessary is because, as has also been made clear with regard to Lasker-Schüler in particular – **nobody seems to know what to do with these things or how to read them**. This work has been attempted on the side of both editors and literary analysts, but in ways that corrupt, in ways that excise poems from their context, in ways that ultimately do not face what is actually at hand or the complexity of what Lasker-Schüler actually created. Lasker-Schüler wrote interesting poems, to be sure, but she clearly also did so much more than that, and this has not been made visible yet. Without this framework, it appears to be chaos. This dissertation has begun to give that a closer look, to find an order in it. Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* is only one example of a new way of creating literary and poetic texts that occurred 100 years ago, and this demands new ways of dealing with such complex groups of works in the field of literature.

(3) We lack an edition that addresses and accessibly presents this complexity and all of the information needed, that would enable those working in the field of literature to begin to read what is actually there. The final chapter will be a reflection on what such an edition could look like and how this information and these publications could be adequately and accessibly presented. How could a different edition be created and structured in a way that highlights the complexity and multiplicity of this work-group rather than sweeping it under the rug, that makes the reception and posthumous edition problems obvious, that makes the work that still needs to be done finally possible?

Chapter Four: Presentation Possibilities

I. Introduction

Major improvements have been made with regard to Else Lasker-Schüler's edition history since the appearance of several corrupt posthumous editions, most especially because of Norbert Oellers and the historico-critical edition on which he collaborated as editor. It is also true, however, that we still lack an edition that accessibly presents the *Hebräische Balladen* publications and the fact of their multiplicity, as they were created, and that explicitly addresses the problem of corrupt versions. The most immediate consequences of this lack of such an edition are, as we have seen, the fact that corrupt editions and ensuing faulty scholarship have continued to circulate and wreak havoc on reception even after the appearance of the historico-critical edition, and second, the fact that, beyond and also despite Christine Radde's noteworthy contribution in particular, there is still a glaring lack of thorough literary scholarship on Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* outside of the inadmissible and problematic – that is to say, scholarship that is not based on corrupt versions, does not in some way perpetuate misinformation from scholarship which was based on these editions, is also aware of and makes explicit the fact of the multiple publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*, and finally, considers even **one** of the *Hebräische Balladen* publications in depth as Lasker-Schüler actually created them, reading poems within their composed and author-authorized cyclical contexts rather than (for example) excising them from these contexts and reading them individually and chronologically in order of first appearance.

What kind of edition is needed to address this complexity in an accessible way and thereby enable the work on the *Hebräische Balladen* that has yet to be done – a reading of what

Lasker-Schüler actually created? What could such an edition look like? What possibilities for presentation exist? Who are the readers, and what might readers expect or need such an edition to do? This chapter means to consider editions theory and practice in order to reflect on the question of how this phenomenon of a work-group might most appropriately be presented in an edition, whether book, digital, or hybrid, and thereby finally made available and accessible to a reading public.

II. Multiple ‘Versions’ in Practice & Theory (or: Texts versus Works)

Variation Apparatuses

Many different forms of editions exist that have found a variety of individualized and text-specific solutions to the question or problem of multiple ‘versions’ – that is, of how to present readers with manuscripts, especially those that are either unpublished variations or early drafts of a published work, or fragments or versions of an unpublished text.⁵³⁵ Where editors are faced specifically with a situation of multiple unpublished versions relating to a single author-authorized, published work, common text-genetic edition practice is that the work is provided in the main body of the volume, and variations are included in an appendix, either in the back of the book or in a separate volume, frequently via encoding all of the information into *Siglen* and

⁵³⁵ The word *text* is used in editions theory in a few ways, which the reader will observe throughout this chapter. All works are texts, but not all texts are works (which are authorized for publication by their author in their specific form). Occasionally, editors use this term to refer to a body of related manuscripts (or *Fassungen*) that may or may not include a corresponding published work. Quotes included in this chapter will often use the term *text* to refer to both works and unpublished materials – the materials in general with which editors work – but when used by the author of this dissertation, the reader is to assume that the term refers specifically and only to texts that are not (author-authorized published) works. Where necessary, I will use the clarifying terms “unpublished text” or “manuscript” and “work” or “publication” to distinguish between texts that are works and texts that are not.

various types of *Variantenapparate*, with the expectation that readers will (or will even be able to) reconstruct a full picture of each different text for themselves from there.

The types of apparatuses⁵³⁶ used for the purpose of displaying variations include:

(1) *lemmatisierte Einzelstellenapparate* for which

wird zunächst das entsprechende Bezugswort (Lemma) aus dem Edierten Text angegeben, es folgt eine nach links geöffnete eckige Klammer. Danach wird die jeweilige Varianz verzeichnet und mit einer Sigle für den Textträger bzw. den Schreiber geschlossen.⁵³⁷

As per the example given by Bodo Plachta, if the edited text reads “das große Haus am Bach” and the abweichender Druck *D*²” reads: “das große Schloß am Bach,” then this type of *Variantenverzeichnis* appears as follows: Haus] Schloß *D*².⁵³⁸

(2) *nichtlemmatisierte Einzelstellenapparate*, a variety of the former type which “verzichtet dabei auf ein Bezugswort.”⁵³⁹ Following the example given for the *lemmatisierte* version, this type of variation apparatus would look like: Schloß *D*². Plachta also notes that because *Schloß* could technically replace *Bach* instead of *Haus*, if it is unclear which word is being replaced,

⁵³⁶ The reader should note that, while not ideal, the term apparatus or *Apparat* in editions theory can refer to two separate concepts or forms: (1) There is the *textkritischer Apparat* or *Variantenapparat*, which specifically refers to a type (and as the reader will see, several different subtypes) of a *Variantenverzeichnis*; that is, these are forms used to display specific changes and variations across a body of texts (here broadly manuscripts, publications, or a mix of both). (2) There is also, of course, the *Apparat* in the broader sense, referring to a whole and singular part of a historico-critical edition that contains information as to editorial decisions for text-basis and structure (for example), *Entstehungsgeschichte* of texts and works, reception during the author’s lifetime, documentation of sources, the *Kommentar* or *Erläuterungen* illuminating things for readers such as now obsolete words and references, and the *Variantenverzeichnis* for texts and works (which may or may not take the form of a text-critical *Variantenapparat*, as will be detailed in this chapter). For the purposes of this chapter on different methods for displaying variations across texts and works, apparatus will usually be clarified as “variation” or “text-critical” and follow Plachta’s and other theorist’s usage of the term in the sense of meaning number (1). Where the term apparatus is used in the sense of the second and broader meaning, this will also be clarified.

⁵³⁷ See: Plachta, Bodo. *Editionswissenschaft. Eine Einführung in Methode und Praxis der Edition neuerer Texte*, 2nd ed., (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2006), 101. Henceforth referred to as Plachta, *EW*.

⁵³⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵³⁹ *Ibid.*

editors may add an extra clarifying word: große Schloß D^2 .⁵⁴⁰ If something is deleted in another version rather than changed or added, editors may use [] to symbolize this.⁵⁴¹

(3) *Einblendungsapparate*, for which

werden die auftretenden Varianten oder Korrekturvorgänge unmittelbar in den fortlaufenden Text »eingebildet«, wobei der Zweckmäßigkeit halber stets die Genese nur eines Textträgers zugrundegelegt werden sollte. Aber auch mehrere Textträger lassen sich in einem Einblendungsapparat zusammenfassen, wenn die Abweichungen nicht zu umfangreich sind.⁵⁴²

An example comes from Goethe's memoir *Dichtung und Wahrheit*. Plachta explains:

Die variante Passage entstammt einer Textredaktion (H^{g219}), die erst nach Goethes Tod entstanden ist und in spitzen Klammern linear in den Text eingebildet Korrekturen von Riemer (*Ri*) und Bleistiftkorrekturen von Eckermann (Ec^b) dokumentiert. Der in der Altphilologie gebräuchliche kursive Doppelpunkt entspricht der Lemmaklammer, das Zeichen > weist auf eine Sofortkorrektur, und die Abkürzungen *propon* und *erg* sind in »schlägt vor« bzw. »ergänzt« aufzulösen.⁵⁴³

The example *Variantenapparat* follows:

sich <: ich Ec^b > konnte nicht ohne sie, sie nicht ohne mich seyn; aber < so> > in den Umgebungen und bey den Einwirkungen Anderer, <: ihres Kreises, *propon Ri* : einzelner Glieder ihres Kreises, Ec^b > was ergaben sich da <oft *erg RiEc^b*> für Mißtage und Fehlstunden! (Ec^b) H^{g219} .⁵⁴⁴

Plachta also provides a further example involving an entirely different set of special symbols, many of which are unable to be reproduced here, conceptualized for another textual circumstance, namely for Klopstock's *Arbeitstagebuch*, in order to denote deletions ([]), additions ([] but without the bottom corners of the brackets), the extent of a change made (a small triangle on either side of the change), changes from later variants (:), immediate corrections (a lightning bolt), an event in which the chronology of a variation is unclear (>),

⁵⁴⁰ Plachta, *EW*, 101.

⁵⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 102. Common for all types of apparatuses.

⁵⁴² *Ibid.*

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

correction through replaced text (ˆ), and text expanded by the editor (< >).⁵⁴⁵ The reader should therefore note that in each case, editors adapt such text-critical apparatus models, especially the symbols used, according to the individual and often quite particular needs of a specific text or set of texts.

(4) *Treppenapparate*, a form which

bietet sich für Textträger an, die durch Textabbrüche gekennzeichnet sind, z. B. dadurch, daß der Autor immer wieder Sofortkorrekturen vorgenommen oder sich alternative Formulierungen notiert hat, die er erst in einem späteren Korrekturgang einer Revision unterzog. [...] Anwendbar ist diese Methode aber ebenso bei einem Arbeitsverfahren, in dem die Grundschrift eines Textes vollständig niedergeschrieben und erst in weiteren Arbeitsschritten korrigiert und überarbeitet worden ist. Beim Treppenapparat werden die Korrekturfolgen mit einer aufsteigenden Ziffern- bzw. Buchstabenfolge entsprechend der textgenetischen Chronologie bezeichnet. Dabei ist zu beachten, daß die jeweils höhere Textstufe die vorangehende aufhebt: Textstufe (2) hebt Textstufe (1) und Textstufe (b) hebt Textstufe (a) auf usw.⁵⁴⁶

The example here comes from Heinrich Heine's manuscript draft (*H'*) of the 9th stanza of *Nachtgedanken*, for which Plachta first explains the symbols:

Das Zeichen /::/ umschließt Wiederholungen von Wörtern, Textpassagen und Interpunktionszeichen durch den Editor, die in der Handschrift nur einmal vorkommen. Unterpunktierung kennzeichnet unleserliche Buchstaben bzw. Wörter. Eckige Klammern markieren Streichungen Heines.⁵⁴⁷

The example for this style of variation apparatus follows:

Edierter Text (DHA 2,130):

Und zählen muß ich – Mit der Zahl
Schwillt immer höher meine Qual,
Mir ist als wälzten sich die Leichen
Auf meine Brust – Gottlob! sie weichen!

Apparat (DHA 2,774):

Und *bis* weichen!]
(1) Ich kann nicht

⁵⁴⁵ Plachta, *EW*, 103.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 104-105.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 105.

The example provided for this form comes from the poem *Der Zweifler* by Bertolt Brecht. The manuscripts included are:

ein Schreibmaschinentyposkript (Sigle T1: Grundschrift mit Sofortkorrekturen; T1.1: spätere Korrekturen im Typoskript auf T1; T2: vermutlich spätere Einfügungen in das Typoskript), das handschriftlich mit Bleistift (Sigle: H3) überarbeitet worden ist. [...] Das Zeichen ” zeigt die Wiederholung des darüberstehenden Worts oder Satzzeichens an.⁵⁵¹

Especially noteworthy is perhaps the remark that “[d]ie weitere Überlieferung dieses Gedichts in seinen Drucken wird hier nicht berücksichtigt.”⁵⁵² (!) The example, (abridged here for brevity), follows:

Edierter Text:

der zweifler

immer wenn uns
 die antwort auf eine frage gefunden schien
 löste einer von uns an der wand die schnur der alten
 aufgerollten chinesischen leinwand, sodass sie herabfiel und
 sichtbar wurde der mann auf der bank, der
 so sehr zweifelte.
 [...]

Apparat:

Titel	T1-H3	der zweifler
1	T1-T2	immer wenn ---
	H3	” ” uns
2	T1-H3	die antwort auf eine frage gefunden schien
3	T1	löste einer von uns an der wand ----- die alte
	T1.1	” ” ” ” ” ” ” den knoten
	T1.1	” ” ” ” ” ” ” die schnur
	H3	” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” der ” n
4	T1	aufgerollte-- chinesische-- leinwand, sodass sie herabfiel und
	T1.1	” n ” n ” ” ” ” ” ” ”
5	T1-H3	sichtbar wurde der mann auf der bank, der
6	T1-H3	so sehr zweifelte.
		[...] ⁵⁵³

⁵⁵¹ Plachta, *EW*, 107. He notes that all manuscripts included are found under *Signatur 338/8* in the *Brecht-Archiv*.

⁵⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵⁵³ *Ibid.*, 111.

In each of these cases it is clear that readers using such a variation apparatus, regardless of type, require education as to their purpose, structure, and symbols, in order to adequately understand them – and that even with all of this, as well as a clear edited ‘end’ text to reference, it is relatively complex and difficult work for a reader to discern and reconstruct the separate texts a *Variantenapparat* is attempting to show.

Oftentimes, furthermore, editions employ these forms to show variations because they aim overall to put the **writing process** leading up to a publication on display, to provide text-genetic insight into the final product of a published work through supplementary unpublished material from the process of its conception, and/or to present material that was never published and perhaps has no corresponding work in its unpublished state and form, to a reading public.

According to Plachta:

Den Prozeß der Textentstehung über mehrere Bearbeitungsstufen hinweg zu verfolgen und in einem Apparat verständlich darzustellen, ohne daß der Leser auf die originalen Handschriften, Typoskripte oder Drucke, in denen sich die Textgenese vollzieht, zurückgreifen muß, wird heute als eine der wichtigsten editorischen Aufgaben angesehen. Allerdings sind die dafür entwickelten Darstellungsverfahren nicht immer ohne weiteres zu verstehen [...].⁵⁵⁴

The reason this is relevant, of course, is that as we have seen in the case of Lasker-Schüler’s historico-critical edition, the methods in practice for dealing with a single author-authorized work and multiple unpublished manuscript versions in particular are also applied to situations wherein what editors have instead are multiple separate and different but fundamentally and intimately related and interconnected **publications**.

⁵⁵⁴ Plachta, *EW*, 99.

Common Alternatives

The first major issue with this is that this practice is not ideal even for texts that are not works (and even where an intended academic audience is concerned). Plachta laments:

Die Uneinheitlichkeit und Kompliziertheit vieler Apparate, ihrer Zeichensysteme und ihrer deskriptiven Beigaben resultieren in vielen Fällen zusätzlich aus der spezifischen Überlieferung eines Textes oder der hermetischen Arbeitsweise eines Autors. Eine von Korrekturen übersäte und mit vielen Einfügungen oder Umstellungen versehene Handschrift wird immer ein Gegenstand bleiben, der nur mühsam zu entschlüsselnde Sachverhalte und Informationen des Arbeitsprozesses enthält.⁵⁵⁵

Further criticism for text-critical variation apparatuses, (in fact much more blatant derision), comes from French editor Almuth Grésillon, who refers to such forms as essentially useless “unleserliche Feigenblätter”⁵⁵⁶ and “ein[] bloß überkommen[es] Modell!”⁵⁵⁷

That these models are an unsatisfactory approach to presenting variations throughout textual development as they were intended to do is furthermore made evident by the fact that many editors have experimented and tried to find better (i.e. more accessible, clear, user-friendly, comprehensible, less cryptic and encoded) ways of presenting readers with unpublished manuscript variations and fragmented texts. The most frequent alternatives involve facsimiles and/or (sometimes graphically reproduced) transcriptions of a manuscript, so that readers might be able to more easily and immediately grasp and see what has actually been created, represented in its actual (or at least more close to actual) unfinalized form(s). Facsimiles and/or transcriptions

⁵⁵⁵ Plachta, *EW*, 99. This comes from the introduction to his text in which he explains why he deems it necessary in the first place for him to write a text that lays out the definitions and demonstrations of the various types of *Varietenapparate*.

⁵⁵⁶ Grésillon, Almuth. *Literarische Handschriften: Einführung in die „critique génétique*,” (Bern: P. Lang, 1999), 217. As quoted in: Sahle, Patrik. *Digitale Editionsformen. Zum Umgang mit der Überlieferung unter den Bedingung des Medienwandels. Teil 1: Das typographische Erbe*, in: *Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, v. 7, (Books on Demand: Norderstedt, 2013), 206.

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

are sometimes included, in full or in excerpt, in an appendix or supplementary volume (that is, as part of a historico-critical apparatus in the singular, broader sense)⁵⁵⁸ along with a corresponding published work, and this can be done either in place of or in supplement to variation apparatuses attempting to highlight very specific differences across texts. To name a rather basic example in comparison with some others, a student edition of Büchner's *Woyzeck* provides, in lieu of a variation apparatus, a simple (non graphically reproduced) transcription of the separate fragments which were edited into *Woyzeck* by someone other than their author (without facsimiles) directly **before** the reading text – the much more commonly known version of the play; both are in the main body of the volume.⁵⁵⁹

Facsimiles and/or transcriptions are also sometimes used to present unpublished manuscripts as the focus of their own edition or volume. Examples of this largely include editions and volumes dedicated specifically to presenting a reading audience with fragments that do not correspond to a(n authorized) work. When the version of a 'work' the reading public has had access to before the appearance of the edition of fragments or unpublished manuscripts is a corruption, such as with Friedrich Nietzsche's (sister's) *Wille zur Macht*⁵⁶⁰ or Franz Kafka's never (author-authorized) published texts (*der Process*, to name one example), editions or

⁵⁵⁸ Refer to footnote 535.

⁵⁵⁹ Büchner, Georg. *Woyzeck*, in: *Werke und Briefe. Münchner Ausgabe*, ed. Karl Pöribacher, Gerhard Schaub, Hans-Joachim Simm and Edda Ziegler, 12th ed., (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2006). (1st ed. – Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1988). The reading text **follows** the clearly marked "Entwurfstufen" in the volume (198-232). The "Lesefassung" is then clearly marked as such, as well as that it was "erarbeitet von Werner R. Lehmann" (233-255).

⁵⁶⁰ See: Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Arbeitshefte*, sec. 8-9, ed. Marie-Luise Haase, Bettina Reimers, et al, in: *Nietzsches Werke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006). *Nietzsches Werke* was originally edited by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, beginning publication in 1967. The inclusion of the *Hefte* was not originally planned and was published as an addendum after the deaths of Colli and Montinari. In the original volumes of the edition before the *Hefte*, Colli and Montinari refuse to list *Wille zur Macht* as a work and make explicit that this is because it was abandoned by the author himself well before any kind of completion and the 'work' readers know is actually a series of corrupted publications put out by Nietzsche's sister; later editors accompanied this choice with *Hefte* volumes marking certain passages in the facsimile pages to show just how much editorial infringement was committed by Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche.

volumes dedicated to transcriptions and/or facsimiles of an author's unpublished manuscripts become a way of presenting readers with what the author actually created, to make the editing of a foreign hand in the well-known corruption or non-author-authorized publication transparent.⁵⁶¹ On other occasions, editions in which facsimiles and transcriptions of unpublished manuscripts are the main event are created to present an entirely unknown text (or multiple versions or fragments of it) from a well-known author. Such editions of unpublished texts are treated as stand-alone in their own right.

Norbert Oeller's publication of the 1915/16 *Hebräische Balladen* manuscript⁵⁶² is one such edition; this book treats an unpublished manuscript corresponding to multiple publications as deserving of its own posthumous edition – something for which, unfortunately, none of Lasker-Schüler's actual publications of the *Hebräische Balladen* outside of the publication from 1914 have been deemed worthy. When Oellers published Lasker-Schüler's handwritten manuscript of the *Hebräische Balladen* from 1915/16, he chose to put it in its own edition in full facsimile, with transcriptions following the full manuscript, as well as a conclusion providing the reader with more information on publication history, etc. If unpublished texts, with or without corresponding author-authorized works, are frequently seen as worthy of their own editions and volumes, why should multiple authorized **works** be handled as less worthy of page real estate, instead fragmented, condensed, and encoded into various charts, variation apparatuses, and symbols in an appendix?

⁵⁶¹ See: Kafka, Franz. *Der Process*, ed. Roland Reuss and Peter Staengle, (Basel: Stroemfeld, 1997). In 16 parts with a CD, "issued in slipcase with individual chapters laid in separately to allow succession not specified originally by the author but variously interpreted by editors." With Stroemfeld / Roter Stern's edition of Franz Kafka's *der Process* from 1997, editors Roland Reuss and Peter Staengle provide facsimiles and transcription of handwritten manuscripts rather than a cleanly edited and seemingly final body of text, because Kafka himself never published nor authorized the book most readers know as his work; they also avoid the editorial infringement of deciding on a chapter order, which Kafka never finalized or authorized himself, by presenting each chapter as its own separate volume, so that readers might approach these in any or in multiple different orders.

⁵⁶² Oellers (2000).

Of course, while such alternatives as facsimiles and transcriptions may be more immediately intelligible than text-critical apparatuses, and visually give a reader a much better overview of what an unpublished text looks like as a whole in the form created by its author, (the second point also being true in comparison to a reading text pieced together and cleaned up by an editor), **they are not viable options for presenting work-groups, because work-groups are not made up of unpublished texts but rather publications**, and the goal of presenting them as a set of variations in an edition is not to give readers a look into texts in their unfinalized forms or into the writing process and textual development leading up to a single authorized work.

These alternatives (or more comprehensible supplements) to a variation apparatus are not suited for presenting multiple publications, and so the default option of placing one publication in the main body in full as the representative work and all others (at least in the case of a text-genetic or historico-critical edition) into text-critical apparatuses and abbreviations in an appendix remains the current common practice for multiple varying publications. This is done just as if there were, in fact, multiple manuscript versions and a single publication. If editors can and do attempt to remedy the problem of cryptic and inaccessible codes, variation apparatuses, and charts relegated to the appendix of an edition in such complex cases as a situation of multiple varying unpublished texts with or without an (author-authorized) publication, why not also try to find better solutions to presenting what is an equally prevalent, and in comparison much simpler, situation of multiple authorized publications in a work-group?

Texts versus Works

The second (major!) issue with applying the methods for handling one published work and multiple unpublished texts to multiple publications, it follows, is that such editions of unpublished texts, either on their own or in conjunction with a single published work, attempt to make concepts and conceptualizations of a *text* –that is, not an author-authorized, published *work*– visible. Texts which are not works (i.e. not published or authorized for publication by their author in that form) are considered to be both static and dynamic, fixed in that they are written down but open in that they are part of a process and not published or finalized;⁵⁶³ they are not closed in the same way that a work is upon the act of its publication. With text-genetic editions,

wollte [man] grundsätzlich weg vom finalen Werk, in dem man nur noch die „Totenmaske der Konzeption“ sah, und hin zur lebendigen kognitiven Aktivität. In der Edition wollte man statt der erstarrten Endform des dynamischen Textes die Textdynamik selbst abbilden; statt des Produkts den Prozess (die Produktivität – productivité); statt der Schrift (écrit) das Schreiben (écriture); statt des Textes die avant-textes. Philologie als Kunstwissenschaft sollte der Erforschung der Literatur als Kunst und als dynamischer künstlerischer Prozess der (Ver-)Dichtung dienen.⁵⁶⁴

When works, closed entities, are described as having an openness and dynamic character of their own, this is not the same kind of openness as that of an unpublished text, but instead refers to the open and dynamic nature of the generation of meaning by the readers in its reception. This does not undermine the closed nature of a work but rather is a direct result of it (*Dialektik der Abgeschlossenheit*).⁵⁶⁵ In contrast to a set of material including multiple

⁵⁶³ Refer to: Martens, *Werk*, 175-186.; *Ibid.*, *Text*, 94-11.; Martus.

⁵⁶⁴ Sahle, 205.

⁵⁶⁵ Refer to: Martens, *Werk*, 178. As mentioned in a previous chapter, the author also becomes a part of this readership, whereby the closed nature of a work is proven and not undermined by those situations where they pick

unpublished *texts* and a single corresponding authorized *work*, multiple interconnected publications are each closed; their multiplicity does not undo this, nor does the most recent publication undermine the closed nature or work-character of the former.

The conceptualizations of text and work are certainly similar (it is true that all works are texts), but they are also intrinsically different and by no means interchangeable (not all texts are works). Why should the practices developed for one, conceptualized specifically to highlight the unfinished or more specifically unpublished nature of a text and the nature of the writing process itself, particularly in conjunction with the presentation of a single work emerging as the published result of this process, be applied to the other, in this case multiple intimately connected and simultaneously varying **publications**?

Modifications of text-critical apparatus forms that allow for this distinction between text and work to date, for a situation in which there are multiple different publications and unpublished manuscripts, usually involve simply denoting whether a variation listed is from an unpublished text or publication using abbreviations such as D (for *Druck*) and H (for *Handschrift*) – as is the case with the Lasker-Schüler *Werke und Briefe*⁵⁶⁶ – rather than handling them separately or differently. There is a theoretical editorial consensus that every version – here meant to include both unpublished texts and published works – after the author’s death should be dealt with as equally valid and *gleichwertig*,⁵⁶⁷ this of course does not change the separation in definitions of, nor the importance of at least denoting the difference between, published

the work back up and break it open again to work on it again, since the stage before revisiting and revising the work involves the author as a receiver participating in the generating of meaning through reception of their own work. (See also: Klausnitzer, 297.)

⁵⁶⁶ Here, the reader may recall, the abbreviations distinguishing text from publication include H and D but also include some further *Siglen* that are a bit more complex as well, for example referring to GG (*Gesammelte Gedichte*) and HB (*Hebräische Balladen*).

⁵⁶⁷ See: Scheibe, 20.

authorized works and unpublished texts. These abbreviations serve as evidence of that theoretical distinction and editorial conviction.

What this minor method of distinguishing between unpublished texts and publications does not do, however, is solve the problem of accessibility and comprehensibility of a variation apparatus, nor the problem that this information, when given in an appendix (if at all, depending on the type of edition), is by all appearances made supplementary and secondary to the work chosen to be presented in full in a volume and is ultimately treated as hierarchically less important and less immediately relevant through the practice of relegating it (particularly in encoded chart and list form) to either the back of the book or a separate volume full of (other) supplementary information such as commentary. Perhaps most importantly, the physical separation of a work-group into main information (full reading texts) and extra information (such as charts and variation apparatuses) defines a functional reality for readers of such an edition, especially when the ‘other’ information is not presented in an easily comprehensible or user-friendly manner; it forms a hierarchy between, and shapes a reader’s approach to, the work provided in the main body and its optionally accessed, strewn about, encrypted and difficult-to-decode counterparts. This functional hierarchy is also in place when editors use either text-critical apparatuses or facsimiles and transcriptions to present unpublished textual variations in the appendix or commentary volume of an edition containing a corresponding author-authorized published work – but when this is not a situation of a work-group made up of many significantly varying publications, it is arguably more appropriate to consider this supplementary information and to present it as such.

Variation Apparatuses for Poems, Charts for Cycles?

A further and final problem with applying this method to a work-group such as *Hebräische Balladen* is that *Variantenapparate* attempt to provide the reader with a condensed list of very particular details such as specific varying word choices from a single work to its varying counterparts, here both print and manuscript. This does not adapt well to this work-group nor give the full picture a reader would need, not only because (a) it is difficult for most to decipher, (b) this is a practice or model usually used show the development and changes made throughout the writing process from manuscripts and drafts into a final product (the work), a situation which does not apply here (or perhaps applies several times over and is problematically not made separate from any such changes across **publications** in a clear and comprehensible manner), or (c) it puts multiple publications into an appendix and on par with drafts and manuscripts as ultimately supplementary information to the one work chosen to be presented in full – but also because each text-critical apparatus is only able to show variations across (here published) versions of **one individual poem at a time** and not from whole collection to whole collection.

As previously demonstrated, the changes across *Hebräische Balladen* publications have much more to do with larger-scale composition in terms of order and number of poems than changes to specific poems themselves. The historico-critical edition *Werke und Briefe* attempts to make up for the inability of the (in this case *lemmatisierte*) variation apparatuses for each individual poem (found in the subsections titled *Varianten und Lesarten*) to give readers a full overview of the changes across the work-group by also including multiple charts that are intended to show readers which poems have been included in which order in differing

publications. As noted in the previous chapter, however, the end result is unfortunately that readers are left with multiple different variation apparatuses for each individual poem and multiple charts comparing sets of publications (and the manuscript from 1915/16), all of which are listed in widely spread out locations in the *Anmerkungen* volume. This approach ultimately sends any readers who may show an initial interest in the fact of the multiple publications of this work-group (information not made immediately apparent in the first place) on a hunt for multiple sets of complexly fragmented and convoluted information, all of which they must find in several different locations, some of which the reader would only know to look for in the first place if they have already managed to unencrypt certain other pieces of information beforehand (for example, which poems were ever included in any *Hebräische Balladen* publication), and all of which they must learn how to decode, then decrypt individually, and finally synthesize in order to have any chance at getting a vague idea or overview of how each of Lasker-Schüler's multiple publications of *Hebräische Balladen* differ from one another. In the end, this approach to editing and presenting Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* manages to center only the publication of the 1914, provided as a reading text, and to functionally designate all other publications to the lower position of supplementary information, and supplementary information that must furthermore be hard earned if the reader wishes or attempts to work so hard for it at all.

It is at this point rather clear: the practice for editing and presenting variations across multiple unpublished versions (usually corresponding to a single work) are not suited or fitting to be the practice applied to multiple differing authorized publications within a work-group, i.e. that one is published in front and the others are banished to the appendix in a series of variation apparatuses and charts if they are mentioned or included in any way at all. These are essentially and intrinsically very different situations, and the work-group deserves consideration and

solutions specific to itself. What we still need are editions that are better able to address and present the specific phenomenon of work-groups – multiple separate and different but fundamentally and intimately related and interconnected *publications* – and that do so more accessibly than what has to date been the common practice for either unpublished manuscripts or published variations.

III. Poetry Editions (and: Edition is Interpretation)

Beyond the previous considerations of the solutions and practices that editors have found for dealing with unpublished texts as well as (unsatisfactorily) adapting them to a work-group, it is necessary to turn to another important aspect of the work-group *Hebräische Balladen* and its specific needs, before the question of how to present a work-group accessibly can be adequately answered. The *Hebräische Balladen* are a series of authorized publications, but more specifically, they are **also** a work-group of poetry collections, and they therefore require an edition that can sufficiently and accessibly showcase not just a set of multiple interconnected publications i.e. works, but a set of multiple publications which are also each differently composed and arranged works-within-works (*Werkkomplexe*).⁵⁶⁸ What is a poetry edition? How must these be – or how are they – different from other kinds of editions?

The “Frage nach den Besonderheiten der Lyrik-Edition ist bislang noch nicht hinreichend in der Forschung berücksichtigt worden.”⁵⁶⁹ Poetry editions present “neben den für die Edition

⁵⁶⁸ Martens, *Werk*, 182.

⁵⁶⁹ Burdorf, 2.

jedes literarischen Textes relevanten Problemen eine Reihe spezifischer Anforderungen,”⁵⁷⁰ including (but not limited to) *Einheit des Gedichts*, *Zyklen- und Gruppenbildung*, *Varianten und Fassungen*, and *Handschrift und Druck*.⁵⁷¹ Editors of poetry editions must grapple with questions such as “Welche Rolle spielen [...] Paratexte wie insbesondere Gedichttitel oder Nummerierungen?”⁵⁷² and “Welche Kriterien gibt es, um mehrere Gedichte als in einen Zusammenhang gehörig zu erkennen, und wie ist eine solche Erkenntnis editorisch umzusetzen?”⁵⁷³ Dieter Burdorf remarks that “in all diesen Fällen stellt sich das Problem von Einheit und Vielheit eines Textes, zugleich auch das der Hierarchisierung von Texten oder Textteilen”⁵⁷⁴ and that “[b]ei einigen Gedichten liegen sowohl handschriftliche als auch gedruckte Fassungen vor,”⁵⁷⁵ in which case editors are to determine the status (“autorisiert und wenn ja in welcher Form?”) and chronology.⁵⁷⁶ According to Burdorf:

Obwohl einige diese Probleme auch bei der Edition nichtlyrischer Texte auftauchen, stellen sie sich doch bei lyrischen Texten in besonderer Weise. Das Spezifische besteht vor allem darin, dass die Einheiten Vers – Strophe – Text – Zyklus bei Gedichten (jedenfalls bei solchen traditioneller Bauart) untereinander eng zusammenhängen, da eine Strophe nur aus einer festen Anzahl von (möglichst auch gleich oder jedenfalls nach einer festen Regel gebauten) Versen besteht, ein strophisches Gedicht aus gleich gebauten Strophen, ein Zyklus aus formal oder inhaltlich verbundenen Gedichten. In der modernen Lyrik [...] werden allerdings diese Selbstverständlichkeiten in Frage gestellt. Jede Edition, die im Überlieferungsträger nicht vorhandene Einheiten rekonstruiert oder konstituiert, muss Rechenschaft darüber ablegen, aufgrund welches Verständnisse von Text und Gedicht sie das tut.⁵⁷⁷

⁵⁷⁰ Burdorf, 10.

⁵⁷¹ Ibid., 10-11.

⁵⁷² Ibid., 10.

⁵⁷³ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁵⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁷ Ibid.

Poetry is a genre that presents its own set of issues and needs that editors must face and for which they must tailor solutions when making an edition, and this becomes especially crucial when multiple versions and/or publications are to be included as part of the picture.

Work-Groups & Text-Genetic Poetry Editions

The fact alone that text-genetic and *critique génétique* editions are “besonders bei Lyrikeditionen häufig zu finden”⁵⁷⁸ since their conception in the 20th century⁵⁷⁹ highlights that something is going on with regard to poetic texts and works and their special tendency toward multiple versions as well as multiple publications in different contexts,⁵⁸⁰ especially in consideration of the special inherent part to whole relationship, movability of parts, and process of composing individual poems as well as collections and cycles. Peter Goßens extrapolates here on text-genetic poetry editions:

Solche [Lyrik-]Editionen dienen in erster Linie der Sicherung, Erschließung und damit auch Überlieferung literarischer Nachlässe und der Herstellung eines möglichst »authentischen Text[es] in seiner originalen historischen Gestalt«. In der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts hat sich zudem aus der Beschäftigung mit Fassungen und Varianten ein editorisches Spezialinteresse an der »Textgenese« entwickelt, das sich unter textdynamischen Gesichtspunkten mit den Entstehungsbedingungen literarischer Texte beschäftigt. Gerade in diesem Bereich spielte u.a. mit den o.g. Ausgaben von Celan, Heym und Trakl die Edition von Lyrik eine zentrale Rolle und hat der Forschung, aber auch dem »normalen« Leser neue Erkenntnismöglichkeiten über die Entstehungsprozesse von Dichtung eröffnet. Historisch-kritische Editionen versuchen dabei auf der Grundlage der ihnen zur Verfügung stehenden Materialien einen »gültigen« Text

⁵⁷⁸ Goßens, 274.

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁸⁰ Though the multiple publications aspect may not quite as often involve multiple differing but interconnected publications of cycles such as the *Hebräische Balladen*, or *Phantasmus* or *Hauspostille*, editors of poetry editions are still tasked with making decisions on selection, ordering, and general presentation of poems and published variations, largely because of common modern publication specific to poetry, wherein individual poem titles have been published in multiple contexts such as almanacs and author-authorized cycles and collections, and perhaps also in differing forms.

unter Zuhilfenahme möglichst objektiver Darstellungs- und Rekonstruktionsmethoden herzustellen.⁵⁸¹

As previously discussed, text-genetic poetry editions do not specifically (and were not intended to) address the issue of multiple publications or the phenomenon of work-groups in particular, but rather unpublished fragments, texts, and manuscripts from an author's *Nachlass*, sometimes leading toward a final publication, and in general, to put the writing process and development of poetic works on display:

Während alle bisher vorgestellten Editionsmodelle den Gedichttext als statische Einheit zeigten, die als Ganzes ediert und gelesen werden konnte, gehen die textgenetischen Editionen von einem dynamischen Textbegriff aus, der in der Genese eines Gedichtes »eine Qualität des Textes selbst« sieht. Textgenetische Editionen versuchen, die Entstehung des Textes bis in die ›Werkstatt des Dichters‹ zurückzuverfolgen. Bei diesem Editionstypus, dem fast all historisch-kritischen Lyrikeditionen der letzten Jahrzehnte zuzurechnen sind, steht nicht mehr die Edition eines ›authentischen‹ Lesetextes, sondern der Entstehungsprozess eines Gedichtes im Mittelpunkt. Jede dieser Editionen hat ein mehr oder minder eigenes Zugangsmodell für den Umgang mit dem jeweiligen Nachlassbefund entwickelt. Auch wenn die Dynamik der meisten Textgenesen in der Edition eines (statischen) gedruckten Textes letzter Hand ihr Ende findet, ist dieser Lesetext nicht das Zentrum textgenetischer Editionen; dieses ist vielmehr die Handschrift bzw. der Nachlass eines Dichters, aus dem die Genese editorisch entwickelt wird. Seit dem Erscheinen der *Frankfurter Hölderlin-Ausgabe* (1975-2008) ist daher auch das Handschriftenfaksimile nicht mehr schmückendes Beiwerk, sondern integraler Bestandteil der Edition.⁵⁸²

What Goßens is describing is very clearly a very different situation than that of presenting a **work**-group, and this is a set of goals and focal points that quite obviously is not at all fitting for a work-group like the *Hebräische Balladen*. Such editions have nonetheless clearly served as models for editions such as *Werke und Briefe*, and their structures and methods have also

⁵⁸¹ Goßens, 266. See also: Plachta, *EW*, 8.; Woesler, Winfried. "Neugermanistische Editionsleistungen des 19. Jahrhunderts," in: *Geschichte der Editionsverfahren vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart im Überblick. Ringvorlesung*, ed. Hans-Gert Roloff, (Berlin: Weidler, 2003), 124-142.; Nutt-Kofoth, Rüdiger / Plachta, Bodo (ed.). *Editionen zu deutschsprachigen Autoren als Spiegel der Editionsgeschichte*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2005).

⁵⁸² Goßens, 274. Embedded quote from: Kreuzer, Hans-Joachim. *Überlieferung und Edition. Textkritische und editorische Probleme, dargestellt am Beispiel der historisch-kritischen Kleist-Ausgabe*, (Heidelberg: 1976), 52.

translated into and greatly influenced the ways editors approach a situation of a work-group to date.

One noteworthy entry in the history of text-genetic poetry editions was *die Stuttgarter Hölderlin-Ausgabe* (1943-85),⁵⁸³ an edition tasked with presenting multiple often highly complex manuscripts of unpublished poems. Editor Friedrich Beißner chose “ein System organischer Textdarstellung, das die Entwicklung eines Gedichtes von seinen frühesten Fassungen bis zum abgeschlossenen Gedicht vorführt,”⁵⁸⁴ which was criticized for displaying an *ideales Wachstum* rather than the much less straightforward reality.⁵⁸⁵ According to Zeller, editors should more clearly separate *Befund und Deutung* and in doing so, enable the user of a (historico-critical) edition to reconstruct the *Handschrift* themselves using the diacritical editorial symbols, and thereby to answer questions of *Textkonstituierung* differently than the editors and to find answers to questions the editors themselves had not yet answered, asked, or anticipated.⁵⁸⁶

In choosing to present the 1914 (i.e. second) publication of *Hebräische Balladen* rather than the last, as well as the first publications of individual poems, at least, the editors of the *Werke und Briefe Gedichte* volume manage to avoid falling into the particular trap of displaying an *ideales Wachstum*, and indeed, the edition has enabled readers to seek answers outside the realm or capacity of the edition itself (such as those being asked in this dissertation: what do the multiple cycles of the *Hebräische Balladen* actually look like, how many publications are there

⁵⁸³ Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Sämtliche Werke*, 8 vols., ed. Friedrich Beißner, (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1943-1985).

⁵⁸⁴ Goßens, 274.

⁵⁸⁵ This term is actually Beißner's own, coming to his own defense after critiques. Beißner explains that because knowing the chronology was impossible, he was not presenting *das reale* but rather *das ideale Wachstum*: Beißner, Friedrich. “Aus der Werkstatt der Stuttgarter Hölderlin-Ausgabe,” in: Ibid., *Hölderlin. Reden und Aufsätze*, (Weimar: H. Böhlau Nachfolger, 1961), 260. See also: Nutt-Kofoth, Rüdiger (ed.), *Dokumente zur Geschichte der neugermanistischen Edition*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2011), xxvii.

⁵⁸⁶ Zeller, Hans. “Befund und Deutung. Interpretation und Dokumentation als Ziel und Methode der Edition,” in: *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. Gunter Martens und Hans Zeller, (Munich: Beck, 1971), 49; See also: Goßens, 274.

exactly, how do they differ from one another, where can they be found, and how have they been read?). In this way, it seems that *Werke und Briefe* has followed Zeller's guideline.

At the same time, *Werke und Briefe's Gedichte* volume provides a fine demonstration of both Burdorf's previously quoted statement that editors making lyric editions must be do so with a clear concept of what understanding of texts and poems they are operating under and also of Windfuhr's paradigm "Edition ist Interpretation"⁵⁸⁷ in its very structure, especially with regard to the choice to present the 1914 *Hebräische Balladen* publication in full and then each individual poem ever included in any *Hebräische Balladen* publication in chronological sections according to the date of and in the form of first publication – as noted in the first chapter appendix, usually in periodicals and literary magazines.

Single-Poem and Cycle Publications

Especially when it comes to author-authorized published poetic works, or more specifically, single poems published individually in contexts such as anthologies and almanacs, and cycle publications of poems, editors are faced with making a decision of how to structure and order the materials they are presenting, which will both stem from their conceptualization of poems and cycles and influence a reader's approach and interpretation:

Nicht *die* Lyrik-Edition, sondern die Edition von Lyrik muss dann [...] abgezirkelt in den Blick genommen werden, wenn man das Gedicht als Kurztext begreift und seine Integration in den Kontext anderer Gedichte betrachtet. Der Frage der Anordnung muss sich jede Ausgabe stellen, und die Oppositionen etwa von

⁵⁸⁷ Windfuhr, Manfred. *Die neugermanistische Edition. Zu den Grundsätzen kritischer Gesamtausgaben*, in: *DVjS* 31, (Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 1957), 440. As quoted in: Goßens, 266.

Autorordnung vs. Editorordnung oder systematischer vs. chronologischer Ordnung durchziehen die germanistischen Ausgaben seit dem 19. Jahrhundert.⁵⁸⁸

The choices editors of the *Gedichte* volume of *Werke und Briefe* made with regard to the organization and ordering of Lasker-Schüler's works do not center the final publication as though all others that came before were in directed teleology toward an ideal, but they do result in a centering of one representative work over all other corresponding publications, namely: (1) the first publication of each individual poem, and (2) the most popularly received – the second – of the *Hebräische Balladen* cycles. This is an attempt to highlight both a single representative form of each individual poem as individual works **and** a single representative form of each (set) of Lasker-Schüler's cycle publications.

The structural choice to include chronological sections of individual poems in the form of and according to the date of their first publication, excised from their (often later) context of cycles and collections is by no means without justification or reasoning. In fact, this is a specific decision made by the editors of the *Gedichte* volume of *Werke und Briefe* to center and display the fact that periodical and magazine publications of individual poems was, for Lasker-Schüler as well as generally at this historical point in time, very common practice, and typically occurred before the author would release a collection in book form:

Ein [...] Modell etabliert sich erst gegen Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts und gewinnt besonders im 20. Jahrhundert an Bedeutung: Periodika wie z.B. Almanache, Musenalmanache, Jahrbücher und Zeitschriften, aber auch Anthologien bieten Dichtern teilweise erstmals eine Plattform, um ihre Arbeiten zu präsentieren. Bis heute – das zeigt nicht zuletzt das seit 1979 erscheinende *Jahrbuch der Lyrik* wie die Rubrik *Das neue Gedicht* in der *Literarischen Welt* oder die Lyrikabdrucke, z.B. regelmäßige Abdrucke neuer Gedichte im Feuilleton der *Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung* – findet Lyrik zunächst auf diesem editorischen Weg ihr Publikum. Ein Dichter, der heute, ohne jemals zuvor in einem anderen Medium

⁵⁸⁸ Nutt-Kofoth, Rüdiger. "Zur Geschichte der Lyrik-Edition," in: *Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin*, ed. Dieter Burdorf, *editio / Beihefte*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 18. Henceforth referred to as Nutt-Kofoth, *Lyrik-Edition*.

publiziert zu haben, direkt einen eigenständigen Gedichtband vorlegt, gehört sicherlich zu den Ausnahmen. Anders als die formal offenen, periodischen Schriften sind Anthologien meist einer bestimmten Gattung bzw. lyrischen Form verpflichtet oder thematisch ausgerichtet.⁵⁸⁹

The aspect of individual poem publications in places such as almanacs and literary magazines is an extremely important part of Lasker-Schüler's publication history in general, and certainly pertaining to her *Hebräische Balladen* poems, so it should be noted in any edition presenting the *Hebräische Balladen*. Centering and making visible Lasker-Schüler's participation in this historical publishing practice with regard to poetry in particular is therefore highly respectable and utterly valid.

Dieter Burdorf emphasizes that, for poetic editions in particular,

Aspekte wie Zyklusbildung und Umstellungen sowie die Erstpublikationskontexte, z. B. in Zeitungen und Zeitschriften, sind editorisch darzustellen oder zumindest problemlos nachvollziehbar zu machen, da sie für die Interpretation jedes Einzelgedichts, das in solchen Entstehungs- und Publikationskontexten steht, relevant sind.⁵⁹⁰

The *Werke und Briefe* edition has indeed managed to strike something of a balance between *Zyklusbildung* and *Erstpublikationskontexte* – a formidable task when it comes to Else Lasker-Schüler's body of works. Unfortunately, however, the centering of individual first-edition poem publications and single representative cycle publications in the *Gedichte* volume was ultimately done at the expense of the ability to highlight Lasker-Schüler's multiple cycle publications, and thereby also her **published** *Umstellungen*, especially in a way that is *problemlos nachvollziehbar*.

Goßens remarks on the value of *Einzelausgaben* of poetic works since the 19th century, structured and composed by their authors:

⁵⁸⁹ Goßens, 270.

⁵⁹⁰ Burdorf, 14.

Dem Dichter selbst ist es ein Bedürfnis, seinen Gedichten in der materiellen Form eines Buches eine gewisse Dauer zu verleihen und sie der Vorläufigkeit von Periodika und Anthologien zu entziehen; auch in sozialer Hinsicht weist der eigenständige Gedichtband den Dichter als solchen aus.⁵⁹¹

The importance of cycle building and of regarding author's *Einzelausgaben* of poetry as significant compositional wholes only grows for modern poets:

In der Dichtung der Moderne des 20. Jahrhunderts wird der Kunstcharakter des einzelnen Gedichtbandes durch komplexe Strukturierungen wie Zyklenbildung oder inhaltliche Korrespondenzen noch weiter verstärkt. Hier übernimmt der editorische Aufbau des jeweiligen Bandes eine individuell ordnende Funktion einer ansonsten von der Regelpoetik weitgehend befreiten Lyrik.⁵⁹²

Zyklusbildung is also an extremely compelling and substantial aspect of Lasker-Schüler's publication history, and in highlighting the first publication contexts of individual poems in chronology alongside a single representative cycle publication of *Hebräische Balladen* in the main poetry volume, especially at the expense of centering her **various and multiple published** approaches to cycle building, which are addressed but placed into various separate encoded charts throughout the annotations volume, the *Werke und Briefe* edition does not adequately emphasize nor ultimately comprehensibly provide the readers the necessary information about or access to the phenomenon of her work-group consisting of multiple book publications with varying compositions.

As previously noted, moreover, *Werke und Briefe* does not resolve nor even address the problem of the chaos that corrupt posthumous editions effected on the reception of the *Hebräische Balladen*, especially with regard to the lack of clarity and confusion about the actual order of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* publications in the first place. For Lasker-Schüler's multiple published approaches to cycle building to be adequately in focus, and for

⁵⁹¹ Goßens, 271.

⁵⁹² *Ibid.*, 272.

clarity on her differing compositions of the *Hebräische Balladen* and their actual (i.e. authorized) orders, it is apparent that we require a different kind of edition.

Representation & Interpretation

“Das nur in einer ‚End version‘ präsentierte Gedicht verliert auf diese Weise viel von seiner Brisanz und verschleiert die Tatsache unterschiedlicher Lektüremöglichkeiten,”⁵⁹³ whether the ‘end product’ is the last or simply any single representative publication regardless of its chronology, and while this statement is intended to be an argument for text-genetic editions, it proves especially true if the ‘versions’ beyond the ‘end version’ chosen as representative are all also **publications** rather than manuscripts and drafts that were created during the writing process leading to a single publication.

The fact that presenting a single work as representative leads to lost opportunities and possibilities for interpretation can also easily be applied not only to single poems, but to cycles and collections as wholes. Cycles and collections are themselves *Kunstprodukte*,⁵⁹⁴ “denn hier stellt der Autor ein Korpus von Gedichten selbst zusammen und bindet die einzelnen Gedichte in eine größer angelegte, komponierte bzw. strukturierte Form ein.”⁵⁹⁵ An important part of reading and interpreting a poetry cycle or collection, and therefore also a work-group made up of several of these, is the ability to regard

die möglichen Formen von Kontinuität im poetischen Text und die wesentlichen Ebenen, auf denen sie in Erscheinung treten, [...] wobei folgende mögliche

⁵⁹³ Plachta, Bodo. “Chaos oder „lebendige Arbeit“? Zu den Problemen der Überlieferung von Brechts Lyrik,” in: *Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin*, ed. Dieter Burdorf, *editio / Beihefte*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 190. Henceforth referred to as Plachta, *Chaos*.

⁵⁹⁴ Goßens, 271.

⁵⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

Abstufung weitgehende Berücksichtigung [finden]: Kontinuität innerhalb des Gedichtes selbst, Stellung des Gedichtes in der Kontinuität des Werkes, d. h. unter anderem im Zyklus, bzw. Gedichtband oder im Zusammenhang mit der planmäßigen Anordnung des Gesamtwerkes.⁵⁹⁶

There is as of yet no posthumous edition to center the phenomenon of Lasker-Schüler's compositions and structures of her differing *Hebräische Balladen* publications, and as a direct result, there is also no existing scholarship or interpretation to date that considers these factors – neither comparing across all of them, nor even regarding the composition and structure of one of them in depth.

Edition ist Interpretation. A new kind of edition with a focus on Lasker-Schüler's cycle building, and one that is made with the concept of a work-group in mind for the *Hebräische Balladen*, that presents readers with the necessary materials and information in an accessible and comprehensible manner, would ultimately also provide readers with the possibility of different and new approaches to interpreting this work-group (as well as clearly address and dispel the misinformation still circulating because of the corrupted posthumous versions of Lasker-Schüler's set of cycles).

Of course, a poetry edition is “kein eigener editionswissenschaftlicher Typus, auch wenn von der editorischen Auseinandersetzung mit Lyrik erhebliche Impulse für die Entwicklung der Editionswissenschaft ausgingen.”⁵⁹⁷ Rather, lyric editions “widmen sich spezifischen textuellen Phänomenen und entwickeln eigenständige editorische Lösungen, die dann in das Gesamtkonzept einer historisch-kritischen Ausgabe eingliedert werden.”⁵⁹⁸ This is precisely what needs to be done for the specific phenomenon of a work-group made up of poetry cycles,

⁵⁹⁶ Lajarrige, Jacques (ed.). *Vom Gedicht zum Zyklus. Vom Zyklus zum Werk. Strategien der Kontinuität in der modernen und zeitgenössischen Lyrik*, (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2000), 7.

⁵⁹⁷ Goßens, 266. See also: Nutt-Kofoth, *Lyrik-Edition*, 17.

⁵⁹⁸ Goßens, 266.

and when making an edition of poetry that centers a work-group such as the *Hebräische Balladen* and the author's differing compositions and orders of the cycles, editors must also reflect on the following:

Jede Edition sollte funktional, mit einem klaren Adressatenbezug, konzipiert sein. Um das zu gewährleisten, ist in künftigen editionswissenschaftlichen Arbeiten eine *Theorie des Lesers oder Benutzers von Editionen* zu entwickeln. Daran sind auch empirische Leserforschungen anzuschließen.⁵⁹⁹

That is, there is still the crucial question of intended readership. Who is the edition for? How does this determine how to present the materials and structure the edition?

IV. Edition Types and Intended Audience

One final and rather critical issue that needs to be addressed before considering more concretely how an edition might present Lasker-Schüler's work-group the *Hebräische Balladen* is the edition type. The target audience(s) of any edition defines its type, its structure, its presentation of materials, and its overall methodological approach.

Different types of *wissenschaftlich erarbeitete* editions in the German literary tradition have various methodological approaches to texts and works, and these could be said to be based at least partly on differing perceived importance of information such as *Textentstehung*, *Textgeschichte*, *Publikationsgeschichte*, and *Überlieferung*, including *Varianten*, which effects how texts and works are presented as well as with what information in commentary and appendices (if these are included at all). The ideal goal that all of these types share is to present a

⁵⁹⁹ Burdorf, 14.

gesicherten (simply put, non-corrupt) text (whether unpublished texts or works) to a reading public. Goßens explains:

Grundsätzlich unterscheidet man zwischen drei Ausgabentypen: Leseausgabe, Studienausgabe und historisch-kritische Ausgabe, wobei der Übergang zwischen diesen Editionstypen fließend ist. Mit jedem Ausgabentypus sind andere wissenschaftliche Ansprüche wie eine andere Zielgruppe verbunden. Die lange Zeit herrschende Vorstellung einer Hierarchie von Editionen, an deren Spitze die historisch-kritische Edition steht, ist heute der Einsicht gewichen, dass Editionstypen funktionsbedingt jeweils unterschiedliche Aufgaben und Ansprüchen gerecht werden (müssen).⁶⁰⁰

Dirk Götsche succinctly describes the varying target audiences each type has in mind:

Während sich historisch-kritische Ausgaben in erster Linie an den wissenschaftlichen Benutzer wenden, sind Studien- und Leseausgaben für breitere Leser- und Benutzerkreise konzipiert. Die Studienausgabe wendet sich an Wissenschaftler, Studenten und wissenschaftlich oder literarisch besonders interessierte Leser, die Leseausgabe an das lesende Publikum als Ganzes.⁶⁰¹

Historico-Critical or Text-Genetic Editions

Historico-critical editions and text-genetic editions, “[d]er Ausgabentypus mit den höchsten wissenschaftlichen Ambitionen [...], d[er] sich seit dem Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts entwickelt hat,”⁶⁰² are typically the only editions that attempt to present and address text-genesis and publication history in depth. Ideally, they are also intended to provide the foundation on which other types editions constructed for a broader readership are based, though in practice, given the expense and time necessary to complete such a massive undertaking and long-term project as a text-genetic edition, this is often either not the case, or occasionally even the other way around. Goßens expands on the history and typical goals of such an edition:

⁶⁰⁰ Goßens, 273.

⁶⁰¹ Götsche, Dirk. “Ausgabentypen und Ausgabenbenutzer,” in: *Text und Edition. Positionen und Perspektiven*, ed. Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth, et al., (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 2000), 53. As quoted in: Goßens, 273.

⁶⁰² Goßens, 274.

Karl Goedeke's Schiller-Ausgabe (1867-76) wie die Weimarer Goethe-Ausgabe (1887-1919) haben in dieser Hinsicht wichtige Impulse gegeben. Von hier aus entwickelte sich, in Anlehnung an die textkritische Editionsmethodik der Altphilologie und germanistischen Mediävistik, das Modell einer Gesamtausgabe aller Werke und Schriften, die zugleich alle Textzeugen und ihre Varianten und Fassungen in die Edition mit einbezieht. Die Textvarianz wird hier durch lemmatisierte Apparate im Anhang wiedergegeben. Im Vordergrund steht die Herstellung eines möglichst »authentischen Text[es] in seiner originalen historischen Gestalt«. Dadurch wird die archivarische Vielfalt eines Textbefundes zwar formal erfasst und beschrieben, auch werden Konjekturen und Emendationen editionswissenschaftlich begründet, aber man erhält nur wenig Aufschluss über die eigentliche Entstehung der Texte.⁶⁰³

Historico-critical editions do have a reputation for being highly complex and not particularly user friendly; they seem to have an accessibility and comprehensibility problem in general, especially when it comes to their approaches to presenting the text-genetic information they have been conceptualized to present, and even where their intended academic and scholarly audience is concerned. It is not a new topic of debate for editors of such editions, "dass sich jeder kompetente Leser seinen eigenen Weg zu diesen hochkomplexen Texten suchen muss und dass die Editionen nur die Hilfsmittel zur Textkonstitution bereitstellen, nicht jedoch die fertigen Texte."⁶⁰⁴ According to Dieter Burdorf,

Insofern wird man erneut über die Anforderungen an historisch-kritische Ausgaben und über sinnvolle Verwendungsweisen solcher Ausgaben diskutieren müssen. Auch das Verhältnis von Edition und Interpretation ist auf dieser Basis neu zu reflektieren: Muss jeder Leser, der ein textkritisch problematisches Gedicht verstehen und interpretieren möchte, dessen Text für sich jeweils neu konstituieren? Welches Bild vom Leser wird mit einer solchen Erwartungshaltung möglicherweise verbunden? Werden bestimmte Lesergruppen durch eine solche Erwartung von vornherein von der Lektüre ausgeschlossen, oder werden im Gegenteil dadurch schwierige lyrische Texte gerade für neue Lesergruppen aufgeschlossen? Hier wären auch ein neues Verständnis vom Text und neue Lesepraktiken, wie sie sich im Zuge der rasanten Entwicklung der neuen Medien ergeben haben, in die Reflexion einzubeziehen.⁶⁰⁵

⁶⁰³ Goßens, 274. See also: Plachta, *EW*, 8.

⁶⁰⁴ Burdorf, 9.

⁶⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

As previously addressed, the text-genetic approach in historico-critical editions as it has been both understood and employed to date is best suited to what Goßens himself refers to “die archivarische Vielfalt eines Textbefundes”⁶⁰⁶ – and not to a set of multiple differing but interconnected authorized publications. This is a problem when thinking about how to present a work-group like the *Hebräische Balladen*, especially given that other edition types would not typically concern themselves with *Varianten* to the same degree. But when a historico-critical edition such as the *Werke und Briefe* edition does so, in the classic historico-critical fashion, in which “die dadurch zwangsläufig entstehende ‚Reduktion‘ von Textfassungen auf vermutlich nur eine repräsentative sei [...] im Zusammenspiel von Text und Apparat ‚auszugleichen‘,”⁶⁰⁷ it is unfortunately approached and executed in a way that is (1) already considered difficult and cryptic even for the scholarly audience for which they have been designed and (2) arguably wholly unsuited to a work-group, which are an entirely different situation than complicated unpublished textual variation situations and *Nachlass* materials.

Text-genetic editions are built to deal with a textual situation that is ultimately much more highly complex in nature than a varying set of interconnected publications. When the methods for the former are applied to the latter, they arguably manage to overly complicate an otherwise comparably straightforward and easy to comprehend situation, ultimately making it much less accessible and more convoluted than it was in its original form(s) to begin with (as we have seen with the *Gedichte* volume of *Werke und Briefe*). Else Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* require another approach – namely, one that is equipped to lend focus to variations as historico-critical editions do, but which does so in a way both more appropriate to multiple authorized separate but connected publications (which are closed, authorized, printed works) and

⁶⁰⁶ Goßens, 274.

⁶⁰⁷ Plachta, *Chaos*, 182-3.

more accessible to readers, rather than (however inadvertently) over-complicating multiple authorized publications to the level of several handwritten manuscripts, i.e. dynamic and open snapshots of stages of the writing process, which are often difficult to read and transcribe in the first place, and which editors must investigate for their authenticity and chronology as well as the chronology of the layers of correction within each in order to go on to present changes made during the **writing process** to readers. Because they are made up of publications, work-groups like the *Hebräische Balladen* are not as complex as that – and they do not need to be.

There is something to be gleaned from the focus on variations of a text-genetic or historico-critical edition that could be better adapted or applied to a work-group than has yet been managed – but the form itself appears inappropriate for presenting a work-group, since these editions are usually tasked with critically representing an author's entire oeuvre, and since it is furthermore unfitting to apply the text-genetic methods typically used for presenting textual variations from a *Nachlass* to condense and fragment a set of authorized printed works into the same kinds of encoded information for readers to reconstruct back into a whole picture on their own, (especially given that as previously discussed, the preferable and more comprehensible alternatives of facsimiles and transcriptions are not a viable option here), when these could easily be more simply presented along with easily understood and clear-cut information on publication history and reception and posthumous edition problems.

Studienausgaben

Studienausgaben, the second type of edition, are typically much less expansive, much less complex, and much less expensive than the average historico-critical edition – though they

still tend to draw from the already established foundation of a historico-critical edition, if one already happens to exist. When it comes to the historico-critical edition's comparatively much more detailed and thorough handling of variations (and in general of aspects such as the history of a text's development and publication), however, this is precisely where a *Studienausgabe* tends to edit – often providing “Bezug auf Varianten nur, wenn dadurch eine Textstelle wesentlich erklärt oder beleuchtet werden kann.”⁶⁰⁸ Goßens describes this edition type succinctly:

Gerade Studienausgaben werden im wissenschaftlichen Kontext ausgesprochen häufig genutzt, denn sie sind zum einen wesentlich preisgünstiger als historisch-kritische Ausgaben und bieten durch ihre umfangreichen Kommentare auch eine gute inhaltliche Zugangsmöglichkeit. Zudem sind sie aufgrund ihrer meist weniger komplexen Darstellungspraxis leichter verständlich als die wissenschaftlichen Großprojekte der historisch-kritischen Ausgaben. Gute Lesewie Studienausgaben leisten oftmals »editorische Pionierarbeit« und übernehmen bei vielen Autoren bis heute die »Funktion von Interims-Ausgaben«, denn die wissenschaftlichen Großprojekte der historisch-kritischen Ausgaben werden schon aus Kostengründen nur für wenige Dichter veranstaltet.⁶⁰⁹

These editions combine simplicity and accessibility with commentary and information on aspects such as historical context and publishing history, and it is precisely in this fact that this type could serve as a model for what the *Hebräische Balladen* work-group needs in order to be adequately and comprehensibly presented, in conjunction with the historico-critical edition type's in-depth focus on variations.

It is also not unheard of for student editions to confront the issue of variations, especially with regard to fragments and unpublished manuscripts, for example where what the public has previously known to be an author's 'work' is not an author-authorized publication. The reader

⁶⁰⁸ “Kommentar-Empfehlungen für Editionen von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit,” in: *Probleme der Edition von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Lothar Mundt, Hans-Gert Roloff and Ulrich Seelbach, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992), 163.

⁶⁰⁹ Goßens, 273-274. See also: Plachta, *EW*, 17.

may recall a previously mentioned edition of Büchner's *Woyzeck*, wherein the fragmented pieces crafted into a play by someone other than the author are provided in simple and accessible transcription in the appendix. There are also student editions, though this is rarer, that handle the issue of multiple publications: Goethe's two authorized publications of *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* are printed side by side in a *Reclam* edition, with the left-hand pages reserved for the first edition (1774), and the right-hand pages reserved for the second and more commonly known (1787).⁶¹⁰ Of course, two publications of a novel are quite easily and appropriately displayed in *Paralleldruck*, and Lasker-Schüler's many cycle publications of the *Hebräische Balladen* would need a solution that is perhaps somewhat more complicated to work out than this.

Leseausgaben

A final edition type to consider is the *Leseausgabe*. These typically do not include any type of commentary – at most an introduction. This type is most often the type of edition published by an author personally, including either single-work or collected works. Reprints of those editions are also most often *Leseausgaben*, though (especially posthumously) they may include more information in an introduction written by an editor or an expert such as a literary analyst or historian, for example. Goßens illuminates the *Leseausgabe* and compares it to the *Studienausgabe*:

Unter Leseausgaben versteht man alle oben vorgestellten Einzel- und Gesamtausgaben, mit denen die Texte eines Dichters zugänglich gemacht werden. Sie müssen nicht unbedingt einem wissenschaftlichen Anspruch folgen. Dennoch bemühen sich die Editoren unter textkritischen Gesichtspunkten verlässlich zu gestalten. Der größte Unterschied zwischen einer Leseausgabe und

⁶¹⁰ Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers. Paralleldruck der Fassungen von 1774 und 1787*, ed. Matthias Luserke, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1999).

anderen wissenschaftlichen Ausgabentypen besteht im meist fehlenden wissenschaftlichen Kommentar. Während die Studienausgabe nicht nur ihre textkritischen Entscheidungen dokumentiert, sondern der Edition auch Hinweise zur Überlieferungslage des jeweiligen Textes sowie vereinzelt auch inhaltliche Kommentare beifügt, verzichtet die Leseausgabe weitgehend auf solche Informationen. Zudem präsentieren Lese- wie Studienausgaben – trotz ihrer wissenschaftlichen Grundlegung und trotz ihrer umfangreichen Kommentare – ihren Text oft nicht in seiner historischen Textgestalt, sondern orientieren sich meist an den Standards der jeweils gültigen Rechtschreibung bzw. eigens entwickelten Rechtschreibenmodellen, wie z.B. die Editionen des *Deutschen Klassiker Verlages*. Außerdem müssen beide Editionstypen das Gesamtwerk eines Autors nicht vollständig wiedergeben, sondern sie können sich auf eine bestimmte Auswahl beschränken.⁶¹¹

Which type of edition would be best suited for the needs of the *Hebräische Balladen*? It seems that if the main goals are a conglomeration of highlighting variations across Lasker-Schüler's publications of the work-group, and doing so in a user-friendly, easily comprehensible and accessible manner, then what is required here could potentially be something of a combination of aspects of each of these types, but that the most fitting form would perhaps be a student or reading edition – especially since what is required to further (or enable) scholarship on the *Hebräische Balladen* is a presentation and illumination of a specific set of works, and explicit information as to the publication, edition, and reception history, rather than a historico-critical presentation and text-genetic documentation of her entire oeuvre – which already exists in the *Werke und Briefe*, and which in its text-genetic approach both undermines and over-complicates this very phenomenon instead of highlighting it as a set of multiple authorized and legitimate works. It is time to address the question: What could such an edition look like? What editions exist that could possibly serve as models for, and be adapted to, Lasker-Schüler's work-group?

⁶¹¹ Goßens, 273.

V. Work-Group Editions? Possible Models & Adaptations

It is quite clear that within both edition theory and practice, a well-defined theoretical concept for a work-group is lacking within the field of literary studies – though the phenomenon itself is certainly not. As a result, work-groups are simply placed into edition types where they do not quite fit, – especially historico-critical editions, given that this type tasks itself with textual variations to a much higher degree than the others – and they are presented using unfitting methods, conceptualized and best-suited for textual situations mostly involving a body of unpublished variations or unpublished variations on a single published work, which therefore do not adequately (and are not able to) center them as a set of equally important interconnected and varying published **works** in a way that is easy for readers to access or that ultimately allows for interpretation of work-groups as a phenomenon or form.

In Lasker-Schüler's case, furthermore, the lack of adequate and clear presentation in full of any *Hebräische Balladen* publication other than the 1914 cycle leaves readers unable to access or interpret any other *Hebräische Balladen* publication and robs them of an opportunity to comprehend her various approaches to cycle building. The lack, furthermore, of explicit information on the corrupted posthumous editions, combined with the ease of access to those multiple corrupted editions and ensuing faulty scholarship that continues to be disseminated, as well as the lack of user-friendly and accessible information as to the fact of her multiple publications and the differences in orders and inclusion across them, have also caused severe and ongoing confusion as to Lasker-Schüler's actual cyclical ordering of her *Hebräische Balladen* publications in the first place.

What is required is a way of dealing with the matter of multiple authorized publications differently than we have previously dealt with a single publication and their corresponding unpublished variations. What needs to be different from the current and common theory and practice, both in general and particular to multiple ‘versions’ or unpublished material and fragments, to present **work-groups** appropriately? Do models of editions exist, whether book, digital, or hybrid in form, which might resemble what we need and could be adapted adequately and accessibly to this phenomenon? Are there examples of editions with accessible and reader-friendly presentation of multiple versions, if not multiple publications? How could the *Hebräische Balladen* be presented so that readers have access to, and can therefore interpret, what Lasker-Schüler created, as she created them?

Photo facsimiles of the first editions of the *Hebräische Balladen* fortunately do exist. Unfortunately, however, these are not readily accessible or easily found, even when one has managed to do the background work and piece it all together, given the fact that the information about the existence of many *Hebräische Balladen* publications is also not readily available or easily accessible in the first place, to know exactly what one is looking for: how many, which dates, which publishers, etc. If one uses the search engine KVK, for example, entering only *Hebräische Balladen* and *Else Lasker-Schüler*, specifying ‘nur digitale Medien’ and selecting all digital media options, one most easily finds an electronic edition of the Cassirer 1920 publication available for download via Frankfurt am Main’s university library,⁶¹² or digitized and readable

⁶¹² Lasker-Schüler, *Hebräische Balladen* (Cassirer 1920), 7-26. Electronic Edition. *Ub.Uni-Frankfurt.de*, (Frankfurt am Main: Universitätsbibliothek, 2011). Web. 29 May 2018. <<http://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/freimann/urn:urn:nbn:de:hebis:30:1-136848>>.

online via HathiTrust from the University of Michigan.⁶¹³ All other publications, aside from the 1914 which is of course represented in *Werke und Briefe*, are much more difficult to come by – even, say, with both physical and digital access to a university library in the US, a university library in Germany, and the Berlin *Staatsbibliothek*.

One solution to the question of how to present this work-group, therefore, would be to simply publish these together in full. If one were to re-release all of the *Hebräische Balladen* together in a single volume with an introduction on publication and reception history and easily read and accessible lists highlighting differences in order and inclusion, the downside to such a book edition would be the size and space needed for such a collected reprinting, especially if *die gesammelten Gedichten* would be included in full for context. In the interest of focusing only on the cycle the *Hebräische Balladen* and saving space, readers could also be referred to these books for more and given information as to the ordering and placement of the *Hebräische Balladen* within *die gesammelten Gedichten* in easy to read lists showing where in these volumes the *Hebräische Balladen* appear among other work-groupings and poem titles. In this event, the fact that two of the publications were not stand-alone books but embedded within this context would need to be made very clear. There is justification for doing this, however, even from the standpoint of text-genesis that has so poorly fit this work-group to date; Burdorf asserts:

Soweit das überlieferte Textmaterial Alternativen (z. B. verschiedene Fassungen oder Varianten) enthält, sollten diese auch in die Edition eingehen – was nicht heißt, dass nicht editorisch strukturiert und ausgewählt werden dürfte. [...] Um angesichts knapper finanzieller Ressourcen einen nicht funktionalen editorischen Maximalismus zu vermeiden, werden auch exemplarische Editionen einzelner Texte oder **Textgruppen (z. B. Gedichtzyklen)** als sinnvoll angesehen.⁶¹⁴

⁶¹³ Lasker-Schüler, *Hebräische Balladen* (Cassirer 1920), 7-26. Electronic Edition. *Babel.Hathitrust.org*. Digitized by the University of Michigan / Google. Web. 29 May 2018. <<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015050633943;view=1up;seq=13>>.

⁶¹⁴ Burdorf, 14. Emphasis mine.

Each first edition could also be re-released as individual volumes in a series or a box set, including the full *die gesammelten Gedichten*, with an introduction in each book. There are positives and negatives when considering whether to re-publish this work-group as an individual volume or as a series of several books, as books cost money to make and each of these could be considered special interest items that would need to sell well from the standpoint of a publisher in order to be worth being made. A positive aspect to a single volume is that all of the information is included in one place, will ultimately take up less space, and could cost less to produce than several separate books; individual volumes, however, can be purchased either separately or together, and could perhaps more easily include *die gesammelten Gedichte* in full as well.

If each book were indeed to be republished separately, a more basic physical book idea could be modeled off of a posthumous edition of Holz' 1898/99 *Phantasmus* with an introduction by Jost Hermand;⁶¹⁵ Hermand's introduction provides readers with a summary of Holz' publication history of his *Phantasmus* as well as the general reception history and overall trends of changes across publications (and the posthumously published fragment). In this case, one publication was chosen as the 'best' representation (which as previously explained is quite subjective, and can be argued to be the most highly or well received, or the first, or the final). To its credit, however, this reprint gives readers the information as to the rest of the publications and does so in a clear, reader-friendly, accessible way – something still lacking for Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*.

Even a re-publication of one of the *Hebräische Balladen* beyond the 1914 publication, with a good introduction and clear outline of the situation (including specific information about

⁶¹⁵ Holz, Arno. *Phantasmus. Mit einer Einführung von Jost Hermand, Professor für Neuere Germanistik an der University of Wisconsin*, (New York / London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968).

all other publications, differences across publications in order and inclusion as well as paratext, reception history and popularity, corrupt versions and scholarship), would vastly improve the availability of information to readers. Information as to Holz' many publications of *Phantasmus* is much more readily available and easily found than it is for Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* – in fact, with a quick Google search, this information is even quickly found on officially and decidedly non-academic (and arguably questionable) websites such as *Wikipedia.de*⁶¹⁶ and a site called *eNotes*⁶¹⁷ that provides students with study guides and critical essays for a subscription price; of course, it has also been made available by both the author himself in his multiple essays on the subject of the reworking and republication of *Phantasmus* as well as editors publishing reader editions posthumously. From there, it is relatively easy for readers to find most editions of each of his publications; the final fragment, heavily edited by his widow for the Luchterhand collected works edition *Arno Holz Werke* from 1961, though out of print, can be found used online for sale, and this is the only point where a reader may have an issue. While this is not ideal, it is still a much better degree of available information and publications overall than what exists for Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* – even with the existence of her historico-critical edition – where a clear and accessible outline of the situation is nonexistent to begin with, and most publications, even though they have been digitized, are extremely difficult to find and access even for a reader with all of the information on which publications exist in the first place and connections to multiple international libraries. Frankly,

⁶¹⁶ “Phantasmus,” *Wikipedia.de*. Web. 29 May 2018. <<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phantasmus>>. Information about Brecht's multiple *Hauspostille* publications can also be found on the German Wikipedia: “Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille,” *Wikipedia.de*. Web. 29 May 2018. <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertolt_Brechts_Hauspostille>. Not so for the *Hebräische Balladen*, which are listed only as being published in 1913.

⁶¹⁷ “Arno Holz Critical Essays,” *eNotes.com*, 2018. Web. 29 May 2018. <<https://www.enotes.com/topics/arno-holz/critical-essays>>.

any edition that sets out to focus on Lasker-Schüler's work-group and does so accessibly, even if it can only provide a single publication outside of the 1914 *Hebräische Balladen*, would begin to finally repair the lack of information and dissemination of misinformation.

These are all relatively straightforward ideas for book editions – but perhaps straightforward and simple is what is necessary now to begin to fix the problem at hand and finally make this work-group accessible (and visible as something that exists at all) to a reading public. It is all too clear that the 1914 publication, variation apparatuses and charts encoding and fragmenting information about the rest (or lack of information about them all together), and extremely difficult to find digitizations of first editions beyond the Cassirer 1920, have not done the trick.

With any book edition of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, editors will face decisions as to whether to adapt Lasker-Schüler's writing to current *Rechtschreibung* standards (not recommended in this case), and whether to include all original paratext such as Lasker-Schüler's hand-drawn images (in this writer's opinion, certainly). Editors will also need to decide whether they will include the aforementioned information as to publication history, differences, and reception history in an introduction and/or an afterword or appendix, and whether they will perhaps include commentary (as to historical context, language, and references, for example).

Of course, today there are also digital options for publication, and Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* could also be presented together in one digital location. An introduction with all the necessary information could just as easily be included in this format, but with a digital publication or edition, changes could easily be highlighted via color-coding, for example,

and publications could be linked to one another as well as linked to wherever they are specifically mentioned in an overview, and in either book or digital format, comprehensible lists summarizing and comparing the order of each could be provided. A digital format would also make it easier to provide *die gesammelten Gedichte* publications in full, with direct links to the *Hebräische Balladen* in each.

Digital editions exist that intend to show variants, i.e. the working stages and “complex writing phenomena lying under the final version of a work,”⁶¹⁸ but that are able to do so more generally comprehensively than the ways text-genetic book editions containing variation apparatuses do. *Digitalvariants*, for example, allows readers to view each text separately as well as to compare texts side by side, with differences highlighted in color. For Shakespeare’s *King Lear*, Act 1 Scene 1, for example, there are 4 “Folio” versions and 2 “Quarto” versions.⁶¹⁹ The reader can choose one, or they can choose two at a time to compare side by side, and under ‘versions,’ source information can be found on all available texts. Something like this could easily be applied to Lasker-Schüler’s *Hebräische Balladen* – in this case, with clear information on the fact that all were publications and therefore works, as well as on the variation in inclusion and order of poems, and the posthumous corrupt editions and ensuing faulty reception and scholarship. It would be possible to include lists of the poem orders in each publication along with source information (as well as information on positioning and context of and within *die gesammelten Gedichten* publications), and full cycles to compare side by side (perhaps even the currently existing digitized first editions of each publication, rather than the typed up texts

⁶¹⁸ *Digitalvariants.org Homepage*. Web. 29 May 2018. <<http://www.digitalvariants.org>>.

⁶¹⁹ Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedie of King Lear. Actus Primus. Scaena Prima*. Online Edition. *Digitalvariants.org*. Web. 29 May 2018. <http://www.digitalvariants.org/index.php?option=com_mvds&view=MVDSingle&name=kinglear&template=mvd&version1=1>.

Digitalvariants provides), as well as links connecting poem titles across publications to allow for easy comparison of individual poems. Something like this could also be part of a hybrid edition, for example as part of a book edition providing a single publication with an introduction and information directing the readers to the rest.

Digital editions, as compared to book editions or even simpler digital publications or digitizations of the first editions, are perhaps the most suited format for presenting a work-group such as the *Hebräische Balladen*, because digital editions are an opportunity to provide readers with a ‘portal’ through which they can easily access all of the books in this work-group and much more, with no limitations on space. *Nietzsche Source*,⁶²⁰ for example, allows users to access information in four different languages and includes an online international and multi-lingual literary magazine for Nietzsche studies, a digital version of the critical *Gesamtausgabe* from Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, and a digital facsimile reproductions of Nietzsche’s entire *Nachlass*. For something such as the *Hebräische Balladen*, such a portal could focus solely on the work-group rather than Lasker-Schüler’s entire oeuvre (something which the *Werke und Briefe* edition already does), providing every first edition in full (including *die gesammelten Gedichte*), perhaps in the cross-linked manner described above with the *Digitalvariants* example, as well as (accessible, clearly presented!) text-genetic information, information on publication history, on the changes made across the publications, on reception during the author’s lifetime, and on the posthumous edition history and reception problems, plus commentary pertaining to word usage and historical context and references, viable scholarly contributions (potentially in full, in excerpt or abstract form, or in a bibliography), and possibly also facsimiles of the manuscript not authorized for publication (as long as the fact of its non-authorization is made

⁶²⁰ *NietzscheSource.org*, ed. Paulo D’Iorio. Web. 22 Jun 2018. <<http://www.nietzschsource.org/>>.

very clear and this is presented in a way that clearly separates it from the work-status of all of the other *Hebräische Balladen* cycles). A digital edition done well would make it incredibly easy for users to explore the works themselves, how they differ from each other, and any other information they may need or wish to find on the topic of the *Hebräische Balladen*, all in one interconnected location. Its digital nature also means that it could be found via a simple Google search, thus making all of the publications and all of the information the public currently lacks all the more much more ready-at-hand and accessible than a book edition could ever aim to ever do.

Any one of these ideas for editions, likely *Leseausgabe* or *Studienausgabe* in type if book form, but perhaps most fittingly a digital edition, would provide the reading public with the necessary information and access to Lasker-Schüler's multiple *Hebräische Balladen* work-group publications, both of which we still lack nearly 100 years after her last *Hebräische Balladen* publication. Editions are essential for both the development of genre-specific concepts in the field of literature and for the reception and recognition of poets and their works:

Die Auseinandersetzung mit Lyrikedition sollte [...] nicht nur (aber auch) die Frage im Blick haben, in welcher Form ein historischer Text ›richtig‹ ediert wird, sondern auch, welche Folgen bestimmte Editionsformen für die Entwicklung gattungsspezifischer Zuschreibungen wie für die literaturhistorische Kanonisierung von Dichtern und ihren Werken haben.⁶²¹

There are certainly details and decisions to be worked out by editors undertaking the project of presenting this work-group, but what is most important is that this is finally done in a way that makes visible and treats as equally legitimate and worthy of space the authorized multiple cycle publications of the *Hebräische Balladen*, so that they may **finally** be read for what they are and in the form in which they were created, whether any given reader or scholar decides

⁶²¹ Goßens, 268.

to approach one of them individually or all of them together. Editions define the way readers approach works, and even a simple book, set of volumes, or digital edition including all of the *Hebräische Balladen* in full and providing the public with the very fact that this is a set of differing interconnected publications, would give Lasker-Schüler's work-group and all of the individual publications within it the chance they deserve to be read and interpreted as she created them, would therefore at long last enable viable scholarship and thorough interpretation to begin, and might perhaps finally allow the misinformation based on corrupt versions that continues to be disseminated to be laid to rest.

Conclusion

The central question of this dissertation has been how one might adequately present and interpret Else Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, as they were created, composed, and authorized by Lasker-Schüler herself, for six separate and different yet intertwined publications. Throughout the exploration of this exact question, major gaps within the fields of literary studies and editorial theory and practice have been revealed; these are multifold, and of philological, editorial, theoretical, and interpretative natures.

We currently lack a refined concept for such a set of publications as this, here referred to as a work-group, in both the field of literature and of editions and philology. We also lack theory on the composition of poetry cycles and collections, especially with regard to the fact that these are larger wholes composed of arrangeable smaller works (and therefore seem particularly susceptible to re-composition, as shown through *Hebräische Balladen*, *Phantasmus*, and *Hauspostille*).

More specific to Lasker-Schüler, potential readers still do not have access to non-corrupt editions or re-issues of any of the *Hebräische Balladen* publications aside from the second (1914) (assuming that one considers an expensive historico-critical edition to be accessible) and, perhaps, the digitization of the Cassirer (1920) (with the caveat that this can be found only if one knows to look for it in the first place – there is not a single interpretation of this particular publication). There is also no edition that adequately and accessibly presents the *Hebräische Balladen* publications (or any single one of them) alongside user-friendly and clear facts and details of changes made across her multiple publications and of the corrupt posthumous editions and the vast consequences these have had with regard to ensuing faulty scholarship and

reception; though Norbert Oellers' special edition of an unpublished manuscript version of the *Hebräische Balladen* does this, it is odd that none of the publications in this work-group have been deemed worthy of the same treatment.

It is no wonder, then, that a further quite serious gap was discovered throughout this investigation: namely, that there exists to date no single viable, thorough interpretation of even **one** of her *Hebräische Balladen* publications as **Else Lasker-Schüler created and composed them**, including the 1914, that is, which both does not use a corrupt version or refer to scholarship that has done so, and includes considerations of her arrangement and (juxta-)position choices (rather than, for example, interpreting every poem title ever included in an authorized *Hebräische Balladen* publication individually, chronologically, and excised from cyclical context, as Christine Radde does in the only existing, thorough, viable monograph on the *Hebräische Balladen* to date) – let alone of multiple publications as composed wholes and of how changes made across publications have an effect on possible meanings generated through reading – nearly 100 years after Lasker-Schüler released her final *Hebräische Balladen* to the public.

First and foremost, the fact that there is no concept or terminology for what we have here called a work-group is significant precisely because the phenomenon **itself** is not lacking. Such work-groups have been created by authors since around the early 1900s. Lasker-Schüler, as well as Arno Holz and Bertolt Brecht, are not the only authors ever to compose and publish a set of intimately interconnected but varying works, and this phenomenon is also not exclusive to the genre of poetry.⁶²² Furthermore, precisely the lack of a refined concept and terminology makes other examples of this phenomenon needlessly difficult to find, pinpoint, categorize together, and

⁶²² For an example of a work-group that takes a memoir rather than poetry cycle form, see Ernst Jünger's *In Stahlgewittern*.

study further. For the time being, if one seeks to find such sets of publications, one must hope that there is even enough awareness about certain known works and the fact that these may actually consist of multiple publications in the first place for this information to have been made available somewhere, and one must go on to either happen upon such mentions in texts within the fields of literature or editions, or search for examples by using terms such as *Fassungen* and *versions*, and then finally differentiate between a single work with multiple unpublished manuscript versions and a **set of multiple publications**.

Refined concepts, categories, and terminology are a particularly important matter at hand because these **directly** affect the way that works are presented by editors and, as an immediate consequence of both categorization and presentation, how (and even whether!) works are received by both non-scholarly and scholarly audiences alike. Terminology in the fields of literature and editions determine how literary phenomena are approached. It cannot be understated that whether they are recognized and categorized at all, and how this is done, affects how, and whether, the reading public is able to access, read, and interpret works. Adequate and appropriate presentation of a text or work is only possible if editors are able to recognize the work or text for what it is at the outset, and this in turn dictates whether readers can receive and interpret that work or text for what it is. Reception is guided by availability of information, and availability and presentation of works themselves, and this includes the texts and works chosen for presentation in the first place, the information with which editors choose to surround these, and the manner in which these two crucial and basic elements of an edition are included and handled.

Common practice so far for editions and simple re-publication of work-groups (or more accurately, parts of work-groups) has been to choose one best representative publication and

leave the rest to an appendix, where they are treated like unpublished manuscripts or a set of minor and insignificant variations on the one Work (in historico-critical editions, this is usually done in an inaccessibly encrypted and encoded manner through variation apparatuses), if they are mentioned or included in any way at all.

Most reissues of Bertolt Brecht's *Hauspostille* are reprints of the first (publicly) printed edition from 1927, with no mention of other publications. A few of these build off of a reprint from 1951, however, with "Gesang des Soldaten der roten Armee" in the first *Lektion* removed at Brecht's request.⁶²³ For Brecht, it makes a certain sense to choose the most well received to read or to present, especially given that the reasons for were largely practical and due to historico-political context, and it is understandable at least, that editors and publishers have typically followed this logic.

For Arno Holz, as well, who was working out his own poetic theories through different publications of *Phantasia* and trying to create an ideal total *Weltbild*, something that is ultimately impossible to perfect or complete, it makes some sense, too, that re-publications are often of the most well-received as well (namely the 1898/99), but furthermore that interpreters would read him teleologically – which, and this is quite noteworthy, they often do even when they are presenting or focusing on only one publication, referencing the other publications and their development from beginning to end as well as Holz' own writings on this matter – because that is precisely how he himself explained what he was doing with his *Phantasia*, and because the other publications and general information on this are relatively available and accessible to those motivated enough to obtain the first editions, enabling this.

⁶²³ Brecht, Bertolt. *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille. Mit Anleitungen, Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang*, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1951). See also: *BFA*, v. 11, 304.

These are perhaps sufficient or adequate approaches for *Hauspostille* and *Phantasia*, but they are certainly not ideal and still ultimately do not allow readers equal or easy access to the multiple publications at hand. Regardless of author intention or the reasons why these work-groups were created, what we are facing, that is to say, what we have been left with, are **multiple** publications. A conceptualization and categorization for this exact phenomenon, and the availability of information as well as all of the publications that are part of these work-groups, has the potential to break open more possibilities for reception on both of these cycle sets and any other work-groups like them.

This is also precisely the place where Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* requires a greater sense of urgency for a different kind of presentation than even either *Hauspostille* or *Phantasia* does – namely, one that is operating under a concept for what this set of works actually is. Even as it is not ideal that interpreters and editors of *Phantasia*, for example, argue their reasoning for interpreting or presenting one publication over the others, they have easy access to the information that there are multiple publications and (less easy) access to all of the publications themselves, and they also often themselves make the fact there are multiple varying publications explicit and include interpretation of the changes across these publications even where they have chosen one as the focal point or 'best.' Not so for Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen*, where interpreters are with **very few** exceptions either unknowingly working from a corrupt version or are citing secondary literature that has, and often do not have information that there is more than one publication in the first place (whether the interpreter is working from a corrupt version or the 1914), therefore perpetuating misinformation and faulty reception, and where access to all of her publications proves extremely difficult, in fact nearly impossible, due to lack of information and as well as availability of the publications themselves.

This ongoing confusion and lack of access are at least partially a result of the fact that the historico-critical edition is the only existing edition of a non-corrupt publication. While this edition was an enormous endeavor and provides a relatively solid text-genetic handling of Lasker-Schüler's entire oeuvre, the readings on the *Hebräische Balladen* that have appeared since *Werke und Briefe*'s publication have simultaneously been enabled by its presentation of the 1914 cycle in full **and** led astray by its editors' decision to leave out the fact of the corrupt editions entirely as well as their choices for methods of presentation of the rest of the work-group that confound and encrypt the fact of multiple publications, how any of the others were structured, and how the publications differ from one another.

The lack of information about Lasker-Schüler's multiple *Hebräische Balladen* publications is also likely a result of the fact that, while information can be gleaned about the financial and practical publication-related reasons for creating and releasing so many differing *Hebräische Balladen* cycles, from her letters as well as her public admonishment of publishers' and the publication industry's exploitation of authors such as herself, Lasker-Schüler did not explicitly give in writing any theoretical or aesthetic reasons for breaking a work back open, revising it, and releasing another publication, as both Brecht and Holz have been known to do – which is certainly not to say that she had none.

It is likely that the genre of poetry in particular holds within it at least one way to answer the question as to why Lasker-Schüler may have created and published her *Hebräische Balladen* multiple times over. The genre of poetry itself has something intrinsically peculiar to it when it comes to the phenomenon of the creation of a work-group; the strange correlation between poetry and multiple publications is made especially visible through the modern practice of publishing individual poems in multiple contexts as well as into cycles and collections, as

Lasker-Schüler herself has done, and the fact that the special part-to-whole relationship of collections and cycles and the poems of which they are comprised so clearly lends itself to recombination can easily be seen when one looks at a set of cycles such as the *Hebräische Balladen* – but we currently lack theory on the combination of poems into larger wholes or the composition of *Werkkomplexe* such as cycles and collections, as well as on the phenomenon of re-composition and re-publication. Existing poetry theory is unsatisfactory and unfitting for the consideration of a non-normative set of published and varying but related cycles like the *Hebräische Balladen*.

Work-groups, including but not limited to work-groups of poetry cycles, are indeed a non-normative literary phenomenon, and this calls for more attention. Work-groups, with Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* as a very specific example, are a disruption of the idea that works are single published unities and entities. These are instead both interconnected and individual. They are also an interruption and disturbance of the conceptualization of a work as an idea separate from or existing somewhere outside of all produced materials **and** of the definition that works are any published entity authorized in a specific and completed form by their authors – according to those terms, these are both one work and many.

This phenomenon should no longer be swept under the rug. Though perhaps an easy solution, it is ultimately a gross oversimplification and altogether insufficient to decide that one publication should be preferred and presented at the expense of all others. This robs readers of the ability and option to access to what authors such as Lasker-Schüler have actually created and limits reception possibilities. All publications in a work-group are equally legitimate. The best way to honor that equal validity and to showcase this phenomenon is not to pick one piece and ignore the rest, but to find a way to re-present the set and make it accessible to a public as a

whole and as it was created, to allow for the reception of these intertwined varying publications as and for what they are. For Lasker-Schüler's *Hebräische Balladen* in particular, this is especially critical and long overdue.

The initial optimism that there would be theory and scholarship on this phenomenon, on composing and rearranging poetry collections, and on the *Hebräische Balladen* was discovered throughout this dissertation to have been gravely misplaced. The most vital conclusion to result from this exploration of Lasker-Schüler's *Hebraische Balladen* as a set of multiple varying, legitimate, interconnected publications is therefore quite simply this: all *Hebräische Balladen* publications need to be made available and accessible in the first place, with a concept of this literary phenomenon of work-groups in mind, provided together alongside a clear and user-friendly presentation of all necessary information on reception, publication history, and differences across the cycles, ideally in a digital portal which could be easily found and explored by any interested reader and which would best allow for cross-linking of all publications and information without limitations on space. Not only do the *Hebräische Balladen* seem to call out for this manner of presentation, but if such an edition were to exist, it would also ultimately enable **multiple** theoretical and interpretative gaps to **finally** begin to be filled.

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H. *Natural Supernaturalism. Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*, (New York / London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971).

Andreotti, Mario. *Die Struktur der modernen Literatur*, 3rd ed., (Bern / Stuttgart / Wien : Paul Haupt, 2000).

“Anthologie,” in: Burdorf, Dieter / Fasbender, Christoph / Moennighoff, Burkhard (ed.). *Metzler Lexikon Literatur. Begriffe und Definitionen*, 3rd ed., (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2007), 28-29.

“Arno Holz Critical Essays,” *eNotes.com*, 2018. Web. 29 May 2018.
<<https://www.enotes.com/topics/arno-holz/critical-essays>>.

“Ballade” in: Knörich, Otto (ed.). *Lexikon Lyrischer Formen*, (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1992), 21-27.

Barthes, Roland. *The Death of the Author*, in: *Image, Music, Text*, ed. and trans. Stephen Heath, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 142-148.

Bauschinger, Sigrid (ed.). *Werke. Lyrik, Prosa, Dramatisches*, (Munich: Artemis und Winkler, 1991).

Begemann, Christian. “Der Körper des Autors. Autorschaft als Zeugung und Geburt im diskursiven Feld der Genieästhetik,” in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, ed. Heinrich Detering, (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 44-61.

Beißner, Friedrich. “Aus der Werkstatt der Stuttgarter Hölderlin-Ausgabe,” in: *Hölderlin. Reden und Aufsätze*, (Weimar: H. Böhlau Nachfolger, 1961), 251-265.

Benjamin, Walter. *Einbahnstraße*, (Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt Verlag, 1928).

Benthien, Claudia / Stephan, Inge. *Meisterwerke: deutschsprachige Autorinnen im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Claudia Benthien and Inge Stephan, (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 2005).
[“Einleitung,” 9-19]

“Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille,” *Wikipedia.de*. Web. 29 May 2018.
<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertolt_Brechts_Hauspostille>.

Bogosavljević, Srdan. “Die Ballade im Expressionismus,” in: *Die deutsche Ballade im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Srdan Bogosavljević and Winfried Woesler, (Bern: Peter Lang / Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2009), 41-68.

Bohnenkamp, Anne. “Autorschaft und Textgenese,” in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, ed. Heinrich Detering, (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 62-79.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984).

- *Practical Reason. On the Theory of Action*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998).
- *The Rules of Art. Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).

Bosse, Heinrich. *Autorschaft ist Werkherrschaft. Über die Entstehung des Urheberrechts aus dem Geist der Goethezeit*, (Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh, 1981).

Brecht, Bertolt. *700 Intellektuelle beten einen Öltank an*, originally published in: *Prisma im Zenith. Der 10. Kostüm-Künstler-Karneval am 3., 4., 6., 7., 8. Februar 1928. Fest-Almanach*, ed. Erich Engel and Paul Hamann, (Hamburg: Johannes Asmus Verlag, 1928). Also printed one year later in *Simplicissimus*, v. 46, (Munich: Simplicissimus-Verlag, 11 Feb. 1929).

- "Anleitung zum Gebrauch der einzelnen Lektionen," in: *Hauspostille*, 14th ed., (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1996), 7-9.
- *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille. Mit Anleitungen, Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang*, (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1927).
- *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille*, in: *Gedichte*, v. 1, ed. Elisabeth Hauptmann, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1960).
- *Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille. Mit Anleitungen, Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang*, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1951).
- *Bertolt Brechts Taschenpostille. Mit Anleitungen, Gesangsnoten und einem Anhang*, (Potsdam: Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1926).
- *Bertolt Brecht. Werke. Große kommentierte Berliner und Frankfurter Ausgabe*, 31 vols., ed. Jan Knopf and Werner Hecht, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988-1999).
- *Gesammelte Werke*, 8 vols., ed. Elisabeth Hauptmann, (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1967).

Büchner, Georg. *Woyzeck*, in: *Werke und Briefe. Münchner Ausgabe*, ed. Karl Pörnbacher, Gerhard Schaub, Hans-Joachim Simm and Edda Ziegler, 12th ed., (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2006).

Burdorf, Dieter. "Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin. Zur Einleitung," in: *Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin*, ed. Dieter Burdorf, *editio / Beihefte*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 1-16.

Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. Michael Shaw, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

Calinescu, Matei. *Five Faces of Modernity*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987).

Derrida, Jacques. *Grammatologie*, (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1983).

Digitalvariants.org Homepage. Web. 29 May 2018. <<http://www.digitalvariants.org>>.

Duden.de, (Bibliographisches Institut GmbH, 2013). Web. 24 May 2015.
<<http://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/>>.

“Ekloge” in: Knörich, Otto (ed.). *Lexikon Lyrischer Formen*, (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1992), 49-50.

Fieguth, Rolf. “Architektur der Wolken. Einleitungssessay,” in: *Architektur der Wolken. Zyklisierung in der europäischen Lyrik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Rolf Fieguth and Alessandro Martini, (Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), 11-20.

Fischer, Grete. *Dienstboten, Brecht und andere Zeitgenossen in Prag, Berlin, London*, (Olten / Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, 1966), 134.

Fischer, Hans W. “Einleitung zum Phantasmus,” in: *Das Werk von Arno Holz*, v. 7, (Berlin: J. H. W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1925), I-XIV.

Fisher, Clara. “Workshop as a Work: Nietzsche’s *Hefte* and Brecht’s *Notizbücher*,” in: *The Future of Philology*, ed. Hannes Bajohr et al., (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 73-95.

Foucault, Michel. *What is an Author?* (1969), in: *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 113-138.

Gay, Peter. *Modernism. The Lure of Heresy. From Baudelaire to Beckett and Beyond*, (New York / London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2008).

Geiger, Ludwig. “*Hebräische Balladen* von Else Lasker-Schüler. A. R. Meyer Verlag. 1913. Berlin-Wilmersdorf,” in: *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, 77/18, 2. May 1913, (Berlin: 1913), 215.

Gelhard, Dorothee. “*Mit dem Gesicht nach vorne gewandt*”: *erzählte Tradition in der deutsch-jüdischen Literatur*, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008), 84.

George, Stefan. *Das Jahr der Seele*, (Berlin: Verlag der Blätter für die Kunst, 1897).

Gerhard, Cordula. *Das Erbe der ‚Großen Form‘. Untersuchungen zur Zyklus-Bildung in der expressionistischen Lyrik*, (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1986).

Ginsberg, Ernst (ed.). *Dichtungen und Dokumente*, (München: Kösel, 1951).

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers. Paralleldruck der Fassungen von 1774 und 1787*, ed. Matthias Luserke, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1999).

Goßens, Peter. “Lyrikedition,” in: *Handbuch Lyrik. Theorie, Analyse, Geschichte*, ed. Dieter Lamping, (Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2011), 266-276.

Göttsche, Dirk. “Ausgabentypen und Ausgabenbenutzer,” in: *Text und Edition. Positionen und Perspektiven*, ed. Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth, et al., (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 2000), 37-63.

Groys, Boris. *Logik der Sammlung. Am Ende des musealen Zeitalters*, ed. Michael Krüger, (Munich/Vienna: Carl Hanser, 1997).

Haberkamp, Frederike. “Buntumschlungen in der Bibel. Else Lasker-Schülers Hebräische Balladen,” in: *Fäden möchte ich um mich ziehen. Ein Else Lasker-Schüler-Almanach*, ed. Hajo Jahn / Hans Joachim Schädlich, (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag, 2000), 116-122.

Hahn, Barbara. “The Politics of Dedication: Else Lasker-Schüler’s Poems,” in: *MLN*, v. 132/3 (April 2017), ed. Andrea Krauss, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), 720-733.

- *Unter falschem Namen*, (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1991).

Hallensleben, Markus. “Das avantgardische Ich als jüdisches ‘alter ego’: *Der Wunderrabbiner von Barcelona und Hebräische Balladen*,” in: Else Lasker-Schüler. *Avantgardismus und Kunstinszenierung*, (Tübingen / Basel: Francke Verlag, 2000), 215-236.

Herman, Jost (ed.). “Einleitung,” in: *Arno Holz. Phantasmus*, (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968), iii-iii.

Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Sämtliche Werke*, 8 vols., ed. Friedrich Beißner, (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta’sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1943-1985).

Hölter, Achim. “Kontexte der Lyrik,” in: *Handbuch Lyrik. Theorie, Analyse, Geschichte*, ed. Dieter Lamping, (Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2011), 98-106.

Holz, Arno. “Aus dem *Phantasmus*: Nachgelassene neudurchformte Fassung,” in: *Das Gedicht: Blätter für die Dichtung*, v. 2/14 (1936)

- “Die neue Form und ihre bisherige Entwicklung,” in: “Kunsttheoretische Schriften,” *Arno Holz. Werke*, v. 5, ed. Wilhelm Emrich and Anita Holz, (Berlin-Spandau: Luchterhand, 1961), 110-137. Originally appeared in: *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, v. 10 (1918/19), nr. 7, 164. Reprinted in: *Die befreite deutsche Wortkunst*, 79-81.

- “Idee und Gestaltung des Phantasus” (1918), in: “Kunsttheoretische Schriften,” *Arno Holz. Werke*, v. 5, ed. Wilhelm Emrich and Anita Holz, (Berlin-Spandau: Luchterhand, 1961), 86-109. Originally published in: *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde*, v. 10 (1918), nr. 5/6, 117. Holz later reprinted this essay in: Holz, Arno. *Die befreite deutsche Wortkunst*, (Wien/Leipzig: Avalun-Verlag, 1921), 27f.
- “*Inferno*: ([Gedicht] Aus dem Manuskript der vom Dichter hinterlassenen völlig neu durchgeformten Fassung des Phantasus),” in: *Der Dichter und das Buch: Zum 25jährigen Bestehen des Berliner Bibliophilen Abends, Titellithographie von Alfred Kubin*, (1930), 20-22.
- “Phantasus 1-13,” in: *Das Buch der Zeit. Lieder des Modernen*, (Zurich: Verlags-Magazin, 1886), 391-422.
- *Phantasus. Erstes Heft*, (Berlin: Sassenbach, 1898).
- *Phantasus. Zweites Heft*, (Berlin: Sassenbach, 1899).
- *Phantasus*, (Leipzig: Insel, 1916).
- “Phantasus (Bisher ungedruckt),” in: *Das Inselschiff: eine Zeitschrift für Freunde der Literatur und des schönen Buches*, v. 1 (1919/20), (Leipzig: Insel, 1920), 66-67.
- “*Phantasus*”: *Drei neue Phantasus-Gedichte*, (Offenbach am Main: Ernst Engel, 1923).
- *Phantasus I-III*, in: *Das Werk von Arno Holz*, v. 7-9, (Berlin: J. H. W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1925).
- *Phantasus I-IV*, in: *Arno Holz. Werke*, v. 1-3, ed. Wilhelm Emrich and Anita Holz, (Neuwied a. Rh./Berlin-Spandau: Luchterhand, 1961).
- “*Rücktrauer*: Ms. aus der nachgelassenen neudurchgeformten Fassung des “Phantasus” unveröff.,” in: *Freude an Büchern, Monatsheft für Weltliteratur*, v. 4 (1953), 129.
- “*Wintergroßstadtmorgen*: ([Gedicht] Aus der nachgelassenen, noch unveröffentlichten Neubearbeitung des “Phantasus”), in: *Die Weltbühne: Wochenschrift für Politik, Kunst, Wirtschaft*, v. 25, II (1929), (Berlin: Verlag der Weltbühne, 1929), 809-810.

“Honorar” in: *Wörterbuch des Buches*, 3rd ed., ed. Helmut Hiller, (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1967), 141-142.

Jannidis, Fotis / Lauer, Gerhard / Martinez, Matias / Winko, Simone. “Rede über den Autor an die Gebildeten unter seinen Verächtern. Historische Modelle und systematische Perspektiven,” in: *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs*, (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999), 3-35.

Kafka, Franz. *Der Process*, ed. Roland Reuss and Peter Staengle, (Basel: Stroemfeld, 1997).

Kemp, Friedhelm (ed.). *Gesammelte Werke in 3 Bänden*, v. 1 (*Gedichte 1902-1943*), (Munich: Kösel, 1959-1962).

- *Werke in 8 Bänden*, v. 1 (*Gedichte 1902-1943*), (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1986).

Kilcher, Andreas B. (ed.). "Lasker-Schüler, Else," in: *Metzler Lexikon der deutsch-jüdischen Literatur*, 2nd ed., (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2012), 327-331.

Killy, Walther (ed.). "Else Lasker-Schüler" in: *KILLY Lexikon*, 2nd ed., v. 7, (Berlin: Walther de Gruyter, 2010), 243-245.

Klausnitzer, Ralf. *Literaturwissenschaft. Begriffe – Verfahren – Arbeitstechniken*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012).

Koldehoff, Stefan. „Vom Nachklang der Schöpfung. Endlich erhält die große Dichterin Else Lasker-Schüler eine historisch-kritische Werkausgabe,“ in: *Die Zeit*, v. 46/1997 (7. Nov 1997), available online at: *Zeit Online*, (Hamburg: *Zeit Online*, 2009-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.zeit.de/1997/46/Vom_Nachklang_der_Schoepfung>.

“Kommentar-Empfehlungen für Editionen von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit,” in: *Probleme der Edition von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Lothar Mundt, Hans-Gert Roloff and Ulrich Seelbach, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992), 161-166.

Kraus, Karl: [Notizen – Zum Spendenaufruf für Else Lasker-Schüler], in: *Die Fackel*, v. 14, nr. 370/371 (5 Mar. 1913), 33.

Kreutzer, Hans-Joachim. *Überlieferung und Edition. Textkritische und editorische Probleme, dargestellt am Beispiel der historisch-kritischen Kleist-Ausgabe*, (Heidelberg: 1976).

Lajarrige, Jacques (ed.). *Vom Gedicht zum Zyklus. Vom Zyklus zum Werk. Strategien der Kontinuität in der modernen und zeitgenössischen Lyrik*, (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2000).

Lamping, Dieter. *Das lyrische Gedicht. Definitionen zu Theorie und Geschichte der Gattung*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).

Lasker-Schüler, Else. *Gesammelte Werke in zehn Bänden*, (Berlin: Cassirer, 1919/1920).

- *Hebräische Balladen*, (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: A. R. Meyer, 1913).
- *Hebräische Balladen. 2. vermehrte Auflage*, (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: A. R. Meyer, 1914).
- *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte*, (Leipzig: Verlag der Weißen Bücher, 1917), 9-27.

- *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte*. 2. Auflage, (Leipzig: Wolff, [1919]), 9-28.
- *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Die gesammelten Gedichte. Sechstes bis zehntes Tausend*, (Munich: Wolff, 1920), 9-28.
- *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Hebräische Balladen. Der Gedichte erster Teil. Mit einer Einbandzeichnung der Verfasserin*, (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1920), 7-26.
- *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Hebräische Balladen. Der Gedichte erster Teil. Mit einer Einbandzeichnung der Verfasserin*, (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1920), 7-26. Electronic Edition. *Ub.Uni-Frankfurt.de*, (Frankfurt am Main: Universitätsbibliothek, 2011). Web. 29 May 2018. <<http://sammlungen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/freimann/urn/urn:nbn:de:hebis:30:1-136848>>.
- *Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Hebräische Balladen. Der Gedichte erster Teil. Mit einer Einbandzeichnung der Verfasserin*, (Berlin: Paul Cassirer, 1920), 7-26. Electronic Edition. *Babel.Hathitrust.org*. Digitized by the University of Michigan / Google. Web. 29 May 2018. <<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015050633943;view=1up;seq=13>>.
- *Hebräische Balladen: In der Handschrift von Else Lasker-Schüler*, ed. Norbert Oellers, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 2000).
- *Ich räume auf!*, in: *Werke und Briefe*, Bd. 4.1 (Prosa 1921-1945: Nachgelassene Schriften), ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki and Itta Shedletzky, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2001), 47-85.
- *Werke und Briefe*, 11 vols., ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki and Norbert Oellers, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1996-2004). See: v. 1.1 (*Gedichte*), ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki and Norbert Oellers, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1996); v. 1.2 (*Gedichte - Anmerkungen*), ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki and Norbert Oellers, (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1996); v. 4.2 (*Prosa 1921-1945: Nachgelassene Schriften. Anmerkungen*), ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki and Itta Shedletzky, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2001); v. 6 (*Briefe 1893-1913*), ed. Ulrike Marquardt, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2003); v. 7 (*Briefe 1914-1924*), ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2004); v. 8 (*Briefe 1925-1933*), ed. Sigrid Bauschinger, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2005); v. 9 (*Briefe 1933-1936*), ed. Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2008).

“Lesen,” in: Pfeifer, Wolfgang et al. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen* (1993), digitalized and edited by Wolfgang Pfeifer for: *das Digitale Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2017). Web. 7. Feb 2017. <<https://www.dwds.de/wb/lesen>>.

Leuenberger, Stefanie. *Schrift-Raum Jerusalem: Identitätsdiskurse im Werk deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, (Köln / Weimer: Böhlau, 2007), 119.

Liska, Vivian. "Biblische Frauen in der Lyrik Else Lasker-Schülers," in: *Else Lasker-Schüler-Jahrbuch zur Klassischen Moderne*, ed. Lothar Bluhm und Andreas Meier, (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2000), 36-54.

Livingston, Paisley. "Texts, Works, Versions," in: *Art and Intention. A Philosophical Study*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 112-134.

Lukács, György. *Die Theorie des Romans. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der grossen Epik*, (Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand, 1963).

Martens, Gunter. "Das Werk als Grenze. Ein Versuch zur terminologischen Bestimmung eines editorischen Begriffs," in: *editio*, 18 (2004), 175-186.

- "Was ist ein Text? Ansätze zur Bestimmung eines Leitbegriffs der Textphilologie," in: *Texte zur Theorie des Textes*, ed. Stephan Kammer and Roger Lüdecke, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005), 94-113.

Martus, Steffen. *Werkpolitik. Zur Literaturgeschichte kritischer Kommunikation vom 17. bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

Marx, Friedhelm: "Heilige Autorschaft? *Self-Fashioning*-Strategien in der Literatur der Moderne," in: *Autorschaft. Positionen und Revisionen*, ed. Heinrich Detering, (Stuttgart / Weimer: J. B. Metzler, 2002), 107-120.

Maslow, Abraham. "A Theory of Human Motivation," in: *Psychological Review*, v. 50/4 (1943), 370-396.

Mayer, Hans. *Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition*, (Pfullingen: Günther Neske, 1961).

Meißner, Thomas. *Erinnerte Romantik. Ludwig Tiecks "Phantasmus"*, (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2006).

Merriam-Webster.com, (Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2015). Web. 24 May 2015.

<<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>>.

Plachta, Bodo. *Editionswissenschaft. 3. Auflage*, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2013), 7-140.

Miller, Christiane. "Reading the Politics of Else Lasker-Schüler's 1914 *Hebrew Ballads*," in: *Modernism/Modernity* 6.2 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 135-159.

Müller, J. "Das zyklische Prinzip in der Lyrik," in: *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 20 (1932), 1-20.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Arbeitshefte*, sec. 8-9, ed. Marie-Luise Haase, Bettina Reimers, et al, in: *Nietzsches Werke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006).

NietzscheSource.org, ed. Paulo D'Iorio. Web. 22 Jun 2018. <<http://www.nietzschesource.org/>>.

Nutt-Kofoth, Rüdiger (ed.), *Dokumente zur Geschichte der neugermanistischen Edition*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2011).

- "Zur Geschichte der Lyrik-Edition," in: *Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin*, ed. Dieter Burdorf, *editio / Beihefte*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 17-37.

Nutt-Kofoth, Rüdiger / Plachta, Bodo (ed.). *Editionen zu deutschsprachigen Autoren als Spiegel der Editions-geschichte*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2005).

Neumann, Peter Horst. "Zyklus-Probleme in experimenteller Lyrik, zum Beispiel bei Ernst Jandl," in: *Vom Gedicht zum Zyklus. Vom Zyklus zum Werk. Strategien der Kontinuität in der modernen und zeitgenössischen Lyrik*, ed. Jacques Lajarrige, (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2000), 241-247.

Oellers, Norbert (ed.). *Hebräische Balladen. In der Handschrift von Else Lasker-Schüler*, (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2000).

- "Else Lasker-Schülers »Hebräische Balladen« - auch für die asiatische Prinzessin Leila," in: *Zeit der Moderne. Zur deutschen Literatur von der Jahrhundertwende bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Hans-Henrik Krummacher / Fritz Martini / Walter Müller-Seidel, (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1984), 363-376.

"Phantasus," *Wikipedia.de*. Web. 29 May 2018. <<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phantasus>>.

Plachta, Bodo. "Chaos oder „lebendige Arbeit“? Zu den Problemen der Überlieferung von Brechts Lyrik," in: *Edition und Interpretation moderner Lyrik seit Hölderlin*, ed. Dieter Burdorf, *editio / Beihefte*, (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 177-192.

- *Editionswissenschaft. Eine Einführung in Methode und Praxis der Edition neuerer Texte*, 2nd ed., (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2006).

Radde, Christine. *Else Lasker-Schülers Hebräische Balladen*, in: *Schriftenreihe Literaturwissenschaft*, v. 44, ed. Heinz Kosok and Heinz Rölleke, (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1998).

Rarisch, Klaus M. "Über Arno Holz (zum Autorenregister)," in: *Die Horen. Zeitschrift für Literatur, Kunst und Kritik*, 12/88 (1972), ed. Kurt Morawietz, 96.

Reiß-Suckow, Christine. "Wer wird mir Schöpfer sein!": *Die Entwicklung Else Lasker-Schülers als Künstlerin*, (Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre Verlag, 1997).

Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge*, in: *Sämtliche Werke*, v. 6, ed. Rilke-Archiv in connection with Ruth Sieber-Rilke and Ernst Zinn, (Wiesbaden / Frankfurt: Insel, 1966).

Sahle, Patrik. *Digitale Editionsformen. Zum Umgang mit der Überlieferung unter den Bedingung des Medienwandels. Teil 1: Das typographische Erbe*, in: *Schriften des Instituts für Dokumentologie und Editorik*, v. 7, (Books on Demand: Norderstedt, 2013).

“Satire,” in: Burdorf, Dieter / Fasbender, Christoph / Moennighoff, Burkhard (ed.). *Metzler Lexikon Literatur. Begriffe und Definitionen*, 3rd ed., (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2007), 677-679.

Scheibe, Siegfried. “Zum editorischen Problem des Textes,” in: *Probleme neugermanistischer Edition. Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 101*, ed. Norbert Oellers and Hartmut Steinecke, (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1982), 12-29.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Hermeneutik und Kritik. Mit einem Anhang sprachphilosophischer Texte Schleiermachers*, ed. Manfred Frank. (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1993).

Scholz, Bernhard F. “Alciato als emblematum pater et princeps,” in: *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs*, (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999), 321-351.

Schulte-Sasse, Jochen. “Foreword: Theory of Modernism versus Theory of the Avant-Garde,” in: Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. Michael Shaw, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), vii-xxvii.

Schulz, Gerhard (ed.). “Nachwort,” in: *Phantasia. Faksimiledruck der Erstfassung*, (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1968), 129-155.

Segebrecht, Wulf (ed.). *Deutsche Balladen. Gedichte, die dramatische Geschichten erzählen*, (Munich : Carl Hanser Verlag, 2012).

Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedie of King Lear. Actus Primus. Scaena Prima*. Online Edition. *Digitalvariants.org*. Web. 29 May 2018.

<http://www.digitalvariants.org/index.php?option=com_mvd&view=MVDSingle&name=kinglear&template=mvd&version1=1>.

Skrodzki, Karl Jürgen. “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Almanachen, Anthologien, Jahrbüchern, Katalogen und Programmheften,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_034.htm>.

- “Beiträge Else Lasker-Schülers in Zeitschriften und Zeitungen,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_029.htm>.

- “Die Bücher von Else Lasker-Schüler. Mit Hinweisen zur zeitgenössischen Rezeption,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_030.htm>.
- “Else Lasker Schüler. Beiträge zu Leben und Werk. Ein Verzeichnis für die Jahre 1903-1945,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2016). Web. 23 Apr. 2016. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_044.htm>.
- “Else Lasker Schüler. Eine Übersicht über die Gedichte und Zyklen,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2015). Web. 17 Apr. 2015. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_052.htm>.
- “Else Lasker Schüler: Mein Volk,” *Karl Jürgen Skrodzki Homepage*, Mar. 2000 (Lohmar: Karl Jürgen Skrodzki, 2003-2014). Web. 17 Apr. 2015. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_012.htm>.
- “Stand und Perspektiven der Arbeit,” in: *Fäden möchte ich um mich ziehen. Ein Else-Lasker-Schüler-Almanach*, hg. von Hajo Jahn und Hans Joachim Schädlich, Wuppertal 2000, S. 188-202. Web version. 17 Apr. 2015. <http://www.kj-skrodzki.de/Dokumente/Text_002.htm>.

Sprengel, Peter. “Else Lasker-Schüler und das Kabarett,” *Text + Kritik* 122: Else Lasker-Schüler, (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1994), 75-86.

- *Geschichte der deutschsprachigen Literatur 1870-1900. Von der Reichsgründung bis zur Jahrhundertwende*, (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1998).

Stern, Josef Luitpold. “Paul Zech: »Das schwarze Revier.« Verlag A. R. Meyer, Berlin-Wilmersdorf,” in: *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (Vienna), v. 25, nr. 87 (Mittagsblatt, 31 Mar. 1913), 5.

Stüben, Jens. “»Ich warte sehnsüchtig [...] auf den ›Stoff‹ den Du mir schenken solltest.« Arno Holz’ Produktionsgemeinschaft mit Oskar Jerschke,” in: *Literarische Zusammenarbeit*, ed. Bodo Plachta, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 197-215.

Thierse, Wolfgang. “‘Das Ganze aber ist das, was Anfang, Mitte und Ende hat.’ Problemgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Geschichte des Werkbegriffs,” in: *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe. Studien zu einem historischen Wörterbuch*, ed. Karlheinz Barck and Martin Fontius, (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1990), 378-414.

Tieck, Ludwig. *Phantasmus. Eine Sammlung von Märchen, Erzählungen, Schauspielen und Novellen*, 3 vols., (Berlin: In der Realschulbuchhandlung, 1812-1815).

Tucholsky, Kurt. (Pseudonym Peter Panter). “Bert Brechts Hauspostille,” in: *Die Weltbühne*, 28 Feb. 1928, No. 9, 334.

- “Dem siebzigjährigen Mosse,” in: *Die Schaubühne* (Charlottenburg), v. 9/1, nr. 19 (8 May 1913), 514-519.

Vanderbeke, Birgit (ed.). “»Fresse schon meine Fingerspitzen wie Spargelköpfe«. Else Lasker-Schüler (1869-1945),” in: »*Ich bin ganz, ganz tot in vier Wochen*«. *Bettel- und Brandbriefe berühmter Schriftsteller*, (Berlin: Autorenhaus Verlag, 2006), 38-49.

Villwock, Peter. *Bertolt Brecht, Notizbücher: Einführung in die Edition (NBA)*. Web version. 4 May 2015.

<http://www.suhrkamp.de/download/Sonstiges/brecht_notizbuecher/Brecht_Notizbuecher_Einfuehrung_in_die_NBA.pdf>, 9-103.

Wagenknecht, Regin. “Bertolt Brechts Hauspostille,” in: *Text und Kritik: Sonderband: Bertolt Brecht II*, ed. Heinz Ludwig Arnold, (Munich: R. Boorberg, 1972), 20-29.

“Why Would More Than 500 Artists Sample the Same Song?” *NPR / TED Radio Hour*. 27 June 2014. Web version. 31 July 2017. <<http://www.npr.org/2014/06/27/322721353/why-would-more-than-500-artists-sample-the-same-song>>.

Wied, Pauline Fürstin zu and Selma Lagerlöf, Richard Dehmel, Karl Kraus, Adolf Loos, Helene Fürstin Loutzo, Karin Michaelis, Peter Nansen, Walter Otto, Arnold Schönberg. [Spendenaufruf zugunsten Else Lasker-Schülers], in: *Die Fackel*, v. 14, nr. 366/367 (11 Jan. 1913), printed on the inside back cover.

- [Spendenaufruf zugunsten Else Lasker-Schülers], in: *Berliner Tageblatt*, v. 42, nr. 37 (Abend-Ausgabe, 21 Jan. 1913).; Ibid. [Spendenaufruf zugunsten Else Lasker-Schülers], in: *Prager Tagblatt*, v. 38, nr. 46 (Morgen-Ausgabe, 16 Feb. 1913), 8.
- “Ein Aufruf für Else-Lasker-Schüler,” in: *Die Freistatt*, v. 1, nr. 1, (Apr 1913), 68f.

Windfuhr, Manfred. *Die neugermanistische Edition. Zu den Grundsätzen kritischer Gesamtausgaben*, in: *DVjS* 31, (Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 1957), 425-442.

Winko, Simone. *Kodierte Gefühle: zu einer Poetik der Emotionen in lyrischen und poetologischen Texten um 1900*, (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2003).

Wittmann, Reinhard. *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels. Ein Überblick*, (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1991).

Wizisla, Erdmut. “Brecht-Editionen,” in: *Editionen zu deutschsprachigen Autoren als Spiegel der Editionsgeschichte*, ed. Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth / Bodo Plachta, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2005), 1-12.

Wohlleben, Robert. "Der wahre Phantasmus," *Fulgura Frango*, Apr. 2014, (Hamburg: Robert Wohlleben / Meiendorfer Drucke / fulgura frango). Web. 17 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.fulgura.de/extern/holz/phantasmus.html>>. Also printed in: *Die Horen. Zeitschrift für Literatur, Kunst und Kritik*, 116/4 (1979), 84-102.

Woesler, Winfried. "Einzelgedicht und Sammlung. Erörtert an Bertold Brechts "Svendborger Gedichten," in: *Vom Gedicht zum Zyklus. Vom Zyklus zum Werk. Strategien der Kontinuität in der modernen und zeitgenössischen Lyrik*, ed. Jacques Lajarrige, (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2000), 81-97.

- "Neugermanistische Editionsleistungen des 19. Jahrhunderts," in: *Geschichte der Editionsverfahren vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart im Überblick. Ringvorlesung*, ed. Hans-Gert Roloff, (Berlin: Weidler, 2003), 124-142.
- "Zur Einleitung," in: *Die deutsche Ballade im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Srđan Bogosavljević and Winfried Woesler, (Bern: Peter Lang / Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2009), 5-7.

Woodmansee, Martha / Jaszi, Peter. "Die globale Dimension des Begriffs der ›Autorschaft‹," in: *Rückkehr des Autors. Zur Erneuerung eines umstrittenen Begriffs*, (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999), 391-419.

Zeller, Hans. "Befund und Deutung. Interpretation und Dokumentation als Ziel und Methode der Edition," in: *Texte und Varianten. Probleme ihrer Edition und Interpretation*, ed. Gunter Martens und Hans Zeller, (Munich: Beck, 1971), 45-89.

Zeller, Hans / Schilt, Jelka. "Werk oder Fassung eines Werks," in: *Zu Werk und Text: Beiträge zur Textologie*, ed. Siegfried Scheibe and Christel Laufer, (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991), 61-86.

Zwerschina, Hermann. "Variantenverzeichnis, Arbeitsweise des Autors und Darstellung der Textgenese," in: *Text und Edition. Positionen und Perspektiven*, ed. Rüdiger Nutt-Kofoth et al., (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2000), 203-229.

"Zyklus," in: Burdorf, Dieter / Fasbender, Christoph / Moennighoff, Burkhard (ed.). *Metzler Lexikon Literatur. Begriffe und Definitionen*, 3rd ed., (Stuttgart / Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2007), 844-845. Here pg. 844.