Challenging the Myth of ‘Young Germany’:
Conflict and Consensus in the Works of Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube
Theodor Mundt and Ludolf Wienbarg

by

Tracey Jane Kinney

B.A., The University of Victoria
M.A., The University of Victoria

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Department of History

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August 1997

© Tracey Jane Kinney, 1997
In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of **History**

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date 10/9/97
ABSTRACT

On December 10, 1835 the Federal Diet of the German Confederation banned the publication and distribution of any works written by a group identified as “das junge Deutschland.” The Diet explicitly named Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube, Theodor Mundt, Ludolf Wienbarg, and Heinrich Heine as members of this group. Since 1835 the term “Young Germany” has been widely accepted among historians and literary analysts alike. However, there has been virtually no agreement regarding the purposes of the group, its importance, or even its membership. In recent years, historical studies have gradually come to accept that the notion of a unified group called “Young Germany” is a myth, but no study has attempted to identify the key issues which divided the so-called Young Germans. This study examines the content of the ‘Young German’ works in the years prior to the Federal ban in order to determine the nature of the disagreements which divided Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg.

By utilizing the voluminous monographic and journalistic works produced by the so-called Young Germans, this study establishes their positions on many of the key issues of the Vormärz era, in particular, the emancipation of women, religious emancipation and Saint-Simonianism, and political emancipation. Based upon these positions, this study argues that there was little consensus among the core ‘members.’ Each man believed that he was contributing to the creation of a new type of literature which would end the Romantic separation of literature from the real world and usher in a more utilitarian form of writing. The author would no longer serve only the muses of literature, he would also serve more practical causes. Beyond this shared conviction, however, there were few issues upon which Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg agreed. Moreover, even on the basic assumption that writers and
their works must serve practical causes there was considerable conflict regarding the implementation of this ideal. On the larger socio-political issues of the day there was virtually no agreement. Some of the 'Young Germans' expressed fairly traditional opinions on these topics, others were remarkably modern. Seldom if ever, however, did they speak with one voice.
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Critical Issues Surrounding the Study of the ‘Young German’ Phenomenon

Between 1830 and 1835 much of the German literary community was scandalized by the writings of a group of men known to the authorities as the Young Germans.\(^1\) The literary efforts of Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube, Theodor Mundt and Ludolf Wienbarg polarized the opinion of the reading public. A young Friedrich Engels dismissed the Young Germans as “woolly-headed phrase-makers”\(^2\) whose overall importance was negligible. However, Wolfgang Menzel, a leading Vormärz literary critic, argued that the writings of the Young Germans were “gegen das vaterländische Interesse”\(^3\) because their writings undermined the foundations of all states, religions and customs. No less a figure than Prince Klemens von Metternich argued that the edict of suppression which eventually prohibited the production and distribution of their works was necessary to preserve the political structure of the state.\(^4\)

In the 1830s the term ‘junges Deutschland’ was used in a largely derogatory fashion. Their enemies had a two-fold purpose in invoking the term. It was certain to resonate with the authorities who were acutely aware of the activities of Giuseppe Mazzini’s Young Italy and

\(^1\)The name was coined following Ludolf Wienbarg’s dedication of Aesthetische Feldzüge (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1834) to “das junge Deutschland.”


\(^3\)Wolfgang Menzel, “Die junge Literatur,” Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände, Literaturblatt Nr. 1 (1.1.1835).

were thus quick to conclude that Young Germany might pose a similar threat to the Metternichian system. Most often, however, the enemies of the new literature used the term 'jeune Allemagne' to emphasize the dangerous pro-French, materialist approach of the writers. Among contemporary literary historians and critics the term remains popular despite the fact that it has been argued convincingly that "as a group, Young Germany was largely imaginary, a fiction put into circulation by the Federal German ban on Heine, Gutzkow, Laube, Wienbarg and Mundt of December 10, 1835."\(^5\)

Many literary historians and critics now acknowledge that the study of 'Young Germany' as a single literary group is immensely problematic. "Never has there been a literary movement the members of which were so much at odds with one another, and this atomization was intensifed by the government assault."\(^6\) Recent scholarship has increasingly evinced a split on the Young German question. Most contemporary historians accept that there were more issues that divided the Young Germans than united them. As James Sheehan had observed "they were different in temperament, character, and fate...."\(^7\) However, most current literary analyses continue to claim that the term has some utility. As Jeffrey Sammons noted, "there are good impressionistic reasons for maintaining "Young Germany" as a useful term. In the core group of writers there is a special quality of intense urgency.... It is more a matter of pitch and gesture, simultaneously robust and bewildered, crowding insistently close to the reader in the


effort to arouse in him some resonance and motion."

Urgency, pitch and gesture aside, there are a vast number of issues which divided the core group of authors who were identified with ‘Young Germany.’ To date no study has attempted to identify the central issues upon which Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg differed. This study will undertake such an analysis. By examining the material produced by the so-called Young Germans in the years prior to the ban, this study will first identify the issues which preoccupied the core group and then analyze the degree to which their positions on these issues varied. However, before any such analysis can be undertaken it is first necessary to establish more clearly the nature of contemporary scholarship on the so-called Young Germans. It is further important to examine some of the methodological issues confronting any study of this ‘group.’ One must also acknowledge the limitations which were imposed on the core group of writers by the environment in which they operated. Finally, the personal backgrounds of the so-called Young Germans and the early influences on them are important in establishing the key issues which motivated each man.

1.

Given the sharply polarized nature of the initial reaction to the so-called Young German movement, it is hardly surprising that subsequent study has produced no consensus upon them. Though most historical and literary works on the Vormärz era have ventured a conclusion on the role and place of the Young Germans, at times it is difficult to determine whether they are all discussing the same group. Young Germany has been a frequent subject for both literary

\footnote{Sammons, Six Essays, 2-3.}
analysts and historians of the Vormärz era. While some degree of consensus is evident in the works of literary analysts, the historical literature remains inconclusive. It is nonetheless possible to detect a gradual evolution in the conclusions of historians on Young Germany. One of the first historians to give serious thought to the nature and importance of the Young German phenomenon was Heinrich von Treitschke. He dismissed the Young Germans as an insignificant literary movement that was French and Judaic in origin and thus doomed from the outset. Treitschke was particularly opposed to Gutzkow, who he believed had attempted to desecrate the tomb of Schleiermacher by publishing the latter’s Vertraute Briefe on Schlegel’s Lucinde. Treitschke concluded that the Young Germans displayed no talent, only mockery and lamented that the movement was symbolic of the “power of Jewry during those few years.”

However, over the years which followed opinion on the Young Germans has moderated substantially. In 1952 C.P. Magill undertook a re-evaluation of the Young German movement and concluded that “[t]here were in existence several Young Germanys; the men who in their own eyes were warriors in the very vanguard of human emancipation, appeared to their opponents on the right as subversive doctrinaires and to their radical critics on the left as aimless dilettanti.”

---

9 Heinrich von Treitschke, History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century, v.5, transl. Eden and Cedar Paul (London: Jarrold and Sons, 1919), 524. Treitschke believed that the movement was rooted in the works of Heinrich Heine, Ludwig Börne, and Rahel Varnhagen von Ense.

10 Ibid., 530.

In his 1954 history of Germany Koppel Pinson emphasized the Young German commitment to human emancipation. Pinson argued that the movement had been inspired by the French Revolution and was thus motivated above all by a thirst for liberty.\textsuperscript{12} The Young Germans were opposed to the excesses of Romanticism and in favour of spiritual emancipation, the rights of youth and a literature that identified with life. Pinson also viewed the Young Germans as the innovators of a realistic style of political journalism (Feuilletonism) in Germany.\textsuperscript{13} Pinson’s opinion regarding the importance of the Young Germans was not, however, shared by some of his contemporaries. Just four years after Pinson’s history Golo Mann deemed the Young Germans unworthy of mention in his \textit{Deutsche Geschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts}.\textsuperscript{14}

The lack of interest in Young Germany evident in Mann’s work was replicated in Agatha Ramm’s 1967 history of Germany. Ramm mentioned the Young Germans, but only as a precursor to the Young Hegelian movement.\textsuperscript{15} She also observed that they produced only one great writer, Heine, who introduced the group to Saint-Simonianism and a type of sentimental socialism. Ramm identified the leader of the Young Germans as one “F. Gutzkow


\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, 66.


[sic] whose work was as upsetting to traditional values as D.F. Strauß' Das Leben Jesu. Two years later, however, William Carr produced a more sophisticated analysis which identified the Young Germans as a school of writers and journalists who had revolted against the established order and denounced Romanticism as an ally of the reaction. Carr added that the Young Germans looked to France and Belgium for their inspiration and as a result declared war on Germany's princely houses. In 1971 Eda Sagarra wrote that the Young Germans reflected a potential never realized in Germany, a potential to recognize the positive place of technology in society and to demonstrate a genuine concern for the condition of their fellow men. However, ten years later George Mosse returned to the argument that the Young Germans were a minor literary movement which pursued so many diverse causes that it accomplished nothing of substance in the end.

A more sophisticated analysis of the Young German movement can be found in Thomas Nipperdey's Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck. Nipperdey sees the Young Germans as an integral part of the reaction to the revolutions of 1830. Inspired by Heine, the Young Germans

---

16 Ibid., 126.


emerged in 1834 flouting tradition and convention, religion and church-inspired morality. They also championed the emancipation of women and of the flesh.\textsuperscript{21} The Young Germans were significant because they had a mobilising and politicising effect on the reading public and on public opinion. Above all they intensified critical reflection and ensured that the literary world became increasingly bourgeois in its outlook.\textsuperscript{22}

All of these early historical studies contain one common assumption. The Young Germans were a single group. More recently, however, historians have begun to question this assumption. James Sheehan notes that the Young Germans were different in temperament, character and fate. Nonetheless he goes on to note that

the ‘Young Germans’ - together with a score of other writers who are sometimes associated with them - shared a set of historical experiences which gave their work from the mid-1830s... a similar emotional tone and critical inclination. \textit{Never a school or a movement}, the ‘young Germans’ belonged together because of their common discomfort with traditional culture and existing social values.\textsuperscript{23}

Contemporary literary analyses have no such difficulties in considering the Young Germans to be a single school. Given the ideologically and methodologically polarized nature of literary historiography, this degree of unanimity seems somewhat unusual. However, the literary histories seem to agree that the Young Germans\textsuperscript{24} were a single movement whose

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 329-330.
\item \textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 330 and 511-518.
\item \textsuperscript{23}Sheehan, \textit{German History 1770-1866}, 580-581; emphasis added.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Most literary historians and critics exclude Heine from the group, since his importance to literary historiography reaches far beyond his association with the Young Germans.
\end{itemize}
primary accomplishment was the creation of a new understanding of the role and function of literature, as well as an entirely new type of literature. This in turn resulted in a new intellectual openness and eventually a new political openness.\textsuperscript{25} Despite the fact that few literary historians have examined the political programme of the Young Germans in detail, all seem to accept that it was the Young German discussion of concepts such as freedom, liberalism and democracy which paved the way for the political upheavals of the 1840s.

Most importantly, the Young Germans represented an important transitional phase in literary history. The goal of the new literature, and of the new criticism which accompanied it, was to co-ordinate literature with life---to make ideas relate to the realities of the world around them, rather than continue the aesthetic aloofness characteristic of the Romantic period. As Hartmut Steinecke noted:

[They] were the first critics, writing at the end of the 'artistic period', under journalistic conditions, who worked as 'free' writers.... [The Young Germans] spanned the period between a generally aesthetic consciousness and an ethical-political one, between author-oriented and reader-oriented literature; therefore an important critical manifestation.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{25}The clearest statement of this position can be found in Peter Uwe Hohendahl, \textit{Building a National Literature: The Case of Germany 1830-1870}, transl. Renate Baron Franciscono (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 107. See also Hartmut Steinecke, \textit{Literaturkritik des jungen Deutschlands} (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1982). Udo Köster, \textit{Literarischer Radikalismus. Zeitbewußtsein und Geschichtsphilosophie in der Entwicklung vom Jungen Deutschland zur Hegelischen Linken} (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1972) sees the work of the Young Germans as an integral part of the expanding literary industry which in turn facilitated the expansion of liberal-democratic political views and the general modernization of society. Rainer Rosenberg, \textit{Literaturverhältnisse im deutschen Vormärz} (Munich: Kurbisken, 1975) goes so far as to argue that while Young Germany did not make the revolutions of 1848, their contributions to the bourgeois emancipation struggle certainly served as preparation for them.

\textsuperscript{26}Steinecke, \textit{Literaturkritik des jungen Deutschland}, 57.
Steinecke further observed that this transitional role was facilitated by the general expansion of the literary market and attendant publication possibilities opened up by that expansion.

Thus for literary historians and critics the Young Germans are considered to be a group because they represented a common style of writing, one which broke with the aestheticism of the Romantic period and ushered in a literature that was at once more realistic and more functional. A recent study by Takanori Teraoka also supports this interpretation as does the earlier work of Jeffrey Sammons who observed that ‘Young Germany’ is a useful term because, "[t]here is a sense of intense urgency characteristic of Young German writing and by which it is identifiable."28

Though few literary histories go beyond stylistic similarities in explaining their consideration of Young Germany as a unified group, a recent article by Robert Holub attempts to provide additional justification. Holub argues that there are three criteria which support the thesis that the Young Germans represented a single group: they were all born after 1800; they all preferred to work in the cities rather than the countryside; and they all demonstrated a propensity for liberal values.29 Holub is then forced to backtrack by admitting that Heine, whom he includes among the Young Germans, was in fact born before 1800 but nonetheless can be included because Heine liked to claim that he came in with the new century. The

27Takanori Teraoka, Stil und Stildiskurs des Jungen Deutschland (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe/Heinrich Heine Verlag, 1993), 44.

28Sammons, Six Essays, 2 and 28.

problem with such a broad categorization is that nearly any writer could be made to fit this definition, even writers who were implacably opposed to the ideas advanced by Gutzkow and the others. Moreover, 'liberal values' can be taken to include an enormous range of ideas, and Holub does not provide a definition which might narrow the concept so as to make it a useful analytical tool.

Less specialized sources tend to resolve the uncertainty surrounding the role and function of 'Young Germany' by presenting the movement as akin to Young Italy. Young Germany thus becomes a romantic association committed to nationalism and the creation of a unified German state.\textsuperscript{30} This mistaken notion likely stems from confusion regarding terminology. When Wienburg dedicated \textit{Ästhetische Feldzüge} to 'das junge Deutschland' he was unaware that a branch of Mazzini's Young Italy movement had been established in Switzerland and was referring to itself as 'das junge Deutschland.' While the two movements were entirely unconnected, subsequent attempts by the Frankfurt police to establish a connection between them has led to enduring confusion regarding the literary 'Young Germany.'\textsuperscript{31}

Among authors who have made a serious study of the movement there can be no doubt that Heinrich Hubert Houben was the seminal authority on the Young German movement and its adherents. His work, which was begun before the First World War and continued far into


\textsuperscript{31}On this subject see Nipperdey, \textit{Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck}, 331. Mazzini hoped to see the establishment of a "Young Europe" movement of which Young Italy would be one part, the splinter group Young Germany another, and so on.
the Weimar years, was in large part responsible for reviving scholarly and popular interest in
the Young Germans. From his first work, *Gutzkow-Funde*[^32] to his last, a two-volume
compilation, *Verbotene Literatur von der klassischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*,[^33] Houben made
the Young German movement the central focus of his studies. Houben provided a wealth of
material on each of the Young German authors as well as some of the lesser-known writers
who were closely associated with the central figures. Houben considered the Young Germans
to be a vital if sadly neglected part of the literary and political culture of the *Vormärz* era.
Houben also emphasized a strong liberal-democratic tradition among the Young Germans.
Given Houben's accepted position as an expert on the Young German movement, this
emphasis on liberalism and democracy has likely influenced subsequent attempts to discover
the liberal-democratic orientation of the Young Germans. Houben's work also argued that the
Young Germans, among whom he counted Karl Gutzkow, Theodor Mundt, Heinrich Laube,
Ludolf Wienbarg, Ferdinand Kühne and Heinrich Heine, were a single literary group,
connected not only by the Reichstag ban, but also by their interests, their opinions and their
literary style.

For the present-day historian, one of the most valuable contributions made by Houben
was his meticulous two-volume cataloguing of the major journals and much of the

[^32]: Heinrich Hubert Houben, *Gutzkow-Funde. Beiträge zur Literatur- und

[^33]: Heinrich Hubert Houben, *Verbotene Literatur von der klassischen Zeit bis zur
Gegenwart: Ein kritisch-historisches Lexikon über verbotene Bücher, Zeitschriften, und
Theaterstücke, Schriftsteller und Verleger*, 2 Bde. (Berlin: Rowohlt, 1924 & Bremen:
Schünemann, 1928); (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965).
correspondence of the various Young German authors.\textsuperscript{34} Two years later Houben followed this work with \textit{Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang},\textsuperscript{35} the first complete history of the Young German movement to be drawn entirely from archival sources. However, Houben's final work was somewhat disappointing. Though richly detailed with regards to the daily travails of the Young Germans and the omni-present censor, the work lacked any degree of analysis as to the impact of that censorship upon their later works.\textsuperscript{36} Nonetheless, the wealth of documentary material provided by Houben in each of his studies is an invaluable resource in reconstructing the complex history of the Young German movement.

In more recent years, Alfred Estermann has also done a considerable amount to preserve the works of the Young German authors. In conjunction with Athenäum Press in Frankfurt, it was Estermann who spearheaded the daunting task of editing, annotating and publishing many of the surviving Young German journals, a project which was completed between 1970 and 1973. Estermann also published a two-volume compilation of documents by and about the Young Germans.\textsuperscript{37} Like Houben's, Estermann's work provides an important

\textsuperscript{34}Heinrich Hubert Houben, \textit{Zeitschriften des jungen Deutschlands}, 2 Bde. (Berlin: Behr, 1906/1909); (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970). A planned third volume, which was never completed would presumably have included several journals omitted from the original two volumes. The major journal omissions are \textit{Zeitung für die elegante Welt} (edited by Laube in 1833/1834), \textit{Mitternachtzeitung für gebildete Stände} (also edited by Laube in 1836), and \textit{Telegraph für Deutschland} (edited by Gutzkow in 1837/1838).

\textsuperscript{35}Heinrich Hubert Houben, \textit{Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang. Ergebnisse und Studien} (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1911); (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1974).

\textsuperscript{36}Heinrich Hubert Houben, \textit{Polizei und Zensur} (Berlin: 1926); reprinted in 1978 by Tannus under the title \textit{Der ewige Zensur: Längs- und Querschnitte durch die Geschichte der Buch- und Theaterzensur}.

source of documentary material for the contemporary historian.

E.M. Butler, one of the few English-speaking historians to study the Young Germans in depth, produced in 1926 what might be the most ambitious study to date of the Young German movement.38 Rather than simply focus on the place of the Young Germans in the history of literature, Butler attempted to characterize the beliefs which motivated them. Butler identified a common set of causes which she believed to be the key to the Young German programme: the equality of men and women, the call for secularism and necessity for a new social order. Butler saw each of these beliefs as symptomatic of the attraction of the Young German authors to Saint-Simonian beliefs, concluding that each of the Young Germans had been influenced in one way or another by the Saint-Simonian belief that history had entered a new critical epoch. The Young Germans were the first and, in Germany, perhaps the last group to recognize that knowledge had outstripped the ability of religion to explain all known facts and they had thus entered an era of skepticism and disorder. Butler also argued that the Young Germans believed in the rehabilitation of the flesh and the equality of the spiritual and the sensual realms.39

As interesting as Butler's thesis was, she was unable to demonstrate convincingly that any of the Young Germans were ardent followers of Henri de Saint-Simon or Prosper Enfantin.40 Certainly, the Young German journals contained a few articles written by and about


39Ibid., 66-86.

40Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) wrote his most famous work *Nouveau Christianisme* in 1825. In it he argued that the era of the great monotheistic religions had passed and in its place a new religion was emerging which was
the Saint-Simonians, but by Butler's own admission the Young German authors themselves remained frustratingly silent on the topic. Laube, though initially intrigued by the doctrines of Saint-Simon, evidently grew suspicious of the Saint-Simonians as the years passed, a fact which Butler wrote off as symptomatic of his "elementary spiritual development."\textsuperscript{41} Gutzkow in 1839 declared a slight knowledge of the Saint-Simonians, but claimed to have had no contact with their doctrines. Despite this Butler argued that the influence "was secretly at work within him before 1835."\textsuperscript{42} Butler had similar problems demonstrating that any of the others were influenced in any significant and long-lasting way by the doctrines of Saint-Simon. However, her work remains an important contribution to the literature on the Young Germans.

Overall, this survey of the past literature on the Young German movement reveals one fundamental fact. There is no general consensus as to the role and function of the Young German writers. While literary analysts agree on some issues, historians do not. Thus the 'Young Germans' appear simultaneously as a minor literary movement and at the same time a vital part of the transition to a new literary era. They have been represented as liberals, democrats, liberal-democrats, early German nationalists and Saint-Simonians. While to some

\begin{quote}
guided by the principle 'love thy neighbour as thyself' and which would achieve the complete emancipation of the flesh. Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin (1790-1864) built upon the ideas of Saint-Simon adding the notion that man and woman together make up the ideal social individual. The Saint-Simonians believed that change could always be made for the better and that a new world was unfolding based on the power of technology to improve the condition of mankind. The version of Saint-Simonianism which reached Germany was concerned almost exclusively with the emancipation of the flesh and not with the doctrines of possibilism and technocracy.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{41}Butler, \textit{The Saint-Simonian Religion.}, 182.

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Ibid.}, 273.
they were merely woolly-headed phrase-makers, to others they were the key agents in making social-political problems a legitimate topic of discussion in the public sphere.

This study will take as its starting point James Sheehan’s conclusions on the so-called Young German movement. The ‘Young Germans’ shared a set of experiences which gave their work a similar critical tone and inclination. Above all they were irreconcilably opposed to the reactionary state. However, at a fundamental level, the idea of “Young Germany” was a myth. On each of the major issues which the so-called Young Germans addressed there was substantial disagreement among the key authors. Their major works reveal diametrically opposed viewpoints and even where there was some degree of agreement regarding the existence of a particular problem, the ‘Young Germans’ more often than not differed upon the resolution of that problem.

2.

Three key methodological questions must be confronted before any serious study of the Young German programme can be undertaken. One must first address the issue of membership: which writers make up the core of the movement that has been labelled Young Germany? Next the contentious question of periodization must be addressed. Finally one must confront the problematic issue of sources, in particular the use of fictional works as an indicator of an author’s personal position on a topic. On the first question, that of membership, there is no disagreement among historians that Karl Gutzkow, Ludolf Wienbarg, Theodor Mundt and Heinrich Laube were members of the inner circle of Young German writers. The Reichstag ban, however, included the writings of Heinrich Heine among the proscribed works and explicitly named Heine as a part of Young Germany. This has subsequently led several
historians, including Houben, to argue that Heine must be included as one of the core members of the Young German movement.

For his part Heine’s interest in the Young Germans was minimal. He refused to acknowledge any link to the other members of the group and when the ban was issued observed that

[j]ust as sometimes revolutionaries who have never seen each other and harbour opposing views are accused and are condemned before the same tribunal of a criminal conspiracy, so my name was arbitrarily linked and proscribed with four others who did not really belong together and who held heterogeneous principles. 43

Heine’s outrage at his inclusion in the ban was further evident in a letter that he sent to the Frankfurt Diet immediately following the ban: “Sie haben mich angeklagt, gerichtet, verurtheilt, ohne daß Sie mich weder schriftlich noch mündlich vernommen, ohne daß jemand meine Vertheidigung geführt, ohne daß irgend eine Ladung an mich ergangen.... [N]ehmen Sie das Interdikt zurück, das Sie über Alles was ich schreibe verhängt haben.” 44 Nonetheless, Houben and others, including E.M. Butler and Robert Holub, have argued that Heine’s influence on the age was so profound that he must be counted within the ranks of the Young Germans.

The inclusion of Heine raises a number of difficulties. Writing in the relative safety of his Parisian exile, Heine faced none of the restrictions which confronted those writers who chose to remain in Germany. Thus while he addressed many of the same themes which


44Heinrich Heine, “À la haute Diète de la confederation germanique à Francfort,” reprinted in Jan-Christoph Hauschild, Verboten! Das Junge Deutschland 1835. Literatur und Zensur im Vormärz (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1985), 50.
interested Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg, he had far more freedom to explore those
issues than did the others. As James Sheehan notes, “his [Heine’s] was a politics of exile and
alienation. Like so many of those forced to emigrate or be silent, Heine remained on the
periphery of public discourse, without the responsibilities of action and the burdens of
compromise.” This fact alone makes any direct comparison of Heine’s interests with those of
the other ‘Young Germans’ problematic. In addition, though Heine broke with the extreme
subjectivity of the Romantic era, his writings still insisted upon the sovereignty of art rather
than the functionalism advocated by the so-called Young Germans. Finally, Heine’s work
lacks the immediacy and urgency which characterizes the writings of Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt
and Wienbarg. As Sammons has noted, “[i]n the older men, Ludwig Börne and Heine, the
urgency is under firmer rhetorical or artistic control.” Thus, even some of the literary
histories also see fit to exclude Heine from the core group of writers.

Though most literary approaches do not include Heine, they do generally incorporate a
much larger number of writers in the core group. Jeffrey Sammons, for example, rejects Heine
but includes Ferdinand Gustav Kühne and Karl Immermann, though in both cases he

---

45 On Heine’s ‘political’ interests see Nigel Reeves, Heinrich Heine: Poetry and Politics

46 Sheehan, German History 1770-1866, 586.

47 Nipperdey, Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck, 511.

48 Sammons, Six Essays, 4.

49 In addition to Sammons, Houben included Kühne (1806-1888) albeit as a minor figure
in the overall movement, as did Walter Dietze, Junges Deutschland und deutsche Klassik. Zur
Ästhetik und Literaturtheorie des Vormärz (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1962). In 1834 Kühne,
acknowledges that the stylistic intensity which marked them as members of Young Germany existed only briefly.\footnote{Sammons, \textit{Six Essays}, 2-3.} Takanori Teraoka includes Ludwig Börne (1786-1837) because of the stylistic affinity between Börne’s later writings and those of the other Young Germans.\footnote{Teraoka, \textit{Stil und Stildiskurs des Jungen Deutschland}, 38.} Using stylistic similarity as his guide, Jost Hermand is able to list some twenty-five writers under the label Young Germany,\footnote{Jost Hermand, Hrsg., \textit{Das junge Deutschland. Texte und Dokumente} (Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam, 1966).} including Gustav Schlesier\footnote{Gustav Schlesier (1811-1866) worked with Laube on the \textit{Zeitung für die elegante Welt} and later assumed the editorship of that journal. Gutzkow’s correspondence reveals that he maintained a cordial relationship with Schlesier during and after the ban.} and Karl August Varnhagen von Ense.\footnote{Two factors tie Karl August Varnhagen von Ense (1785-1858) to the Young Germans. He was friendly with all of the authors, especially Gutzkow, with whom he}
Using similar criteria, a more recent study has argued that the writing style of Fürst Hermann von Pückler-Muskau\textsuperscript{56} resembles that of the other ‘Young Germans.’\textsuperscript{57} This study also argues that Pückler’s liberal convictions and progressive political thinking mark him as a member of Young Germany. However, the study acknowledges that Pückler argued in favour of the maintenance of the monarchy and the aristocracy, something which no-one else in the core group was willing to support.\textsuperscript{58}

In each of the above cases there are unquestionably stylistic similarities between the works. Beyond these similarities, however, there are few solid connections between the four major figures and the host of other writers who have been considered part of ‘Young Germany.’ Thus it is more methodologically sound to limit the Young German movement to the key group of four authors among whom direct and stable connections can be established. A recent study by Helmut Koopmann supports this approach. Koopmann places Gutzkow, Mundt, Laube and Wienbarg on the front line of the Young German movement, counts Heine

maintained an active correspondence, and Varnhagen's publication of Das Buch Rahel in 1834, the diaries of his late wife, served as a major source of inspiration for Gutzkow and Mundt. See Chapter Three for a discussion of the issues which connected Mundt, Gutzkow and Rahel.

\textsuperscript{56}Hermann Fürst von Pückler-Muskau (1785-1871) was Laube's mentor and provided shelter to the latter when he was sentenced to house arrest. Pückler-Muskau was also an author in his own right, publishing \textit{Briefe eines Verstorbenen} both anonymously and under pseudonyms between 1830 and 1832, and \textit{Tutti Frutti} in 1834.


\textsuperscript{58}\textit{Ibid.}, 167-168.
and Börne as the choir-masters, conducting the movement from the sidelines, and views Kühne, Varnhagen von Ense, Pückler-Muskau and the others who were certainly sympathetic to the cause as external supporters.\(^{59}\) While acknowledging the stylistic influence of the older generation of writers, especially Heine and Börne, this study will consider only the works of Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube, Theodor Mundt and Ludolf Wienbarg to be central to the so-called Young German movement.

The issue of periodization is less easily resolved. Koopmann suggests that any study of the group should be confined to the period 1830 to 1840, bounded on the one side by the July Revolutions and the 1832 death of Goethe and on the other by the complete breakdown of relations among the four key members.\(^{60}\) Sammons suggests that the stylistic quality which characterized the Young German movement was restricted for the most part to a half dozen years around 1835.\(^{61}\) Other analysts, including E.M. Butler and Heinrich Houben, evaluate the entire body of work produced by the Young Germans without regard for the date of

---


\(^{60}\) Ibid., 3; the idea that the relationship among the Young Germans broke down completely is somewhat misleading. After Ludolf Wienbarg became co-editor of *Deutsches Literaturblatt der Börsen-Halle* in 1840 he used his position to direct the attention of the public to the works of the other Young Germans once again. A brief survey of the work produced during the years that Wienbarg served as editor reveals reviews of Heinrich Laube's *Jagdbrevier* (*Literaturblatt* Nr. 12 19.12.1840 and Nr. 13 26.12.1840) and *Der Prätendent* (*Literaturblatt* Nr. 58 6.11.1841); Theodor Mundt's *Völkerschau auf Reisen* (*Literaturblatt* Nr. 18 30.1.1841, Nr. 19 6.2.1841, and Nr. 20 13.2.18841) and a lengthy series on *Thomas Müntzer* (*Literaturblatt* Nr. 72-76 12.2.1842 - 19.3.1842). However, Wienbarg maintained an unequivocal silence on Gutzkow's works from this era.

publication in order to reach their conclusions. This study accepts that 1830 is a logical starting point for any survey of ‘Young German’ literature. The July Revolution had a major impact upon the four men. As Gutzkow remarked, the July Revolution was a decisive turning point in his life:

> Der Kronprinz lachelte; aber alle, die Zeitungen lasen, wußten, daß in Frankreich eben ein König vom Thron gestoßen wurde. Der Kanonendonner zwischen den Barrikaden von Paris dröhnte bis in die Aula nach.... Ich stand betäubt an dem Portal des Universitätshofes und dachte über St.-Marc Girardins Prophezeiung und die deutsche Burschenschaft nach.... Ich wollte nur wissen, wieviel Tote und Verwundete es in Paris gegeben, ob die Barrikaden noch ständen, ob noch die Lunten brennten, der Palast des Erzbischofs rauchte, ob Karl seinen Thron beweine, ob Lafayette eine Monarchie oder Republik machen würde. Die Wissenschaft lag hinter, die Geschichte vor mir. 

Finding a logical end point for a study of the movement is more contentious. The boundaries utilized by earlier studies have some degree of rationality. However, none of the previous examinations of the Young German movement have paid sufficient attention to the impact of the Reichstag ban when establishing the parameters of their studies.

Prior to the December 1835 ban the ideas expressed by the Young Germans covered a broad range of topics with little or no self-censorship. Following the ban, however, three changes were immediately evident. First, both Mundt and Laube attempted to deny their involvement with the other ‘Young Germans’ and to establish the innocence and distinctiveness

---


63Sammons acknowledges that Laube was terrified by his imprisonment in 1834 but nonetheless bases his analysis of Laube’s work on the second part of his *Das junge Europa, Die Krieger*, which was written in years immediately following his incarceration. Sammons, *Six Essays*, 26 and 104-123.
of their own works. As Mundt argued on December 27, 1835:

... Das Verbot gegen mich hat mir hinlänglich Anlass gegeben, über die bisher eingeschlagene Richtung meiner literarischen Laufbahn ernstlich nachzudenken. Gleichzeitige Bestrebungen anderer Schriftsteller, mit denen ich zusammen rangirt worden bin, ohne jemals gemeinsame Verabredung mit ihnen gehabt zu haben, sind mir offenbar ebenso schädlich, wenn nicht schädlicher geworden, als meinen eigene Jugend und meine eigenen Tendenzen. Ueber die letzteren bin ich dermassen mit mir zu Rathe gegangen, dass ich auf Ehre und Gewissen die Versicherung abgeben kann: es sei in mir kein gefährlicher und verderblicher Widerspruch gegen die bestehende Ordnung in der sittlichen, religiösen, und politischen Welt vorhanden.64

Heinrich Laube publicly denied membership in Young Germany three times during December 1835 and in the early months of 1836.65 On January 1, 1836 he published his most overt renunciation:

Eine junge Schriftstellerwelt, die 'junges Deutschland' genannt wird, spielt eine Rolle: wer gehört dazu, wer nicht? ... Ein für allemal sei es denn hiermit gesagt, dass unser Journal [Mitternachtzeitung] nicht dazu gehört, die Bestrebungen desselben werden von keiner Opposition eingegeben, die Institute unsrer Gesellschaft werden von demselben respektiert. Invektiven gegen diese Institute wie sie in neuerer Zeit vom 'jungen Deutschland' ausgegangen sind, werden bekämpft.66

In addition to such denunciations of the movement, a marked change was apparent in subsequent publications by the so-called Young Germans. Their writings became much more cautious, a product of the obvious psychological impact of the ban. The psychological

64 Theodor Mundt quoted in Houben, Zeitschriften des Jungen Deutschlands, Bd. 1, 156-157.

65 Laube denied his involvement with the so-called Young Germans in the December 25, 1835 issue of the Allgemeine Zeitung, and again in the January 1, 1836 issue of the Mitternachtzeitung für gebildete Stände.

repercussions were most succinctly summed up by Ludolf Wienbarg:

Ich lebe still für mich, den Wissenschaften und der Literatur, ich habe keine andern Verbindungen, als literarische und buchhändlerische, letztere nicht in Frankfurt. Ich bin unbescholten u für meine Person bürgerlich und polizeilich außer Vorwurf. Sollte mein literarisches Streben nicht überall Billigung finden, so scheint mir dieses kein Motiv zu sein, mich, wo es auch sei in Deutschland, die Luft nicht einathmen zu lassen. Auch bin ich bereit, mich in dieser Hinsicht, vor jedem kompetenten Forum einzufinden. 67

Finally, in the period following the ban, subsequent work by the Young Germans was limited by the practical difficulty of finding a publisher willing to risk a renewed affiliation with the proscribed authors and the restrictions which a series of parliamentary decrees passed in November and December 1835 placed upon the Young German authors. On December 10, 1835 the text of a ban then before the legislature of the free city of Hamburg was officially written into law as a Federal edict. 68 By this edict each state was instructed to take action against the Young German writers and their publishers. A specific warning was directed toward the Hamburg publishing firm of Hoffmann and Campe and the Frankfurt publisher Carl Löwenthal. The latter was ordered to stand trial alongside Karl Gutzkow in Mannheim on charges of creating and fostering a blasphemous portrayal of Christianity and the Christian Church. The Federal edict, which was a strengthened version of a Prussian order of suppression originally issued on November 14, 69 effectively banned the publication of any

67Wienbarg to the Frankfurt High Senate, 17.11.1835; in Houben, Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang, 196. The abbreviations and grammatical inconsistensies appear in the original.

68See Appendix A(i) for the text of the Hamburg ban and several other permutations of the ban which were considered.

69See Appendix A(i) for the complete text of the original order of suppression. The primary change in the December 10 order was the inclusion of Heine's name.
works by the five so-called Young German authors and prohibited all journals edited by the Young Germans; in addition no reviews of their works could be published.

During the subsequent Mannheim trial Gutzkow was forced to defend a series of passages from *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, most of which concerned aspects of Christian belief.\(^{70}\) Following the trial Gutzkow was found guilty on all charges and sentenced to four weeks in prison. Löwenthal, however, was acquitted on the grounds that he had not read the book prior to publishing it and could not therefore be held accountable for its contents.\(^{71}\) On February 16, 1836, the edict of suppression was commuted to a lifetime of special censorship. Finally in 1842 each of the Young German authors was given an opportunity to escape from the censorship restrictions by signing a pledge by which each man would promise not to concern himself with anything that might be offensive to the state, religion, or moral law.\(^{72}\) Mundt, Laube and Wienbarg signed the pledges. Karl Gutzkow refused to sign the loyalty oath and thus special scrutiny of his work continued for another year until he finally signed a watered-down version of the oath in 1843.

\(^{70}\)See Appendix B(iii) for a discussion of the specific passages upon which the Mannheim tribunal focussed.

\(^{71}\)See Chapter Three for additional details on the fallacious nature of this defence. Carl Löwenthal was not only aware of the contents of the book but he was instrumental in the creation of one of its characters. It is interesting to note that although Theodor Mundt believed that the charges against Löwenthal were motivated by anti-Semitism, his acquittal indicated that not everyone was anxious to convict the man based solely on his religious convictions. See Theodor Mundt, “Feuilleton,” *Literarischer Zodiacus* (October 1835), 298.

\(^{72}\)Before signing his pledge Wienbarg had been able to gain a position as co-editor of the *Deutsches Literaturblatt der Börsen-Halle*, but in the summer of 1842, following the signing of the pledge, Wienbarg was promoted to chief editor.
In the years which followed the ban even Gutzkow demonstrated an uncharacteristic reticence to tackle controversial issues and a marked degree of self-censorship was evident in his works. This self-censorship was most evident in 1836, immediately following the Prussian order of suppression. In that year Gutzkow published a two-volume anthology of his major writings on the new literature under the title *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur*. The 1836 collection included all of Gutzkow’s major reviews from 1835. However, Gutzkow made some significant changes to these reviews prior to their re-publication. A comparison of one of the original reviews from 1835 with the 1836 version reveals the degree to which the ban forced Gutzkow to qualify and edit his opinions.\(^{73}\)

In March 1835 Gutzkow published a detailed review of the second volume of Heinrich Heine’s *Der Salon*.\(^{74}\) However, in the 1836 reprint of the review he systematically edited out a series of telling passages.\(^{75}\) Any mention of the journals with which the Young Germans were so closely associated was deleted. Whereas the 1835 review had emphasized the fundamentally German nature of Heinrich Heine’s work, by 1836 this assertion was gone, along with a reference to the fact that Heine’s work discussed the nature of Christianity and Martin Luther. Any connection between Heine and the July Revolution including the 1835 claim that Heine’s work had functioned as the shock troops of the revolution was omitted. A reference to

---

\(^{73}\)See Appendix B(i) for the complete comparison.

\(^{74}\)Karl Gutzkow, “*Der Salon* von Heinrich Heine. Zweiter Teil,” *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland*, Literaturblatt Nr. 10 (11.3.1835), 237-239.

\(^{75}\)Karl Gutzkow, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur*, Bd. 1 (Stuttgart: P.Balz'sche Buchhandlung, 1836), 79-89.

25
Germany's decaying institutions, which initially read "Heine will die Hüter unsrer morschen Institutionen nur ärgern," was removed and the specifics of Heine's attack on the Christian church were buried in the new phrase "es gibt noch immer gewisse Dinge in Staat, Religion, Sitte und Meinung des Volkes, für welche Heine, wenn auch nicht sterben, doch einige Tage lang unpaß sein könnte." Finally, the belief that without Germany Heine was incomplete, a remark which again emphasized the essential connection between Heine and Germany, and a reference to Heine's genius were removed from the 1836 article.

In addition to the revisions evident in Zur neuesten Literatur, Gutzkow also published two revised editions of Wally, die Zweiflerin, the novel which was primarily responsible for the imposition of the interdict against the Young Germans. In 1852 the first revised edition of Wally appeared under the new title Vergangene Tage with several telling changes. Wally was given parents in an apparent attempt to make her appear more human. An entire section which had described Wally's promise to appear naked before her lover and her eventual submission to him, a section which had been singled out by the Mannheim tribunal, was omitted and instead replaced by two new sentences the first of which indicated that Wally wanted to be Caesar's wife, and the second of which clarified that the union between the two was of a spiritual nature since they could never consummate their love. In the same edition all references to an unspecified union between the two were replaced with the phrase 'spiritual union.' Gutzkow

---

76Gutzkow, "Der Salon," 238.
77Gutzkow, Beiträge zur Geschichte, 88.
78Karl Gutzkow, Vergangene Tage (Hamburg: Carl Löwenthal, 1852), 63-64.
then made additional changes in a final revision of *Wally* which was published in 1874. In this edition phrases attacking Christianity were either eliminated or rephrased to obscure their original intent. For example, Wally had originally remarked that it was nice to find mistakes in the Bible. This was subsequently changed to indicate that Wally was scandalized by this discovery. Additional changes made the relationship between Caesar and Wally appear to be a more traditional love story.

The degree of self-censorship which Gutzkow was forced to undertake in the years following the ban severely constrained his ability, and according to some interpretations his willingness,\(^79\) to pursue controversial issues. According to Hartmut Steinecke, a similar degree of self-censorship can be seen in the work of Heinrich Laube.\(^80\) At the end of 1835 Laube published a collection of essays entitled *Moderne Charakteristiken*.\(^81\) Though Laube had planned to include all of the major essays which he had produced during his tenure as editor of the *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, he omitted all of the work which discussed Heine, Börne and the other Young Germans rather than face further sanctions by the censorship authorities. As Steinecke noted, "...sein revolutionärer Elan war zum großen Teil gebrochen."\(^82\)

The overall result of the ban was the destruction of any common ground which might

\(^79\)Peter Bürgel’s analysis of the young Gutzkow’s letters examines the psychological stresses created by the ban and its repercussions. Peter Bürgel, *Die Briefe des frühen Gutzkow 1830 - 1848. Pathographie einer Epoche* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1975).

\(^80\)Steinecke, *Literaturkritik des Jungen Deutschland*, 179.


\(^82\)Steinecke, *Literaturkritik des Jungen Deutschlands*, 179.
have existed between Mundt, Laube, Wienbarg and Gutzkow in the period prior to December 1835. The attempts of Mundt and Laube to deny their involvement in the Young German movement created a permanent rift between themselves and Gutzkow and Wienbarg. In addition, the ongoing self-censorship and the continuing intervention of the censors ensured that these men would be unable to regain the freedom to approach contentious topics which they had enjoyed prior to the ban.

In later years any literary ventures by the Young German authors were greeted with great suspicion by the censors. Both Wienbarg and Gutzkow attempted to launch new literary journals in the relatively liberal publishing climate of Hamburg, a place where Gutzkow believed that he could still speak freely because “die Zensur benimmt sich ganz vernünftig gegen mich. Noch manches freie Wort läßt sich hier aussprechen.” The immediate result of both ventures, however, was a dramatic number of interventions by the censor, making these two journals the most highly censored of any periodicals published in Hamburg between 1819 and 1848.

In 1842 Wienbarg assumed the position of editor of the Hamburger literarische und kritische Blätter (formerly the Literarische und kritische Blätter der Börsen-Halle), a position which he held until 1846.

Gutzkow launched the Telegraph für Deutschland in Hamburg in 1837; his participation in the journal persisted until 1838, though he continued to publish articles in the Telegraph in the 1840s.

Gutzkow to Valerius Meidinger; Hamburg 5.3.1838; BdfG, 150.

A study by Margarete Kramer on the censorship apparatus in Hamburg notes that fifty-one articles from the Hamburger literarische und kritische Blätter were brought before the censor, of these nineteen were banned, nine were published with alterations, and twenty-three articles passed the censor without change. The record for Gutzkow's Telegraph für Deutschland is even more startling. A total of eighty-nine articles (given the short life of the
Given the difficulties associated with determining the true message of works published in the wake of the federal ban, any attempt to discover the original issues which concerned the so-called Young Germans must be limited to the period prior to the ban. This study will take as its starting point 1830, the year of the July Revolution, and conclude with the flurry of works produced before the ban in December 1835.\textsuperscript{87}

The final methodological issue which any study of the 'Young Germans' must confront concerns the nature of the sources available to the historian. The so-called Young Germans were prolific writers of novels, novellas,\textsuperscript{88} essays, travel diaries, letters, reviews and articles.\textsuperscript{89}

\textit{Telegraph} it would seem that this represents every article) were brought before the censor: thirty-six were banned outright, ten published with alterations, and forty-three passed without change; Margarete Kramer, \textit{Die Zensur in Hamburg 1819 bis 1848: Ein Beitrag zur Frage staatlicher Lenkung der Öffentlichkeit während des Deutschen Vormärz} (Hamburg: Helmut Bruske, 1975), 378-388.

\textsuperscript{87}The only exception to this rule is the inclusion of the \textit{Deutsche Revue}, a new journal by Gutzkow and Wienbarg which was scheduled for publication in January 1836. There are constant references during the summer and autumn of 1835 to the articles which were to appear in the \textit{Deutsche Revue}, thus it is apparent that the majority of this work was completed prior to the ban. In addition, at least one of the essays was published in other journals prior to the ban. Because of the periodization of this study some issues which became vitally important to the so-called Young Germans in later years cannot be fully analyzed. One such topic is Gutzkow's attitude towards the Jewish Question. Though he acknowledged that he wrestled with this issue prior to 1835, he remarked that he did not give serious thought to the topic until 1838; Houben, \textit{Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang}, 101. Thus the Jewish Question appears only peripherally in this study.

\textsuperscript{88}Theodor Mundt remarked on the difference between novels and novellas in his 1833 work \textit{Kritische Wälder}: novels revealed developments of world-historical significance, especially through their depiction of the hero's development; whereas "[d]ie Novelle... ist gleichsam nur eine Episode aus dem Roman des Lebens." Theodor Mundt, \textit{Kritische Wälder} (Leipzig: Wohlbrecht, 1833), 140.

\textsuperscript{89}In large part this prolific output is a reflection of the uncertainty associated with a literary career during this time period. Securing an adequate income from literary production
Frequently these genres were combined within a single work. Diaries, letters and essayistic asides feature prominently in the novels produced by Gutzkow, Mundt and Laube. One thus finds that their writings often blur traditional distinctions between fact and fiction. Jeffrey Sammons has argued that "[m]uch of the content of the novels is essayistic, clothed in epistolary and dialogue form, and tends to the same characteristics as the rest of the corpus. At times the writers seem to have thought that the boundary between fiction and non-fiction could be erased altogether."  

The belief that the boundaries between fictional work and non-fictional work could be eliminated was due in large part to the fact that the 'Young German' view of literature was first and foremost a utilitarian one. Regardless of genre, the 'Young Germans' believed that literature must serve a single purpose, namely the radical reorientation of society. Walter Hömberg has argued that

[i]hrer universalistischen Tendenz gemäß ging es ihnen nicht nur um politische und soziale Reformen im engeren Sinne, z. B. um die Ablösung der überkommenen Strukturen und Institutionen, sondern sie erstrebten zugleich eine grundlegende Neuorientierung im Bereich der Moral und der Religion.  

was difficult in the best of times. Gutzkow wrote more in his lifetime than Goethe but still complained in an 1852 letter that he seldom earned a comfortable living from his work: "Meine Existenz zwang mich, augenblicklich die Feder zu einer Arbeit zu ergreifen.... daß ich nichts zu schreiben wüßte, nein, daß ich Alles, was ich schreibe, hervorbringen muß! Daß ich nichts wegwerfen, liegen lassen, lange feilen kann! O man spricht von den großen Classikern, von Goethe, Schiller, Wieland, Herder, Jean Paul! Alle hatten Existenzen, hatten Pensionen." Karl Gutzkow quoted in Walter Hömberg, Zeitgeist und Ideenschmuggel: die Kommunikationsstrategie des Jungen Deutschland (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1975), 17.

90Ludolf Wienbarg did not produce any novels during the period prior to 1835.

91Sammons, Six Essays, 8.

92Hömberg, Zeitgeist und Ideenschmuggel, 43.
The difficulty for the ‘Young Germans’ was that many of the changes which they advocated could not be discussed openly and directly given the repressive restrictions imposed by the Metternichian system of censorship. What was needed was a medium through which the contemporary socio-political system could be criticized and a viable alternative offered, without attracting the attention of the ever-present censors. The ‘Young Germans’ believed that both factual and fictional literature provided that medium. The literature of the ‘Young Germans’ was consciously designed to be critical. It condemned the existing social, religious, political and moral arrangements while offering alternative systems for the reader’s consideration. However, ‘Young German’ literature was also crafted so as to evade the elaborate system of censorship. As Gutzkow noted “[a]mphibienartig leben wir halb auf dem Festlande der Politik, halb in den Gewässern der Dichtkunst.”

He went on to add that “Ideenschmuggel wird die Poesie des Lebens werden.” Fiction was a particularly useful form of camouflage since it allowed the author to distance himself somewhat from the controversial causes supported by his characters. If challenged by the authorities he could argue that he was merely describing a situation and not advocating a particular viewpoint. Fiction was thus the

---


94 Ibid. Gutzkow’s belief in the political potential of literature owes much to Ludwig Börne’s influence on him. Börne believed that literature could be placed in the service of political enlightenment and that a close relationship could be established between the critical literary text and the political debate of an era. The first forty-eight of Börne’s *Politische Briefe* appeared in October 1831 and the young Gutzkow was fascinated by the letters. His subsequent work with Wolfgang Menzel on the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* deepened his respect for Börne’s work; Wulf Wulfing, *Junges Deutschland: Texte - Kontexte, Abbildungen, Kommentar* (Munich: Carl Hanser, 1978), 112.
most effective medium through which subversive ideas could be smuggled to the public without raising the suspicions of the censors. Heinrich Laube confirmed this view when he commented in the *Elegante Welt* that the novel offered the best possible form of camouflage for ideas which would otherwise be banned.\(^{95}\)

Fiction also allowed the Young German authors to use the forms and language of the earlier romantic writers which were familiar to the censors, while at the same time introducing different themes.\(^{96}\) Romanticism continued to exert a powerful influence upon the so-called Young Germans though they themselves claimed that Young German literature was fundamentally different from the apolitical works of the Romantic German authors. The Romantic emphasis on the development of the individual, the pursuit of inner freedom, explorations of morality and the nature of religious belief were common themes in the ‘Young German’ novels. Gutzkow, Mundt and Laube were also deeply influenced by the early Romantic belief that artistic works could prepare the people to accept a new political system by educating and enlightening them. The early Romantics believed that their artistic works were a vehicle through which the potential of the individual could be fully realized. Thus they were able to explore alternative avenues of personal development which were denied to them by the present socio-political system. Romantic literature also displayed a similar tendency to blend multiple genres within a single work.

\(^{95}\)Heinrich Laube, “Literatur,” *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, Nr. 100 (23.05.1833), 398.

\(^{96}\)On the political ideas of the Romantics see Frederick C. Beiser, *Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought, 1790-1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 222-244.
For the historian of Young Germany the blurring of fact and fiction and the frequent resort to such romantic devices as analogy, signs, irony, wit and extravagant metaphors makes the interpretation of their novels extremely problematic. The voice of the author is seldom predominant, thus separating the views of the characters from the views of the author is often impossible. Nonetheless the fictional works were designed to create a new social order, thus their importance to the historian who seeks to understand the goals of the ‘Young Germans’ cannot be understated. In analysing the ‘fictional’ works of the so-called Young Germans this study has operated under the following assumptions. In a general sense the ‘Young German’ view of the author as a critic of contemporary society and his work as the vehicle by which a new order would be achieved, has been taken as evidence that all of the ‘Young German’ works, whether factual or fictional, express the author’s own goals for his society. Even so every effort has been made to ensure that the ideas attributed to a particular author in a ‘fictional’ work have been substantiated by ‘factual’ pieces such as reviews and essays. In addition, several of the so-called Young Germans acknowledged directly that the views expressed in their novels did in fact represent their own opinion. Where this is the case it has been indicated in the text.

3.

The early 1830s was a period of great change in the German states. A variety of oppositional groups were beginning to form, yet the Metternichian system remained as powerful as ever. Some understanding of the era, its origins and its defining characteristics is thus essential to any effort to interpret the actions of the men and women who lived during this period. Following the final defeat of Napoleon the German territories were reorganized into
thirty-eight territories\textsuperscript{97} and united into the German Confederation on June 8, 1815, ushering in a period that is commonly referred to as the Restoration Era.\textsuperscript{98} The great personal prestige that had been gained by Klemens von Metternich (1773-1859) during the Wars of Liberation had enabled the Hapsburgs to dominate the discussions at the Congress of Vienna and the settlement which resulted represented Metternich’s goals above all. Metternich’s primary aim had been to ensure that the settlement was structured so as to avoid any continental instability which might encourage the territorial ambitions of the Russian Tsar. He also evinced a considerable personal antipathy towards any form of revolutionary upheaval.\textsuperscript{99}

Prior to the settlement of 1815 there had been considerable discussion about the shape of the reconfigured German territories. Of greatest concern was the nature of the relationship between Austria and Prussia, but the leaders of the Mittelstaaten were also concerned that the settlement provide some recognition of the power and influence they had gained during the revolutionary wars. In 1814 Prussia’s Karl August von Hardenberg (1750-1822) had argued in favour of an ‘Eternal Confederation of German States.’ Hardenberg’s system would have been a two-tier federal structure under the joint leadership of Prussia and Austria. However, the

\textsuperscript{97} The addition of Hesse-Homberg in 1818 raised this number to thirty-nine.

\textsuperscript{98} This period is referred to variously as the Restoration Era (in reference to the restoration of the monarchies after the Napoleonic occupation), the Vormärz era (a more specific reference to Germany in the period from 1815 to the March revolutions of 1848), and/or the Biedermeier period. The latter term has been preferred by social historians to refer to the period from 1815 to approximately 1850 when an idyllic vision of family life and clearly defined male and female roles dominated social discussion.

smaller states, in particular Württemberg and Hanover, rejected this plan outright as it severely constrained their power. In turn, Metternich proposed that the sovereign princes and leading free cities be formed into a confederation of independent states. This confederation would have one statutory institution, the Bundesversammlung, which would meet in Frankfurt. The Bundesversammlung would function as a Federal Diet. It would be attended by an ambassador from each of the states and would exercise executive authority over the member states. Austria alone would head the meetings of the Diet.

The system which Metternich proposed was entrenched in the Bundesakte of June 18, 1815. Since several substantive problems had not been resolved by that date, they were postponed until the first meeting of the Diet. These issues included common provisions for defence, economic policies and legal institutions, the status of Jews in the Confederation, the position of the mediatized nobility, the drafting of a uniform press law\textsuperscript{100} and the constitutional status of the member states. Each of these questions was designated by a specific provision of the Bundesakte for future discussion.

Though the Vienna settlement was considered by many to be less than ideal, it did generate some substantial hope for the future. In particular, reformers were encouraged by Article Thirteen of the Bundesakte which stipulated that every state should have a landständische Verfassung, a representative constitution. Following the settlement, however, progress on Article Thirteen was frustratingly slow as a constitutional struggle immediately

\textsuperscript{100}Article 18d. of the Bundesakte established that the first meeting of the Federal Diet should address the establishment of a uniform decree on press freedom and should ensure that the rights of writers and publishers were protected against unlawful duplication of their work. See Appendix A(iii) for the full text.
ensued. On one side were the defenders of the traditional estate system who saw the constitution as a way of protecting their particular interests from the ever-growing bureaucratic state. On the other side were the advocates of state sovereignty who saw the constitution as a way to unify and consolidate their states in the face of multiple particular interests. Though most states did adopt new constitutions in the years following the passage of Article Thirteen, they seldom matched the high hopes of the reformers. Considerable unrest thus developed centred primarily in Hesse-Darmstadt and Nassau. The universities in particular emerged as the centres of the protest movement. The Burschenschaften, student organizations that had originated at the University of Jena, protested loudly against bureaucracy and excessive government.

The growing discontent in the universities did not escape Metternich’s attention. On September 20, 1819, using the assassination of the ultra-conservative writer August von Kotzebue by the Jena student Karl Ludwig Sand as a pretext, Metternich imposed the Karlsbad

---

101 The exceptions were Prussia, Austria, Oldenburg and Hesse-Homburg.

102 The most thorough account of the revolutionary upheavals in these years can be found in Karl Wegert, *German Radicals Confront the Common People: Revolutionary Politics and Popular Politics 1789-1849* (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1992).

103 Discontent in the universities was also fueled by the fact that the number of job opportunities for the university-educated population was declining. John Toews notes that “[a]dvancement from the status of unsalaried lecturer (*Privatdozent*) to a fully salaried chair (*Ordinarius*) was slow and difficult in the best of times. Between 1815 and 1848 the average age of *habilitation* as a *Privatdozent* was twenty-six; the average age at which the security of an *Ordinarius* was achieved was thirty-five. Just as in the judicial and administrative hierarchies, there was a long wait in poverty and insecurity before one could hope to attain social and financial security. During the 1830s this situation became considerably worse.” John E. Toews, *Hegelianism: The Path Toward Dialectical Humanism, 1805-1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 215.
Resolutions on the German Confederation. The Karlsbad legislation provided for closer supervision of the universities and tighter regulation of the press through the creation of a central commission that was charged with the co-ordination and enforcement of censorship throughout the Confederation. The Karlsbad Resolutions also included the Untersuchungsgesetz which established the Centralbehörde zur nähern Untersuchung der in mehreren Bundesstaaten entdeckten revolutionären Umtriebe, otherwise known as the Mainz Central Investigating Commission, which included representatives from Prussia, Bavaria, Austria, Hanover, Baden, Hesse and Nassau. In spite of attempts by the Diet to hold the Commission answerable for its activities, it nonetheless enjoyed more or less independent power. Working with the local police forces, the commission scrutinized and condemned the activities of hundreds of Germans, including Fichte, Jahn, Hardenberg and Stein, in the five years of its existence. Though the Karlsbad Resolutions were supposed to end in 1824, the restrictions on the universities and the censorship provisions effectively remained in place until 1848.

The repressive programme contained in the Karlsbad Resolutions was further underscored by the Wiener Schlufakte which was passed in July 1820. The Schlufakte revised the Bundesakte of 1815, removing any of the progressive impulses contained in the original charter. Article Twenty-Six authorized the Confederation to intervene in a state’s domestic affairs if this was deemed necessary for the preservation of the order of the Confederation.

104 Ludwig Bentfeldt, Der deutsche Bund als nationales Band 1815-1866 (Zürich: Musterschmidt, 1985), 106; see Appendix A(ii) for the text of the Karlsbad Resolutions.

105 Ibid., 108.
Article Fifty-Eight limited the ability of state leaders to agree to a constitution that might limit or obstruct their ability to carry out their duties to the Confederation and Article Fifty-Nine warned that the proceedings of any individual Bundestag would not be permitted to threaten the domestic order of any individual state or the Confederation as a whole. Finally, since there had been no progress on a uniform press law or on questions of religious freedom, Article Sixty-Five established that additional discussion of these issues would be postponed indefinitely. Wegert concludes that the measures instituted after the murder of Kotzebue made it so difficult for radicals to remain undetected that from 1819 to 1829 Germany remained quiet.

Among German writers and intellectuals the 1820s saw very strong anti-French sentiments re-emerge, accompanied by a return to more traditional conceptions of the Germanic state. Schulze notes that Baron vom Stein demanded that the constitution of the Peace of Westphalia be replaced by a renewed medieval Empire. The celebration of the Germanic past continued with vom Stein’s *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Heinrich Luden’s *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, and Friedrich von Raumer’s *Geschichte der*

---

106 *Ibid.*, 37-51; see Appendix A(iii).


108 Baron Heinrich Friedrich Karl vom und zum Stein (1757-1831) sponsor of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* was better known for the series of reforms which he put in place in Prussia between 1807 and 1810, including the Edict of 1807 which abolished serfdom and the estate system, ended the restrictions that kept nobles from selling their land to the middle class, and opened trades and professions to all classes.

109 Heinrich Luden (1780-1847) was a Jena historian whose works included *Allgemeine Geschichte der Völker und Staaten des Altertums* (1814) and *Allgemeine Geschichte der*
All of these writers celebrated both the uniqueness and the greatness of Germanic culture and reminded their readers of past triumphs.

As far as many German writers were concerned the most oppressive aspect of the post-1819 reaction was the system of censorship which was established as a result of the Karlsbad Resolutions. Though the uniform press law envisioned in Article 18d. of the Bundesakte had been intended to protect freedom of the press and the rights of authors and publishers, this was quickly twisted into a censorship law. At this time there was a clear belief on both sides of the political spectrum that the power of the written word was immense. Thus, in order to contain the potentially disruptive power of writers and journalists, the Prussian censorship law, established on 18 October, 1819, decreed that all publications with fewer than twenty folio sheets (equal to 320 pages) published anywhere within the German territories must be submitted to a preventive censor, prior to publication. This became known as the Vorzensur. The same law also created a higher authority known as the Ober-Zensur, which retained final executive and judicial authority over all censorship decisions. Local police forces were used to

\[\text{Völker und Staaten des Mittelalters (1821-1822), as well as the twelve volume Geschichte des deutschen Volkes (1825-1832).}\]

\[\text{110Friedrich von Raumer (1781-1873) was a professor at the University of Berlin; his works included Vorlesungen über die alte Geschichte (1821) and Polens Untergang (1832). Both Theodor Mundt and Karl Gutzkow studied with Raumer.}\]

\[\text{111Several writers were forced to resort to extraordinary measures in an attempt to evade the Vorzensur. By publishing volumes two and three of his Reisebilder simultaneously, Heine managed to avoid the Vorzensur by exceeding the 320 page limit. Likewise Gutzkow appended an article entitled \text{"Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit" to Wally, die Zweiflerin} in part to ensure that the novel surpassed the Vorzensur's page limit.}\]
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enforce the edicts of the *Ober-Zensur*.112

With this edict the greater part of the German book industry and all newspapers and journals were subjected to official scrutiny and possible censorship. In order to enforce this law a censorship apparatus was established in thirty-six of the thirty-nine territories of the German Confederation—though the Constitutional states such as Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt were somewhat less rigorous in enforcing the censorship laws.113 The senates of the three free cities of Frankfurt, Hamburg and Bremen argued successfully for the maintenance of their sovereignty in matters of censorship, and thereby avoided the most draconian of the Prussian and Austrian decrees.114

More troublesome for writers and publishers than the *Vorzensur* was the second level of censorship, the *Nachzensur*, which was directed against editors and publishers of offending

[112] Though the legislation which created the censorship apparatus was Prussian, and the Ober-Zensur answered to the Prussian Interior Ministry, the Ober-Zensur had executive and judicial authority in every state of the German confederation.

[113] Udo Köster, *Literarischer Radikalismus. Zeitbewußtsein und Geschichtsphilosophie in der Entwicklung vom Jungen Deutschland zur Hegelischen Linken* (Frankfurt: 1972), 57ff; Baden’s reputation for more liberal application of the censorship decrees did nothing to save the Young Germans in 1835, as Baden banned the publication of all works by the authors named in the Prussian edict a mere twenty-eight days after the ruling by the Prussian censor. It was Baden where Gutzkow was finally imprisoned on 30 November, 1835.

[114] Gutzkow was so certain of the liberal censorship laws in Frankfurt that he chose that city as the base for the proposed publication of *Deutsche Revue*; in a letter to a Mannheim publisher Heinrich Hoff, Gutzkow wrote: “[Es] kommt dazu, daß ich in Frankfurt. mit der Censur auf gutem Fuss stehe, u recht gut weiß, was man bieten kann.” Gutzkow to Heinrich Hoff, Stuttgart 27.8.35. *BdFG*, 151 (these abbreviations appear in the original letter). For a time the *Bundestag* of Württemberg was also able to retain some independence over its press laws. However, a showdown between the Württemberg representative Freiherr von Wangenheim and the *Bundesversammlung* eventually led to the defeat of the former and the restriction of Württemberg’s press law. See Bentfeldt, *Der deutsche Bund*, 113-126.
material. Should a book or journal be banned after publication the entire publishing run could be seized at a considerable loss to the publishing house in question. While ordinarily a single quarrel with the censor would not have any significant repercussions, multiple infringements of the 1819 laws could result in a ban against the entire publishing house. Karl Gutzkow's publisher Carl Löwenthal suffered this fate in the mid-1830s and Heine's publisher Campe resorted to editing Heine's works in 1841 rather than face the wrath of the Nachzensur.

Even during the height of the reaction, however, certain limited avenues remained open for the propagation of liberal and nationalist ideas. The censors were notoriously slow, due in large part to the enormous amount of material they were expected to process. The overwhelming amount of material led the censors to impose an arbitrary limit of twenty pages, below which the censor would not usually review the material. Thus much of the work by liberal and radical authors was published in newspapers, journals and other media carefully designed to evade the twenty page limit. A growing rate of adult literacy and the proliferation of reading circles also ensured that new ideas reached a broader audience than ever before. There was also more to read than at any previous time: the number of books and

---

115 See Appendix A(i) for the ruling of the censor against Carl Löwenthal.

116 Campe had already been warned in 1835 that his affiliation with Heine was placing his publishing house in a dangerous position. The text of the Hamburg ban against the Young Germans ordered that "Die Regierung der freien Stadt Hamburg wird aufgefordert, in dieser Beziehung insbesondere der Hoffmann- und Campe'schen Buchhandlung zu Hamburg, welche vorzugsweise Schriften obiger Art in Verlag und Vertrieb hat, die geeignete Verwarnung zu gehen zu lassen." Houben, Zeitschriften des Jungen Deutschlands, Bd. 1, 439.

newspapers available more than doubled between the years 1820 and 1850. These complementary developments prompted Robert Prutz, a leading *Vormärz* literary critic to comment that "[i]n the bleak period of the twenties, the heyday of the restoration, it was [literature] that primarily, if not exclusively, kept alive the patriotic hopes of the nation and sparked some kind of public life."\(^{118}\)

The hopes that had been nourished by literature and journalism were further boosted by the outbreak of revolutionary activity in 1830. In July 1830 Parisian workers, impoverished by rising food prices, took to the streets protesting the cost of living, the hoarding of grain by merchants and unfair taxes. The Bourbon regime of Charles X collapsed and the King fled to England. After several weeks of indecision among the rebels the duc d'Orléans took the throne as Louis-Philippe, king of the French. The disturbances in France spread quickly throughout Europe. In the North the Belgian provinces revolted against the Netherlands in August 1830. The Belgians demanded their own state, a concession which would have fundamentally violated the territorial settlement established at Vienna. However, the great powers were eventually convinced to accept an independent Belgium on the condition that it remain a neutral nation.

In the East a revolt began in Warsaw in November 1830. Polish army cadets and students demanded a constitution and freedom from their Russian overlords. Landed aristocrats and members of the gentry joined in the revolutionary cause and established a provisional government. However, indecision over the nature of the reform programme split the government and the Russians intervened to crush the rebellion. In the south the Greeks

mounted an independence struggle against their Ottoman overlords. Seeing an effort to gain influence in the area Russia declared war on Turkey, an event which aroused Metternich's suspicions regarding Russia's territorial ambitions. Of even greater concern to Metternich were the activities in the Italian states of Parma and Modena. In February 1831 Italian nationalists rose up against Austrian rule. Though the revolutionaries were ineffective against the powerful Austrian army, the nationalist and republican ambitions which had motivated the rebels were kept alive in the Young Italy movement, founded in exile in 1832 under the leadership of the exiled Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872).119

In Germany the repercussions of the July Revolution once again brought questions of emancipation, liberalism and revolution to the forefront of public consciousness. Leonard Krieger sees the period which began in 1830 as "the decisive conflict and the denouement in the history of the modern state in Germany."120 Krieger argues that the revolution was the catalyst which transferred the fight for liberal principles from official institutions to citizen groups. However, these groups were extremely diverse in their goals and tactics; some liberal supporters advocated constitutional reform while others attempted to foster direct political action. At the same time Krieger believes that an intellectual liberal movement emerged independent of this uncoordinated mass action, and the forces of bureaucratic liberalism were

---

119 In 1834 exiled members of Young Italy who had taken refuge in Bern, Switzerland founded a new movement which was variously called 'das junge Deutschland' or 'das junge Europa.'

also strengthened.\textsuperscript{121}

The July Revolution also led some territories, especially Baden and Bavaria, to ease censorship restrictions which in turn brought about an invigoration of political life. Hagen Schulze argues that in Germany the July Revolution also reinvigorated the debate over nationhood.\textsuperscript{122} Schulze agrees with Krieger that the Revolution was vitally important in enlivening the struggle for liberal principles, but goes on to argue that "freedom in the liberal sense, unity in the national sense... were the ideologies which permeated collective views of the world and carried the promise of future felicity."\textsuperscript{123} Schulze believes that, in Germany, the liberal, constitutional and social currents of the time were all pursuing the national principle.

The most significant demonstration of popular agitation in the German states came in May 1832 when the German Press and Fatherland Association held an open celebration of the proclamation of the first Bavarian constitution at Schloß Hambach. The gathering included representatives of liberal, democratic and constitutionalist organizations, all of whom expressed their dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs in the German Confederation.\textsuperscript{124} The response of the federal authorities to the Hambach festival was predictable. The restrictive

\textsuperscript{121}\textit{Ibid.}, 278-280.

\textsuperscript{122}Schulze, \textit{The Course of German Nationalism}, 60.

\textsuperscript{123}\textit{Ibid.}, 61.

\textsuperscript{124}Wegert offers a convincing argument that the Hambach Festival was far less coherent than the authorities perceived. The radicals were not destroyers of the traditional order; rather, they simply wished to eliminate the existing restrictions on free thought and to educate the common people regarding the sources of their discontent. The common people meanwhile viewed the Hambach festival as a community celebration rather than a radical protest against the status quo. Wegert, \textit{German Radicals Confront}, 144-171.
measures established by the Karlsbad resolutions had already been extended indefinitely in September 1830. In addition, the Federal Diet introduced a series of regulations for the maintenance of peace and order in June and July 1832. On June 28 the Diet reaffirmed monarchical authority and established a commission to ensure that the German states would conform and on July 5 it underscored the existing rules on censorship and limited the public activities of political organizations. Finally, in June 1833 the Diet authorized the creation of the Bundes-Zentralbehörde in Frankfurt, a centralized bureau of police investigation. During the next nine years the Bureau investigated some 2000 suspicious individuals.\textsuperscript{125} During this period of repression many of the states also strengthened their defences against radical activity. In Bavaria 8500 troops were despatched to identify and control revolutionary groups and in Baden the liberal press law which had made that state a safe haven for many radicals was struck down. The reaction in Hesse-Kassel, Hanover and Saxony was even stronger.\textsuperscript{126}

James Sheehan notes, however, that the reaction to the revolutionary upheavals of 1830 was at best incomplete. The proliferation of radical books, periodicals and newspapers defeated the best efforts of the censors, and meanwhile social clubs and cultural organizations became open forums for political discussions.\textsuperscript{127} On April 3, 1833 a small group of former Burschenschaftler attempted to seize control of the city of Frankfurt in the so-called Wachensturm, intending to provoke a wider revolution. The revolution was not forthcoming

\textsuperscript{125}Bentfeldt, \textit{Der deutsche Bund}, 233.

\textsuperscript{126}Sheehan, \textit{Germany 1770-1866}, 614.

\textsuperscript{127}\textit{Ibid.}, 614-615.
but in May 1833 there was renewed unrest in the Palatinate on the anniversary of the Hambach Festival. By the end of 1834 the few Frankfurt rebels who had avoided prosecution formed the *Union*, an association dedicated to mobilizing the German working class. Thus the energies unleashed by the revolutions of 1830 were not easily contained.

4.

The wave of protest which swept Germany in the early 1830s was sustained by the activities of several literary groups. 'Young Germany' was one such group. Drawing upon many of the ideas of 1830 and taking advantage of the various opportunities to evade the reactionary measures instituted by Metternich, the so-called Young Germans were able to produce an immense body of work between 1830 and 1835. Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg were prolific writers, contributing to a variety of literary journals and daily newspapers, while simultaneously producing a substantial body of literature, including both novels and factual or semi-fictional essays.¹²⁸

Karl Gutzkow was the most prolific of the Young Germans. As Sammons observed, "I cannot imagine that anyone who ever lived has read his complete works, not even the indefatigable Houben."¹²⁹ Gutzkow was born in Berlin on March 17, 1811. His father was a civilian employee in the Prussian ministry of war whose income allowed Gutzkow to attend a prestigious gymnasium. During this time he was also able to travel and write extensively and he

¹²⁸ Though this study is only concerned with the activities of the so-called Young Germans prior to 1835, the following biographical sketches cover the entire lives of these writers in order to provide a sense of the fate of these men after the ban.

became fascinated with the works of Novalis and Jean Paul. At the beginning of 1829 Gutzkow entered the University of Berlin which was dominated at that time by the presence of G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) and Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834).\textsuperscript{130} By 1829 the Philosophical Faculty was divided into two conflicting schools of thought: the "philosophical" party which was loyal to Hegel's teachings and the "Historical School" which had coalesced around Schleiermacher and Barthold Niebuhr (1776-1831). The two groups differed over several key issues but the most important division concerned the nature of the state. John Toews notes that

\begin{quote}
[w]hereas Hegel believed that the rational structure of the modern state was the sphere in which the conflicts of bourgeois society were reconciled and the ideal of ethical life finally actualized, Schleiermacher saw the state simply as the external organizational form of the organic communality of a people (Volk) sharing the same language and cultural traditions.\textsuperscript{131}
\end{quote}

Though Gutzkow briefly entered the Theological Faculty; the greater part of his education was completed in the Philosophical Faculty.\textsuperscript{132} During his attendance at Berlin Gutzkow heard lectures by representatives of both major schools of thought: Hegel, Schleiermacher, the

\textsuperscript{130} The brief educational synopses which follow are drawn primarily from Houben, \textit{Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang}; Wülfing, \textit{Junges Deutschland}; and Walter Dietze, \textit{Junges Deutschland und deutsche Klassik}.

\textsuperscript{131} Toews, \textit{Hegelianism}, 57.

\textsuperscript{132} The shift from theology to philosophy was a common path taken by many students and academics during this period. As theology became more dogmatic and increasingly less able to accommodate itself to a changing world, scholars looked to philosophy to provide the 'truths' which they had previously sought in religion. Ultimately the notion of philosophy as autonomous and authoritative would be undermined by the theory of ideology which appeared in the 1840s. According to this theory philosophy itself was dependent on social and political conditions. On this topic see Harold Mah, \textit{The End of Philosophy and the Origin of "Ideology." Karl Marx and the Crisis of the Young Hegelians} (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987), especially 1-19.
Church historian Johann August Wilhelm Neander (1789-1850), the historian Friedrich von Raumer (1781-1873), the philologist August Boeckh (1785-1867) and the geographer Karl Ritter (1779-1859). Gutzkow excelled in Latin and was fascinated by ancient history as well as old Germanic literature. During this period he was clearly drawn to the Hegelian group and on August 3, 1830 Hegel personally awarded Gutzkow a Philosophical Faculty prize for an essay on ancient conceptions of fate. Gutzkow’s continuing interest in antiquity and his mastery of Latin led eventually to his Jena doctoral thesis, *De diis fatalibus*.

At the age of twenty Gutzkow left the academic world and under the guidance of Wolfgang Menzel founded the *Forum der Journalliteratur*. Subsequently he worked with Menzel on the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*, a journal which was inspired by and dedicated to Heinrich Heine and Ludwig Börne. In 1832 Gutzkow published his first novella *Briefe eines Narren an eine Nährin* which attracted considerable attention. In the same year he published his first scarcely-concealed attack on his former mentor, Menzel, in the short yet controversial “Divination auf den nächsten württembergischen Landtag.” In 1833 he published another novella, *Maha Guru, Geschichte eines Gottes*.

The year 1835 was Gutzkow’s most prolific period. In January he assumed the position of editor and chief contributor to the *Literaturblatt* supplement of *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland*, a position which he held until August 22 of that year. During that year he also

---

133 By the 1830s securing an academic career was virtually impossible. The budget of the University of Berlin was fixed in 1830 so that any new appointment meant a salary reduction for existing faculty. The number of Privatdozenten increased enormously but the chance of gaining a permanent position at any university in the German states was virtually nil. John Toews notes that the socio-economic situation was a significant factor in the transformation of many intellectuals into radical cultural critics; Toews, *Hegelianism*, 216.
wrote an introduction to a new edition of Friedrich Schlegel's *Lucinde*. Gutzkow's introduction focussed not on *Lucinde* itself, but rather on Friedrich Schleiermacher's "Vertraute Briefe," an earlier commentary on Schlegel's work. Later in 1835 Gutzkow's first full-length novel, *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, was published. Essentially a novel about one woman's battle with religious doubt, *Wally* was the most contentious of the so-called Young German writings and the direct cause of the Federal ban of 1835.

*Wally* was published in mid-August 1835.\(^{134}\) At twenty folio sheets long the work had been able to evade the office of the *Vorzensur*. However, subsequent reviews and a vitriolic exchange between Gutzkow and Wolfgang Menzel brought the work to the attention of the *Ober-Zensur* in Berlin. The *Ober-Zensur* ruled on September 18 that the novel could no longer be sold in Prussia. On September 22 the novel was banned entirely in Prussia and by October 20 the state of Baden had also indicated its disapproval of the work. On October 27 legal proceedings were instituted against Gutzkow and Löwenthal at the high court in Mannheim. The issue was brought to Metternich's attention on October 31, 1835 by the chief of political police Wilhelm von Wittgenstein.\(^{135}\) On November 1 *Wally* was confiscated in Kurhessen and on November 14 in Mannheim, though evidently by the 14th Carl Löwenthal had only two copies of the work, from the original printing of 800, left unsold. Also on November 14th

\(^{134}\)August 12 or 16. Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres' notes that there was some confusion regarding the date of publication; Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres, "Introduction," to Karl Gutzkow, *Wally, the Skeptic*, transl. Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres (Frankfurt am Main: Herbert Lang, 1974), 19. Houben reports that *Wally* was published on August 12. Houben, *Verbotene Literatur von der Klassischen Zeit*, 262-263.

\(^{135}\)Houben, *Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang*, 58.
Prussia imposed a formal edict of suppression on the work. On November 24th Gutzkow's application for a residency permit in Frankfurt was withdrawn and three days later a preliminary hearing determined that Gutzkow and Löwenthal would be charged with derision of the Christian faith and Church. On November 30 a warrant was issued for Gutzkow's arrest and he was imprisoned in Baden until his trial began on January 8, 1836. On January 13 a Mannheim tribunal found Gutzkow guilty of defaming the Christian religion. He was sentenced to an additional four weeks in prison, over and above the time he had served while awaiting trial and was also ordered to pay one third of the trial costs.

Immediately prior to the ban Gutzkow had begun a collaborative venture with Ludolf Wienbarg which was to have led to the publication of a new literary journal, *Deutsche Revue*, in January 1836. However, the ban and Gutzkow’s subsequent imprisonment prevented the publication of this journal. Following the ban Gutzkow published a highly edited collection of his writings under the title *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur* in 1836. Thereafter he returned briefly to work on literary journals but frustration with the censor eventually led him to concentrate on novels and plays. In 1837 he published *Seraphine* and in 1838 the satirical three volume *Blasedow und seine Söhne*. After this novel, Gutzkow turned his hand to play-writing with “König Saul” in 1839, “Richard Savage oder der Sohn einer Mutter” in 1842, “Zopf und Schwert” in 1844 and “Das Urbild des Tartüffes” in 1847. In 1848 Gutzkow was a member of the Committee of Conciliation and wrote two pamphlets which discussed the ideas of freedom and unity.¹³⁶ However, under the direction of Count Arnim-Boytzenburg and

¹³⁶*Published collectively: Karl Gutzkow, Deutschland am Vorabend seines Falles oder seiner Größe* (Frankfurt: C. Löwenthal, 1848).
Prince Lichnowsky Gutzkow also delivered a pacifying speech to the masses, urging them not to take drastic action.\footnote{Ernest K. Bramsted, \textit{Aristocracy and the Middle Classes in Germany: Social Types in German Literature 1830-1900}, rev. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), 79.} After the events of 1848, Gutzkow returned to the creation of novels, the most important of which appeared between 1850 and 1861: \textit{Der Ritter vom Geiste} (1850/51) and \textit{Der Zauberer von Rom} (1858-1861). Also during this period Gutzkow produced the first of two autobiographical works, \textit{Aus der Knabenzeit} (1852). Gutzkow had created a legion of enemies both during and after his involvement with the Young Germans and eventually fell prey to feelings of paranoia. An unsuccessful suicide attempt in 1865 intensified his delusions though he continued to write. During this period Gutzkow produced his autobiography, \textit{Rückblicke auf mein Leben} (1875). Gutzkow died on December 16, 1878, burned to death during a fire at his home.

Theodor Mundt was born in Potsdam on September 19, 1808 the son of a civil servant. He was raised in Berlin and, like Gutzkow, attended the University of Berlin though he first entered the Law Faculty in 1825 before moving to Philosophy in May 1826. Mundt and Gutzkow shared many of the same lecturers including Raumer, Ritter and Boeckh. Mundt was also a student of Hegel, studying logic, natural philosophy and the history of philosophy with Hegel during the winter of 1827/28. Wülffing notes, however, that Mundt was the first of the so-called Young Germans to distance himself from Hegel in 1832.\footnote{Wülffing, \textit{Junges Deutschland}, 131. Mundt also claimed to have studied metaphysics and aesthetics with Hegel in the summer of 1826 but Walter Dietze was unable to substantiate this claim. Dietze, \textit{Junges Deutschland und Deutsche Klassik}, 137.} Mundt’s academic career
concluded with his doctoral studies at Erlangen and a dissertation on ancient rhetoric.

During his years as a student Mundt wrote for several newspapers---both liberal and more conservative publications. From 1830 to 1833 Mundt edited the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* and also wrote several short novellas including, "Der Basilisk, oder Gesichterstudien" and "Madelon." In 1834 Mundt produced his first full-length novel, *Moderne Lebenspirren*, which was followed in 1835 by the publication of a second full-length monograph entitled *Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen* and the highly provocative piece *Charlotte Stieglitz: Ein Denkmal*. The latter was a tribute to the wife of Heinrich Stieglitz, whose suicide had deeply affected Mundt, Gutzkow and the others. Also in 1835 Mundt became editor of *Literarischer Zodiacus* and evidently became fascinated with the proposed collaboration of Gutzkow and Wienbarg on the *Deutsche Revue*. Mundt contacted Gutzkow during this period about the possibility of a meeting early in the new year to discuss the creation of a more formal structure within which the three men would operate. These plans, however, were terminated by the Reichstag decree. Immediately after the appearance of the Reichstag ban an embittered Mundt attempted to distance himself as far as possible from the others. Mundt did receive some recognition for his earlier work as a Young German in 1848 when he was briefly named to the post of extraordinary professor of language and literary history at Breslau. This position did not survive the retrenchment of 1849, however, and soon Mundt was able only to secure work as a librarian in Berlin. Mundt died on November 30, 1861.

Christian Ludolf Wienbarg was born on Christmas Day, 1802, in Altona, the son of a blacksmith. Whereas Mundt and Gutzkow were at the centre of many of the great theological
and philosophical debates of their day by virtue of their attendance at the University of Berlin, Wienbarg was somewhat removed from the great scholars. His mother’s insistence that he study theology led him to the University of Kiel, but his study of Schleiermacher eventually shifted his interest from theology to philosophy.\textsuperscript{139} After serving briefly as a private tutor, Wienbarg moved to Bonn in 1828 where he became interested in Greek philosophy and art, in particular the works of Plato and Aristotle. In an autobiographical essay Wienbarg claimed that he was able to hear lectures by August Schlegel (1767-1845) and Barthold Niebuhr (1776-1831) during this period. However, Houben notes that there is some doubt concerning this chronology of events.\textsuperscript{140} By 1829 Wienbarg moved to Marburg where he submitted his doctoral dissertation: \textit{De primitivo idearum Platonarum sensu}. Following the completion of his dissertation Wienbarg settled in Hamburg where he met Heinrich Heine and briefly joined the circle of writers who had congregated around Heine. Houben notes that Wienbarg was already familiar with Heine’s travelogues but this period of personal contact between the two men was vital in shaping Wienbarg’s style and interests.\textsuperscript{141}

A brief career as a private tutor in Holland produced the travel novella \textit{Holland in den Jahren 1831 und 1832}, written in the style of Heine’s \textit{Reisebilder}. Wienbarg returned to his studies at Kiel in 1833. As a \textit{Privatdozent} he lectured on Gothic and Middle-High German

\textsuperscript{139} Wienbarg was unable to hear Schleiermacher speak in person but in 1830 he did send him a copy of his dissertation and a sonnet which he had composed as an expression of gratitude for the profound influence which Schleiermacher had exerted upon him. Houben, \textit{Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang}, 236.

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Ibid.}, 224-234.

\textsuperscript{141} For his part Heine considered Wienbarg a “sehr geistreichen Mann.” \textit{Ibid.}, 180.
literature as well as the history of German literature. \textit{Ästhetische Feldzüge} (1834), Wienbarg's most important work, was drawn from twenty-four lectures which he gave during this period. In this book Wienbarg called for a new political and functional literature, spear-headed by Germany's young writers, which would revolutionize the role of literature in society. In 1835 Wienbarg published two collections of his most important essays. The first, \textit{Zur neuesten Literatur}, included essays on Heine and Gutzkow. The second collection, \textit{Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis}, was a more thoughtful work concerned with such issues as religious change and the dangers of autocracy. In the same year, Wienbarg moved to Frankfurt in order to begin his collaboration with Gutzkow on the ill-fated \textit{Deutsche Revue}.

After the ban Wienbarg returned eventually to Hamburg to work on several different newspapers including the Hamburger \textit{Neue Zeitung} and \textit{Börsen-Halle}, the Altona\textit{ Merkur} and the \textit{Deutsches Literaturblatt}. Though Wienbarg did find work following the ban its impact was devastating as far as his creativity was concerned. In 1838 Wienbarg produced a new novella, \textit{Tagebuch von Helgoland}, but it lacked the vigour and confidence of his earlier works and following a brief period as editor of the \textit{Deutsches Literaturblatt} from 1840 to 1842, Wienbarg faded gradually into obscurity. In the years surrounding the Revolutions of 1848, he returned briefly to the public stage as he became deeply involved in the Schleswig-Holstein question. Wienbarg fought briefly against Denmark with one of the \textit{Freikorps} units, but his major contribution to the cause came from his meticulous chronicling of the region's history. Between 1846 and 1851 he published six treatises on the Schleswig-Holstein issue, including the three volume \textit{Darstellungen aus den schleswig-holsteinischen Feldzügen} (1850/1851). However, with the failure of 1848 Wienbarg returned once again to private life. By the mid-
1850s a severe battle with alcoholism combined with early signs of mental illness to create a persecution complex. In 1869 Wienbarg was committed to an asylum where he died on January 2, 1872.

Heinrich Laube was the best-known literary critic of the group and the only Young German to enjoy a relatively successful career following the Reichstag ban. Laube was born on September 18, 1806 in Sprottau, Silesia, son of a master stone-mason. Like Gutzkow and Wienbarg, Laube began his university education intending to study theology. He therefore chose to attend the University of Halle as its Theological Faculty was the largest school of divinity in the German states. During Laube's time at Halle the university was the site of an intense theological conflict between the Halle Pietists and Protestant Rationalists, over the true nature of Christ. The rancour generated by this debate seemed to many, including Laube, to reflect all that was wrong with contemporary Christianity. Eventually his study of evangelical theology and the history of biblical criticism alienated him from theology and led him into philosophy. By the time he moved to the University of Breslau in the Winter of 1827/28 Laube had largely abandoned theology for philosophy, under the tutelage of the philosopher Heinrich

---

142 Halle was originally founded as a refuge for Philipp Jacob Spener and his Pietist movement. Spener had established the university and its surrounding institutions, including a pauper school and an orphanage, after being offered refuge in Brandenburg by Friedrich III. Friedrich Schleiermacher was a Halle alumnus.

143 The Pietists believed that Christ was a real historical figure whose activities were recorded in the New Testament; the Rationalists argued (following the line established by Voltaire) that Christ was merely a philosophical entity who provided guidelines for ethical behaviour.
Steffens (1773-1845). Laube gained a peripheral awareness of Hegel’s work during his years at Breslau but his knowledge of Hegelian philosophy remained limited. In 1829 Laube returned to the theological debate concerning the doctrine of original sin but as Houben notes his interest in theology had more or less waned by this point. The revolutions of 1830 completed the break with theology and thereafter Laube devoted himself exclusively to the concrete political and social questions of his day.

Unlike the other Young Germans Laube was very active in the activities of the Burschenschaften both at Halle and Breslau. In the summer of 1826 Laube travelled to Freiburg and was able to meet with Friedrich Jahn (1778-1852) the founder of the gymnastics societies. Soon after he allied himself with the Armine Party which called for an idealistic form of Germanic unity based on Christian premises. His move to Breslau in 1827 brought him into contact with another of the Burschenschaften: the ‘Alten Breslauer Burschenschaft der Raczeks.’ Though he did not become a formal member of this society he did help them secure funding, as well as establishing and editing a newspaper for them.

In 1832 Laube became the in-house literary critic for the Leipziger Tageblatt and the

---

144 Steffens had been an early supporter of the Burschenschaften in the years prior to the Wartburg festival of 1817. His philosophical teachings emphasized the visionary philosophy of Schelling, an influence which would feature prominently in Laube’s work. Nipperdey, Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck, 244.

145 Houben, Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang, 258.

146 Wülfing notes that Gutzkow and Wienbarg were interested in the activities of the Burschenschaften but Laube’s involvement was much more significant. Wülfing, Junges Deutschland, 141-142 & 149.

147 This was Aurora: eine literarische Zeitschrift.
Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung. Around the same time Laube became the editor of the Zeitung für die elegante Welt. His first connection to the other Young Germans came as he travelled in Austria and Italy in 1833 at which time he met Karl Gutzkow and agreed to collaborate with Gutzkow and Wienbarg on the Zeitung für die elegante Welt. However, this collaboration never took place, likely because of Gutzkow’s subsequent attacks on Laube’s work. During this period Laube also began an active correspondence with Heinrich Heine, making him the only one of the Young Germans to have ongoing contact with Heine.

Laube’s most significant works were published during the years 1833 and 1834, beginning with the publication of Das neue Jahrhundert which had been planned as a trilogy though only two volumes, Polen and Politische Briefe, were published. The third volume was to have been an account of the Saint-Simonians, but Laube never completed the work.\textsuperscript{148} Laube next wrote a new trilogy entitled Das junge Europa. Of the three volumes only the first, Die Poeten, was completed prior to the ban. Official censure against Laube began well before the 1835 Federal proscription of Young Germany. Laube’s early involvement with the Burschenschaften came to the attention of the police in late 1833. In May 1834 Laube, who was a Prussian subject, was notified that a decree of banishment had been issued and he had to leave Leipzig within a month. He thus left Leipzig bound for Berlin on May 10, 1834. After an ill-fated attempt to flee Prussia on the advice of Varnhagen von Ense, Laube was arrested on July 26. Six weeks of interrogation in the hands of the city authorities was followed by much

\textsuperscript{148} In 1835 Laube published Liebesbriefe (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1835) a novel which was based on Saint-Simonian principles, much as Die Poeten was, but this was not the promised analytical study of the movement.
harsher treatment in the hands of the federal police. Laube finally confessed his membership in
the *Burschenschaften* in September 1834 but maintained that his loyalty to the state was
unquestionable. With an unspecified sentence hanging over his head Laube published
*Liebesbriefe* and *Moderne Charakteristiken* in 1835, as well as continuing to publish the multi-
volume *Reisenovellen* (1834-1837). The threat of lengthy imprisonment removed much of
Laube's revolutionary zeal and after 1836 Laube began to disassociate himself completely from
Gutzkow and Wienbarg.

In 1836 Laube was finally sentenced to a total of seven years in prison, the longest
sentence given to any of the so-called Young Germans. This sentence was later commuted to
eighteen months of house arrest under the watchful eye of Hermann Fürst von Pückler-
Muskau, during which time Laube wrote *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* and the final two
volumes of *Das junge Europa: Die Krieger* and *Die Bürger*. In 1843 Laube returned to the
*Zeitung für die elegante Welt* as its theatre critic. He played an active role in the revolution of
1848 and was elected to the Paulskirche parliament during the early months of the revolution.
After 1848, however, he again left politics, and from 1849 until 1867 Laube served as the
director of the Vienna Burgtheater. Thereafter he was involved in the founding of the Vienna
Stadttheater, and served as its director until his death on August 1, 1884.

In summarizing the formative influences on the Young Germans many common themes
emerge. Several of the so-called Young Germans were originally interested in the ancient
world. Gutzkow, Laube and Wienbarg were planning to study theology but later chose to focus
on philosophy. Through their interest in philosophy all came into contact with the work of
G.W.F. Hegel and the teachings of Friedrich Schleiermacher. The ‘Young Germans’ were also
drawn to the study of literature, both ancient and modern. Finally, all were forced to leave the academic world by the socio-economic conditions of the early 1830s, a fact which instilled in them a determination to change those conditions.

5.

As the biographical sketches above indicate, despite all of the official and unofficial obstacles facing the writers of 'Young Germany,' Gutzkow, Wienbarg, Mundt and Laube managed to publish an enormous amount of material in the years immediately preceding the ban. From this considerable volume of work, this study will focus on two major sources of information. Their numerous novels and treatises provide the clearest insight into what has been called the Young German programme. Each of the authors produced a substantial number of monographs. Of particular interest to this study are four works which seem to represent best the thought of each man: Gutzkow's *Wally: die Zweiflerin*, Laube's *Das junge Europa*, Mundt's *Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen*, and Wienbarg's *Ästhetische Feldzüge*. In addition to these works, this study will make use of several lesser known novels and collections of essays in order to provide a complete analysis of the range of each man's interests, as well as the widely divergent approaches that the 'Young Germans' utilized.

While the novels, treatises, and essay collections are useful in identifying the wide-ranging issues which preoccupied Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg, considerable use will be made of the journalistic ventures of the four authors in order to trace as closely as possible the specific and changing nature of their beliefs and their methodological concerns. Since the Young Germans believed that literary criticism played a vital role in the transformation of society, their reviews of one another's works are particularly helpful in
establishing the fundamental issues to which each man was committed. This study will therefore make use of the following: Heinrich Laube’s work on the Zeitung für die elegante Welt between 1833 and 1834; the work produced during Karl Gutzkow’s tenure as editor of the Literaturblatt supplement to Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland which covers a large part of 1835; Theodor Mundt’s work on Literarischer Zodiacus which began in 1834 and continued through 1835; and finally, Ludolf Wienberg’s work on the Deutsche Revue and the Hamburg Börsen-Halle.
CHAPTER TWO:
The Inter-Relationship among the Young Germans as Demonstrated in their Journalistic Work

The so-called Young Germans were in complete agreement on only two issues. They were united in their attack on the Vormärz state. In addition, as noted previously, there was also general agreement that it was possible to utilize both factual and fictional literature as a potent weapon in the fight against the old regime. For this belief the Young Germans were indebted to several prominent writers whose works had led to a fundamental break with romantic literary theory. As Peter Hohendahl has argued, the idealistic separation of art and politics which had characterized the romantic authors was shattered by the efforts of the literary avant-garde of the 1830s. The literary theorists of the 1830s expounded the notion that the purpose of art was to serve the political progress of humanity. Hohendahl notes that many literary theorists in the 1830s believed that “the literary movement was the avant-garde of the political and social movement.”

However, as soon as one moves from the general Vormärz belief that literature could

---

149Peter Uwe Hohendahl, Building a National Literature: The Case of Germany 1830-1870, transl. Renate Baron Franciscono (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 106-115. Hohendahl’s study perpetuates the view that romantic literature was fundamentally apolitical, allowing the author to retreat from his frustrated political ambitions into an ideal world of the imagination. More recent works have argued that the early Romantics were deeply concerned with the condition of the real world and in fact viewed art as the key to the social and political regeneration of Germany. See Frederick C. Beiser, Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought, 1790-1800 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 222-244.

150Hohendahl, Building a National Literature, 107.
serve as a vital weapon in the transformation of the socio-political sphere, to the specific means by which this would be achieved, very clear differences of opinion emerge among the 'Young German' authors. Though it might be argued that the polemical character of their literary projects and the need to compete for the allegiance of a relatively small audience made conflict an inescapable fact, the issues which divided the four men went far beyond simple clashes of ego. The root of the conflict among the men can be traced back to four very different sets of personal beliefs and objectives. One way to begin to unravel the ideas that motivated the so-called Young Germans is to examine the nature of the exchanges among them. By so doing, it will be possible to propose a basic outline of the problems which concerned each man, and it will also be possible to make a preliminary assessment of the major issues which divided the four writers who have been considered the nucleus of Young Germany.

The lives of the individuals who made up Young Germany have been exhaustively documented; however, the relationship among the writers has remained virtually unexplored, largely due to its inordinate complexity. One must immediately confront the fact that there was only minimal personal contact between the authors, since each was based in a different city: Laube remained for the most part in Leipzig, Mundt in Berlin, Wienbarg in Kiel (though he moved to Frankfurt in 1835) and Gutzkow in Stuttgart, Mannheim and Frankfurt.\(^{151}\) In addition, a survey of Gutzkow's personal correspondence during the years 1830 to 1848

\(^{151}\)Gutzkow's frequent relocation was a result of his continual search for a more receptive publisher. Hence he left Stuttgart when J.G. Cotta placed a number of restrictions on the publication of his works. Gutzkow attributed this to the fact that Cotta was dominated by Wolfgang Menzel. Frankfurt on the other hand was home to the more receptive J.D. Sauerländer publisher of \textit{Phönix}. Mannheim was the location of Gutzkow's friend and most loyal publisher, Carl Löwenthal, who published the majority of his 1835 works.
reveals very little direct communication with the other so-called members of Young Germany. Finally, there was considerable personal animosity between Karl Gutzkow and most of the other writers, a fact which further limited their level of direct interaction. When the writers of Young Germany did speak to one another they did so primarily through critical reviews of each other's works. While these reviews did little to reduce the level of personal animosity between the men, they do serve to paint a relatively clear picture of the major issues which motivated each man.

1.

In his capacity as editor of *Literarischer Zodiacus* Theodor Mundt reviewed all of

---

152 In a 1973 dissertation Peter Burgel identified some 1367 letters (3347 pages), written by Gutzkow between 1830 and 1848. Of these he examined a narrower sample of 210 letters (15.5%) which nonetheless represented the breadth of Gutzkow's correspondence. In these 210 letters only one letter was addressed directly to Mundt and none to the other Young Germans. A further five letters mention Laube indirectly, four discuss Wienbarg, and six refer to Mundt. In terms of incoming correspondence, Bürgel's research reveals that Gutzkow received one letter from Mundt and none from the others. Though Bürgel's sample is relatively small, it is nonetheless apparent that direct correspondence among Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg was minimal. See Peter Burgel, *Die Briefe des frühen Gutzkow 1830 - 1848. Pathographie einer Epoche* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1975).

153 Ludolf Wienbarg was the only notable exception to this trend. He was one of the few Young Germans to have personal contact with several of the others. He worked with Laube on the *Zeitung für die elegante Welt* and with Gutzkow on *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland*. By 1835 he moved to Frankfurt am Main to become a standing contributor to *Literarische und kritische Blätter der Börsen-Halle* and to create a closer working relationship with Gutzkow. This relationship eventually produced the *Deutsche Revue*, a new literary journal which was to represent all of the best trends in the new literature. However, the ban of December 1835 ultimately prevented the publication of this journal. Following Wolfgang Menzel's attack on Gutzkow, Wienbarg wrote a blistering defence of his friend and co-worker: "Menzel und die junge Literatur. Programm zur deutschen Revue," (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835).

154 *Literarischer Zodiacus: Journal für Zeit und Leben, Wissenschaft und Kunst*
the major and minor works produced by Wienbarg, Gutzkow and Laube. In September 1835 Mundt produced a generally critical review of Heinrich Laube's *Liebesbriefe*, a novel inspired by Saint-Simonian principles. Summarizing Laube's motivation, Mundt observed that Laube had been motivated by Shakespeare's aphorism to 'hang philosophy unless philosophy can make a Juliet.' However, Mundt claimed that Laube had not only buried philosophy, but also Juliet in the process, by killing every aspect of her feminine nature and creating an entirely chimerical character. Mundt concluded that the usually sensible and worldly Laube had missed an excellent opportunity to set the new ideas of the Saint Simonians on love against the real social situation of the day. Instead the novel seemed to drift in the air, lost in destructive tendencies. Mundt's review concluded with the wish that Laube would soon produce a work that was more substantial.

Evidently Mundt's opinion of Heinrich Laube did not change as the year progressed. In

(Leipzig: Gebrüder Reichenbach, 1835-1836). This journal was first published in October 1834 under the title *Schriften in bunter Reihe zur Anregung und Unterhaltung mit Beiträgen von dem Verfasser der Tutti Frutti, Leopold Schefer, Johann Schön, Heinrich Stieglitz, F.G. Kühne u.A.* (Leipzig: Gebrüder Reichenbach, 1834). By 1835 the name had been changed to *Literarischer Zodiacus*. Though the journal received a special dispensation to continue publishing from the Prussian Censor on December 18, 1835, Reichenbach published only one more issue and then announced the end of the journal on February 4, 1836 in the *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*.


156 Ibid., 220. One can see clearly Mundt's insistence that literature serve a practical purpose in his critique of Laube's work.
November 1835 Mundt responded to an anonymous piece published in the literary journal *Minerva* which had commented on the ‘Young German school,’ and had numbered Wienbarg, Mundt, Gutzkow, Ferdinand Gustav Kühne and Laube among its members. In response to the inclusion of Laube Mundt argued that

... [Laube] ist der Dandy der jungen Literatur, der, ohne etwas Bestimmtes zu wissen und zu wollen, seine anmutigen Sprünge macht, und, gewissermaßen wie ein Damenrevolutionair, mit seinem Liberalismus und seiner natürlichen Ethik ein Salonsglück zu machen sucht.... indem er neben ihm einen Schriftsteller, wie Gutzkow, der einen weit ernstern und tiefern Willen und eine höhere Schaffenskraft besitzt, in der Vergleichung geringschätzig herabsetzt.\textsuperscript{157}

Mundt thus acknowledged that there were fundamental differences between Gutzkow and Laube, so fundamental that to consider them in the same breath was to do a great disservice to Gutzkow’s talents. Such comments were particularly remarkable given that they were made at a time when Mundt was otherwise expressing generally negative sentiments toward Gutzkow, especially with respect to the latter’s recently-published novel *Wally*. In drawing the distinction between Gutzkow and Laube, Mundt also noted tangentially that the very idea of a school or clique worked against the purpose of the young literature which depended for its success upon the greatest personal freedom for its authors. This remark underscores the belief among the so-called Young German writers that they were following quite different paths.

In October 1835, one month before Mundt’s comments on the fundamental differences between Gutzkow and Laube, Mundt had reviewed Gutzkow’s *Wally*,\textsuperscript{158} along with two

\textsuperscript{157}Theodor Mundt, “Feuilleton,” *Literarischer Zodiacus* (November 1835), 379.

\textsuperscript{158}Karl Gutzkow, *Wally: die Zweiflerin* (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835).
recently-published collections of essays by Wienbarg: *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis*\textsuperscript{159} and *Zur neuesten Literatur.*\textsuperscript{160} However, Wally was clearly at the forefront of Mundt’s thoughts as all three reviews contained overt attacks on Gutzkow’s most recent work. Mundt did, nonetheless, offer some insightful comments on Wienbarg’s latest ventures. These comments were particularly illustrative of Mundt’s own attitude towards literary production. His review of *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* included a retrospective look at *Ästhetische Feldzüge,* Wienbarg’s most significant work. Mundt lauded *Ästhetische Feldzüge* as a courageous work which stood out as the best of the new literature, a book which should inspire Germany’s young writers to better navigate their way in political, social and ethical matters.\textsuperscript{161} Above all Mundt observed that the humanity and nobility of Wienbarg’s work distinguished him clearly from Gutzkow. “Wienbarg hat durch seine ästhetischen Feldzüge etwas Positives gewirkt und manches tüchtige Gemüth für die auf die Weltanschauung zu begründende Aesthetik gewonnen.”\textsuperscript{162} Whereas Wienbarg respected his enemies, Gutzkow preferred his criticism to slap his enemies in the face. Mundt concluded this digression on Gutzkow by noting that Gutzkow had yet to contribute anything positive to literature. Furthermore, Gutzkow’s abrasive style was wholly responsible for the isolation of German literature and the destructive criticism which it had evoked. More importantly, Mundt argued

\textsuperscript{159} Ludolf Wienbarg, *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835).

\textsuperscript{160} Ludolf Wienbarg, *Zur neuesten Literatur* (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835).

\textsuperscript{161} Theodor Mundt, “*Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* von Ludolf Wienbarg,” *Literarischer Zodiacus* (October 1835), 281.

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 282.
that Gutzkow’s inclination towards rashness and his propensity for one-upmanship had tainted many important social questions. Because of these qualities ‘decent’ people were unable to accept him. As evidence of these accusations Mundt cited Gutzkow’s provocative preface to Friedrich Schleiermacher’s “Vertraute Briefe” on Friedrich Schlegel’s Lucinde. Mundt did hold out some hope for the future, however, in that Wienbarg’s recent move to Frankfurt might allow the two authors to combine their distinctive talents with more productive results.163

Returning to Wienbarg’s most recent work, Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis, Mundt observed that the work was not equal to the quality of Ästhetische Feldzüge. He commented that the book had been hastily put together to the point that “[e]s ist wie eine

---

163 As Mundt’s opinion of Gutzkow began to change he evidently began to view this partnership with somewhat more enthusiasm as is evident in the following letter to Ferdinand Kühne. However, it is equally obvious from this letter that Mundt retained certain reservations regarding Gutzkow:

Das junge Deutschland sammelt sich jetzt in Frankfurt a.M.! Auch Wienbarg ist dort und wird sein Domicil auf längere Zeit dort aufschlagen. Ich habe neulich wieder sehr dringende Mittheilungen vom jungen Deutschland gehabt, und will mit diesen Männern, die sehr lebhaft einen festen Band wünschen, wenigstens persönlich und mündlich zu vereinigen und zu vermitteln suchen sollte! Gutzkow übernimmt mit dem nächsten Jahre wahrscheinlich den ganzen ‘Phönix.’ Seine entsetzliche Tactlosigkeit durch die er Einen compromittiren kann, ehe man sich’s versieht, mit der er es jedoch gar nicht übel zu meinen scheint, ist das grösste Hinderniss zu einer planmässigen Verbindung. Man höre aber wenigstens, was werden kann und soll!

Mundt to Kühne, no date; Houben dates the letter around August 1835; Houben, Zeitschriften des Jungen Deutschlands, 2 Bde. (Berlin: Behr, 1906-9), 413. However, in light of Mundt's announcement in October 1835 that Gutzkow and Wienbarg had just formed a partnership, and Mundt’s earlier implacable hostility toward Gutzkow, it seems more likely that this letter should be dated late October or November 1835.
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skizzenhafte Semiotik der Zeitentwickelungskrankheiten zu betrachten." Alongside the works of Heine and Goethe which Wienbarg applauded, Mundt argued that this latest work made Wienbarg look like more of a fan than a colleague.

In the same issue of *Zodiacus* Mundt also considered Wienbarg’s *Zur neuesten Literatur*, a collection of six essays originally produced for the *Literarischen und kritischen Blätter der Börsen-Halle*. While Mundt was generally appreciative of Wienbarg’s work in this volume, he had two specific criticisms. Mundt objected strongly to Wienbarg’s unrestrained enthusiasm for Heine. Where Wienbarg had referred to Heine as the master of the so-called Young Germans, Mundt argued that Heine would laugh at such praise if he were to hear of it. Likewise he was critical of Wienbarg’s whole-hearted support for Gutzkow. In particular, one of Wienbarg’s essays had defended Gutzkow’s controversial introductory comments to *Schleiermachers Vertraute Briefe über die ‘Lucinde’* (1835). Mundt clearly disagreed with both Gutzkow’s introduction and Wienbarg’s defence, arguing that while total freedom would be better for Germany, it must come through a process of evolution and not from a complete disregard of all accepted conventions.

Mundt saved his most scathing comments on Gutzkow for his review of *Wally: die Zweiflerin*. Mundt acknowledged that the basic question which had inspired Gutzkow was an


165 The six essays were “Goethe und die Weltliteratur,” “Fürst Pückler,” “Raupach und die deutsche Bühne,” “Karl Immermann,” “Heinrich Heine,” and “Lucinde, Schleiermacher und Gutzkow.”

important one. This was the question of whether or not Christianity had become a decrepit institution no longer of use in a changing society. Yet Mundt believed that Gutzkow had no more than scratched the surface of this issue. Instead of a detailed consideration, of the type proffered by Heine, the Saint Simonians and Rahel Varnhagen von Ense, Gutzkow had produced a cold and wholly unsympathetic novel. Mundt accused him of constructing a sacrilegious portrayal of Christianity which reflected a particular malice on Gutzkow’s part. The specific nature of this malice was not, however, explored. Mundt also rejected Gutzkow’s claim that the sacrilegious thoughts of his characters did not reflect his own feelings. Rather Mundt argued that Gutzkow must accept the blame for having created these characters in the first place. In conclusion, he wrote that

[d]ie Schreibart hat etwas absichtlich Trockenes und Herbes, ohne alle geschmackvolle Tinten, wodurch schwerlich eine neue, glückliche Revolution des deutschen Stils bewirkt werden wird. Das ganze Buch macht den Eindruck wie von naßkaltem Wetter; nicht einmal ein Sonnenstäubchen blitzt erhellend und wohltuend durch diese unheimlichen und wirren Regenschauer.167

The reviews of October 1835 clearly established the essential differences between Gutzkow and Mundt. Gutzkow was too brash and too destructive. His works had brought too much criticism upon the new literature and had failed to inspire other young writers to emulate either their style or content. Mundt believed that change must be an evolutionary process which did not attempt to overthrow all established conventions at once. He also objected strongly when the characterizations found in the new literature were too far removed from reality to be believable. Another point of contention between the two concerned the role of the critic in this

period, an issue to which Gutzkow had given considerable thought. Gutzkow believed that the role of both criticism and the critic was vital. "Alles was in den zu Grabe getragenen Zeiten Geist hatte, flüchtete sich in die Kritik. Sie übernahm einen ununterbrochenen Feldzug gegen die Herrschaft des Ruhms und die Prahlerei des Elends."¹⁶⁸ Gutzkow had further observed that since the time of Lessing criticism had been the nemesis of the old school and the vehicle of the hopes of youth. Despite Mundt’s belief that Gutzkow’s criticism was entirely destructive, Gutzkow had argued that his was an effective style of criticism which did not merely destroy. Rather, it had a surgical effect; it healed, restored and made whole a literature which had been systematically destroyed by misguided critics, by the police and by an irresolute public.¹⁶⁹ For Mundt, however, this type of criticism, surgically applied or not, carried too great a risk—the risk of subjecting the new literature to isolation and destructive counter-criticism.

Having established quite forcefully that there were fundamental issues of disagreement between the two men, Mundt appeared to undergo a complete reversal of opinion over the following two months. In November 1835 he published a generally positive review of Gutzkow’s play Nero.¹⁷⁰ Mundt began by emphasizing the importance of approaching Gutzkow’s works objectively, despite the ongoing battle between Gutzkow and Wolfgang Menzel. In Mundt’s opinion Nero marked a turning point for Gutzkow, an abandonment of the obstinate pig-headed skepticism of recent years and a return to the creativity of his youthful

---

¹⁶⁸Karl Gutzkow, Untitled, Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland, Literaturblatt Nr. 1 (7.01.1835), 22.

¹⁶⁹Ibid.

¹⁷⁰Karl Gutzkow, Nero. Eine Tragödie (Stuttgart & Tübingen: Cotta, 1835).
writings. Thus Gutzkow had been able to capture the truth of his own era and of Nero’s era with his portrayal of the Emperor as both a victim of Rome as well as its destroyer. This review marked Mundt’s most sympathetic treatment of Gutzkow, as Mundt even attempted to understand what drove the author to such controversial lengths. “Gutzkow liebt nichts…. Was wird ihm übrig bleiben? Ein Richard’sches ,I am myself alone’? Aber ich sage euch, Gutzkow’s geheime Geliebte ist die Wahrheit, für die er zittert, bebt und ringt, auf die er eifersüchtig ist!”

The volte-face on Gutzkow continued in the December 1835 Zodiacus as Mundt turned his attention to Öffentliche Charaktere, the first volume of Gutzkow’s essays on the leading writers of his era. Again Mundt returned to the subject of Gutzkow’s motivation, arguing that he was fundamentally a private person whose beliefs were only manifest in words and not deeds. Gutzkow’s revolution would be an internal one. Mundt argued that Gutzkow was difficult for many to understand because “Gutzkow ist nicht für die Kirche, nicht für die Schule, nicht für das Haus… aber er ist für den Staat, für allgemeine peripherische Verhältnisse und für die Puncte, welche diese Peripherie bilden…. Was offiziell, was der Geschichte verfallen ist, was auf den Marktplätzen des öffentlichen Lebens, in London und Paris, in Madrid und Berlin, in Constantinopel und Kairo handelt und wandelt und an der Geschichte


On the work in question, Mundt remarked that every word had been carefully crafted and complimented Gutzkow’s grasp of the complex issues of his day. “Furwahr! Ich bewundere Gutzkow’s mannigfaltige Kenntnisse im politischen Fache eben so sehr, als die Art, wir er sie verarbeitet und angewandt hat. Seine literarischen Sünden seien ihm um der Tugenden willen, die er in diesem Buch entwickelte und zu entwickeln Gelegenheit hatte, vergeben!” Noting that the current furore surrounding the publication of *Wally* had led many Berliners to view Gutzkow as the Antichrist, Mundt indicated that personally he had begun to rethink his earlier stance on Gutzkow:

Ich habe begonnen nachzudenken... wie es geschehen mag, daß ein unbesonnener jugendlicher Mensch, von den Scrupeln der Zeit miterfaßt, uns aus unserem jämmerlichen Halbzustande zwischen Glauben und Unglauben... zurückführen will ---ich habe bei dieser Untersuchung einen die Nothwendigkeit dieser Erscheinung motivirenden historischen Standpunket angestrebt --- noch dunkelt es in mir --- aber die Zeit wird Licht bringen.

Precisely at the moment when it was most dangerous to take Gutzkow’s side, Mundt evidently recanted all of his earlier accusations and sought to explain the necessity of Gutzkow’s work to an overtly hostile public. Mundt never acknowledged the motives behind his defence of Gutzkow and barely one month after his sympathetic words once again attempted to distance himself from his contemporary:

Gleichzeitige Bestrebungen anderer Schriftsteller, mit denen ich zusammen rangirt worden bin, ohne jemals gemeinsame Verabredung mit ihren gehabt zu haben, sind mir offenbar ebenso schädlich, wenn nicht schädlicher geworden,

---


174 Ibid., 454.

175 Ibid.
There appear to be several reasons for this short-lived change of heart. The most obvious explanation for Mundt’s enthusiasm was his stated desire to enter into a closer collaboration with Gutzkow and Wienbarg in Frankfurt. While this might not entirely account for Mundt’s willingness to put himself at risk, it does go some way to providing a rationale for his belated attempt to understand Gutzkow’s motivation. Moreover, for better or worse, Gutzkow’s work was attracting considerable publicity, publicity which Mundt might have viewed as beneficial if a joint publishing venture was going to be launched. Another possible explanation would be that Mundt might not have perceived the danger inherent in taking sides in the ongoing Gutzkow-Menzel dispute. Menzel’s attacks appeared to be directed primarily at Gutzkow and there was no reason to assume that the repercussions would affect anyone other than Gutzkow. Finally, Mundt had not, in any substantial way, changed his earlier assertions. His commendation of *Nero* was based on his belief that Gutzkow was finally moving away from...
his destructively abrasive style and the obstinate pig-headed skepticism which had dominated his recent work and instead was returning to the creativity of his youth.\textsuperscript{178}

2.

Given that Mundt’s early criticisms of Gutzkow were based on the fact that Gutzkow was too destructive and abrasive in his criticism, it is hardly surprising to discover that Gutzkow’s criticisms of Mundt accused him of precisely the opposite fault. In January 1835 Gutzkow commented on the appearance of the new literary journal \textit{Schriften in bunter Reihe} (later \textit{Literarischer Zodiacus}), noting that the venture itself was a promising one but Mundt’s style was often tiresome and burdened and his literary speculation was too tentative to be of interest. Gutzkow attributed this failure to Mundt’s fascination with the Hegelian world-view which had left him over-burdened with worries.\textsuperscript{179} More promisingly Gutzkow observed that “[i]n jedem neuen Buch wird Th. Mundt heller, dreister: er streift immer mehr Hüllen von sich ab: und macht wie ein ächter Philosoph einen Durchgang durch die Negation, aus welchem er immer liebenswürdiger und schöner hervortritt.”\textsuperscript{180}

\textsuperscript{178}Mundt, “\textit{Nero. Eine Tragödie},” 359.

\textsuperscript{179}Karl Gutzkow, “\textit{Schriften in bunter Reihe}. Herausgegeben von Theodor Mundt,” \textit{Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland}, Literaturblatt Nr. 2 (14.1.1835), 46-47; Gutzkow was not the only one to notice the heavy hand of Hegelian philosophy on Mundt’s work. Mundt himself remarked upon this in September 1835. “Ich glaube, ich war der erste unter der jungen Literatur, welcher, schon im Jahre 1829, in mehrern Aufsatzen das freie Leben der Persönlichkeit, besonders aber die Rechte der Kunst, gegen den alle Individuelle verzehrenden Begriff der Hegel’schen Philosophie geltend zu machen suchte; und sodann strebte ich, was für uns Norddeutsche ein so schwieriger Durchgangsprozess ist, meine Vergangenheit mit der neuen Gegenwart zu vermitteln....” Theodor Mundt, Untitled, \textit{Literarischer Zodiacus} (September 1835), 217.

\textsuperscript{180}Gutzkow, “\textit{Schriften in bunter Reihe},” 47.
The sympathetic tone evident in Gutzkow’s January 1835 Phönix article continued in his review of Mundt’s Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen. After commending Mundt for his attention to detail and the continued development of his poetic talents, Gutzkow remarked that he was particularly impressed by Mundt’s characterization of Maria—the Madonna to whom the title refers. “Alles, was Mundt in Beziehung auf seine Heldin erfindet, ist genial und hinreiβend schön dargestellt.... Der Spiritualismus Madonna’s bezaubert, ihre Bekenntnisse wird man mit Entzücken lesen.”

Though Gutzkow believed that Mundt was never a particularly inspired philosopher, he observed that he was a very good poet and concluded that if Mundt were to continue to produce works of this quality he would be able to develop his artistic abilities to new heights and this would be an entirely positive development.

Between the two relatively favourable accounts of Mundt’s work, Gutzkow published a far less complimentary diatribe in the April 1, 1835 edition of Phönix. In this article

---


182 Ibid., 430.

183 Karl Gutzkow, “Theodor Mundt, Willibald Alexis und die Pommersche Dichterschule, oder über einige literar-historische Symptome,” Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland, Literaturblatt Nr. 13 (1.4.35), 309-311. This article was the subject of a confused exchange between Theodor Mundt and the publisher of the Revue du Nord in September 1835. Evidently an author for the Revue had picked up on Gutzkow’s use of the term ‘Pommersche Dichterschule’ and had subsequently attacked Mundt for his Pomeranian origins, noting that the area was better known for its goose-liver than the quality of its intellectuals. Mundt not only defended his origins but also accused the author of not reading the article but rather trying to prove that he was up-to-date with the daily literature by casually mentioning titles. Mundt alleged that Gutzkow had never counted him among the Pomerans; Mundt, Literarischer Zodiacus (September 1835), 381-382. In fact Gutzkow did include Mundt in his derogatory
Gutzkow objected to enthusiastic comments made by Mundt in the introductory chapter to *Madonna* entitled “Posthorn-Symphonie.” Mundt had published this chapter in its entirety in the February 1835 edition of *Literarischer Zodiacus* to announce the forthcoming publication of *Madonna*. The article was a rousing call for the new literature to move forward as loudly and self-confidently as possible. Mundt had opened and concluded his remarks with the call “Trarara! Trara! Trara!” Gutzkow seized upon this comment asking

... was meint Theodor Mundt damit, wenn er im zweiten Hefte des Zodiakus die geheimnißvollen Worte ausstoßt: Trarara! Trara! Trara!? Bei Gott, uns wird ganz närrisch zu Muthe, wenn man den Spektakel mit anhört.... Soll dieses unartikulierte Wort die Devise der neuen Berlinischen Bewegungsliteratur werden? Trarara! Trara! Trara!... Leute, betet einen Abendsegen!... Theodor Mundt will unaufhörliche Emanzipation, fortwährendes Losringen von sich selbst, alle Tage ein neues Kleid, so wie es die Mode mit sich bringt, er will nur in Athem bleiben, um Trara! zu Rufen.... Es ist ein neuer Egoismus.

Gutzkow’s main objection to the youthful enthusiasm of Mundt echoed the criticism which Mundt would redirect toward Gutzkow later in the year. Mundt’s over-enthusiasm portrayed the new movement in a negative light for too many people and this was intolerable to Gutzkow. “Es ist grundfalsch, daß unsere Zeit negativ sei. Sie ist so positiv, wie irgend eine.” The problem, according to Gutzkow, was that the new literature has lost its focus,


choosing noise over constructive contributions to building a new century. “Ich glaube an die Zeit, die allmächtige Schöpferin Himmels und der Erden, und ihren eingebornen Sohn, die Kunst, welche viel gelitten hat... und doch die Welt erlösen helfen wird, und bis dahin glaub' ich an den heiligen Geist der Kritik, welchen die Zeit gesandt hat, zu richten die Lebendigen und die Todten.” These criticisms underlined the seriousness with which Gutzkow addressed the task of building a new literature and, by extension, a new socio-political era:


The future must be left to those men who had the ability to construct a new world. Gutzkow did not deny that it was necessary to tear down the old world, but this task was completed and it was essential to move forward.

Whereas Gutzkow’s attitude towards Mundt was generally negative, his opinion of Heinrich Laube changed markedly over the years. The two first met in 1833 when Gutzkow travelled through Italy with Laube. During this time he had read Laube’s newest novel Das

---

187 *Ibid.* This was perhaps the strongest statement of Gutzkow’s commitment to a critical literature which would be capable of transforming the world.


189 This exchange foreshadowed the accusation that Wolfgang Menzel’s work lacked seriousness, a charge which Gutzkow would level against Menzel later in the year.
Upon his return Gutzkow remarked on his experiences with Laube in a letter to Wolfgang Menzel. Gutzkow wrote that

Laube ist 27 Jahr alt, hat eine Nase wie ein Kalmück,\textsuperscript{191} und eine winzige untersetzte Statur... Trotz seines noblen Aufzugs hat er doch zuviel vom Studenten. Seine Lebhaftigkeit ist nur Vehemenz... Unterwegs hab' ich seine Novelle 'Das junge Europa' gelesen und habe ihm offen gestanden, daß mir jeder Zug in ihr zuwider ist.\textsuperscript{192}

In 1835 Gutzkow continued his attack on Laube because of the latter’s involvement with the publisher Brockhaus. The actual target of the article was Heinrich Brockhaus himself. Gutzkow accused Brockhaus of regularly using the literary journal \textit{Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung} (which was published by Brockhaus) as a cheap way to advertise forthcoming Brockhaus publications through lengthy bookseller notices and favourable reviews. “Auf diesem natürlichen Wege ist Raumer ein großer Geschichtsforscher geworden, Krug ein großer Philosoph, Neigebaur ein großer Geograph, Wachsmuth ein großer Stylist, mein Huber ein klarer Kopf, und Sigismund Wiese eine vielversprechende Hoffnung.”\textsuperscript{193} Originally Gutzkow believed that this was not such a bad thing as the public was well aware of what was going on and entertained themselves by reading the biased articles. However, under the editorship of Heinrich Laube and Gustav Schlesier, during the period 1834 to 1835, the deception had

\textsuperscript{190}Given the timing of the trip Gutzkow likely read only the first volume of \textit{Das junge Europa, Die Poeten}.

\textsuperscript{191}Kalmück refers to an ethnic group from Western Mongolia.

\textsuperscript{192}Gutzkow to Wolfgang Menzel, 20.9.1833; \textit{BdfG}, 63-64.

\textsuperscript{193}Karl Gutzkow, “H. Brockhaus, P. Lyser und die kritischen Zahlen um Leipzig,” \textit{Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland}, Literaturblatt Nr. 9 (4.3.1835), 213. Note that Gutzkow took this opportunity to attack his former teacher, Raumer.
become more veiled and therefore more dangerous. Gutzkow accused Laube in particular of dividing authors into good and bad categories without reading their works. Laube would excoriate those works which he alone judged to be bad. These comments echoed an earlier accusation of ‘einsylbigen’ ‘Terrorismus’ which Gutzkow had levelled against Laube in an 1834 letter to Gustav Schlesier.

Thus for the majority of their acquaintance Gutzkow was openly hostile towards Laube and his work. However, this opinion changed dramatically in June 1835 as Gutzkow reviewed Laube’s *Liebesbriefe*, the novella which Theodor Mundt would denounce as shallow and incomplete later in the year. Gutzkow, however, believed that Laube was the best representative of the modern that German literature had. Laube’s novel had woven a new interpretation of the future, a future in which a social revolution would be brought about through the emancipation of love. Though Gutzkow criticized Laube’s tendency to use stereotypical phrases and observations since they detracted from the interesting nature of the story itself, it was nonetheless apparent that Laube’s subject matter stuck a resonant chord with Gutzkow. “Wir schwärmen für eine Erlösung der Menschheit aus den Banden der Convenienz und des Vorurtheils, wir kämpfen gegen die Institutionen, welche den Gottesdienst der Natur verdrängen, wir wollen die Liebe vom Gesetze trennen, und die Wahl bis zum Besitze ohne

---


195 Gutzkow to Gustav Schlesier, 27.11.1834; BdfG, 65. Given Gutzkow’s ongoing communication with Schlesier it appears that even though he named Schlesier as a guilty party in the Brockhaus affair, he did not consider his offences a great as those of Laube.

196 Karl Gutzkow, “*Liebesbriefe. Novelle von Heinrich Laube*” in *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland*, Literaturblatt Nr. 25 (27.6.1835), 598.
Zwischenraum lassen.” On the dedication of the work to Laube’s mentor, Fürst Pückler-Muskau, Gutzkow commented that this was decent and proper. Gutzkow did, however, have one serious objection to Liebesbriefe; Gutzkow accused Laube of occasional dilettantism, of exploiting the subject matter for his own benefit rather than working for the freedom of all, a goal which was ultimately far more important.198

Gutzkow explained his more positive attitude towards Laube in a letter to Karl August Varnhagen von Ense dated October 28, 1835:

Sie haben für Laube eine Art geistiger Vormundschaft... übernommen, die ihn wie sein Genius umgiebt... Sein Ausdruck hat an Concinnität gewonnen, seine Auffassung ist gemäßigt und wahrerisch... Laube, wie er war, zerging mir nicht recht auf der Zunge. Er war früher eine etwas marzipanartige, hartgebackene Süßigkeit, an der man kauen mußte. Jetzt ist sein ganzes Wesen flüssig geworden... Ich freue mich nur, daß er durch Sie Grazie und Sinn für stylistische Schönheit bekommen hat.199

Gutzkow’s complimentary remarks could therefore be seen as an attempt to curry favour with the influential Varnhagen von Ense, rather than a genuine change of heart regarding Laube. The final remarks on Laube’s continuing dilettantism demonstrate Gutzkow’s true feelings regarding Laube’s skills. Earlier in October Gutzkow had continued to sound a cautionary note regarding Laube in a letter to Ludwig Börne. Anxious to distinguish himself in Börne’s eyes, Gutzkow had noted that “Lauben vertret ich nicht: er ist nicht reif u. simlirt [sic].”200 Thus,

---

197 Ibid., 598-599.
198 Ibid., 599.
199 Gutzkow to Varnhagen von Ense, 28.10.1835; BdfG, 64.
200 Gutzkow to Ludwig Börne: 2.10.1835. BdfG, 64.
with the exception of the *Liebesbriefe* review, Gutzkow's attitude towards Laube was generally negative. Though his willingness to offer an alternative to the accepted norms of the day was considered to be very valuable by Gutzkow, the fact that he did so to advance his own personal agenda negated much of the value of his work. Gutzkow clearly believed that the task facing the authors of the new literature was too serious to be derailed by such personal ambitions.

Several weeks after the June 1835 *Literaturblatt* article commending Laube's *Liebesbriefe* Gutzkow turned his attention to Ludolf Wienbarg's *Zur neuesten Literatur*, the work about which Mundt had expressed serious reservations. 

Gutzkow, however, argued that this work was on the cutting edge of the literary creations of his era, a marvel both in terms of the truth contained within the work and the beauty of its style. Gutzkow observed that the article on Fürst Pückler-Muskau was a model of the role that wit could play in criticism; the Raupach piece was classically written and contributed much to a German people sadly lacking in a sense of their own history. Gutzkow thanked Wienbarg for his 'lovely and friendly words' in "Lucinde, Schleiermacher und Gutzkow" and concluded with the hope that a new edition of Wienbarg's work would appear shortly. In the meantime Gutzkow promised a

---


202 It is not surprising that Gutzkow found *Zur neuesten Literatur* so commendable given Wienbarg's unrestrained defence of Gutzkow's commentary on Friedrich Schleiermacher's *Vertraute Briefe* on Friedrich Schlegel's *Lucinde*. Ludolf Wienbarg, "Lucinde, Schleiermacher und Gutzkow," *Zur neuesten Literatur* (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835); (Berlin: Aufbau, 1964), 278.

more complete biography of Wienbarg in the next issue of the Literaturblatt.\textsuperscript{204}

Despite this favourable review Gutzkow evidently treated Wienbarg with a degree of condescension in his personal correspondence. In a letter to Börne Gutzkow observed that “Wienbargs Stellung ist noch immer eine rein zufällige: seine Schriften entstehen aus Nebenursachen.”\textsuperscript{205} A few days later he remarked to Varnhagen von Ense that his collaboration with Wienbarg on the Deutsche Revue was based only on the fact that “Wienbarg liebt mich so herzlich, daß er mir schon oft angeboten hat, die Fehler, die ich begehe, öffentlich sich zuzuschreiben.”\textsuperscript{206} This tone can be attributed to the fact that less than one year earlier Gutzkow had dismissed Wienbarg's talents as those of a politician not an artist. “Wienbarg ist ein geschickter Fechter, der sich durchschlägt u weiter nichts will... Wenn er einen andern Anlauf (manchmal bloß den Anlauf des Styls) nimmt, so rennt er auch wohl das einmal durch, was er vorhin anders gewollt hat. Ich wüßte Niemand, der bei seiner glänzenden Suade so zu politischen Parteiungen zu brauchen wäre, als Wienbarg.”\textsuperscript{207} Few reasons were given for Gutzkow's denial of Wienbarg’s talent. However, there is no doubt that Wienbarg received far

\textsuperscript{204}Gutzkow was reviewing the advance printing of Wienbarg's new book which had appeared in the Hamburg Börsenhalle in July 1835. Several sections of the work had been omitted from the Börsenhalle because of fears of the Hamburg censor. Shortly after Gutzkow's call for a new edition his friend and publisher Carl Löwenthal did in fact publish a new edition of Zur neuesten Literatur, the edition which Mundt reviewed in the October 1835 Zodiacus. The promised biography never came to fruition as the next edition of the Literaturblatt was devoted to a review of Friedrich Gustav Kühne's Eine Quarantäne im Irrenhause and shortly thereafter Gutzkow was fired by Phönix editor Eduard Duller for, among other things, his merciless skewering of the latter's historical novel Kronen und Ketten.

\textsuperscript{205}Gutzkow to Börne, 2.10.1835; BdfG, 75.

\textsuperscript{206}Gutzkow to Varnhagen von Ense, 2.10.1835; BdfG, 75.

\textsuperscript{207}Gutzkow to Schlesier, 27.11.1834; BdfG, 74-75.
greater accolades for his seminal work, Ästhetische Feldzüge, than Gutzkow ever experienced. Thus, professional jealousy cannot be eliminated as a motive for Gutzkow’s petulance.

Gutzkow’s penultimate appearance as editor of the Literaturblatt was marked by one of his most bitter reviews—a review which seemed to reflect a growing disillusionment with the entire literary establishment. The unfortunate target was Ferdinand Gustav Kühne, Mundt’s partner on the Literarischer Zodiacus. Gutzkow began by noting that there was a strange wind blowing out of Berlin:


Gutzkow condemned Kühne’s work as the last gasp of an Hegelian, a novel filled with unoriginal thought and vague characterizations. He also took the opportunity to level another attack at Theodor Mundt: “Mundt und Kühne sind bis jetzt die ausgewachsensten Blumen, welche aus der allmäßlichen Verwesung des Berliner Lebens hervorkeimen. Es sind Todtenblumen, beide, sie haben keinen erquickenden Duft und sind in ihren Blüthensternen mit ängstlicher Symmetrie abgemessen.”209 Given the Hegelian form in which Kühne’s book was written, Gutzkow felt that his work could not possibly help the nation and its youth.210 Again,


209 Ibid., 765.

210 Despite the fact that Gutzkow had been deeply influenced by Hegel during his years at the University of Berlin, he later criticized Hegel for being too systematic and too willing to accept the existing socio-political system. In February 1835 Gutzkow wrote that “[d]ie
as in his attacks on Mundt, Gutzkow focussed on Kühne’s tendency to emphasize noise over substance. However, the fact that Kühne emphasized his own nobility while poking fun at those who were less fortunate was an even worse sin in Gutzkow’s eyes. He concluded the review with the disillusioned remark, “[g]eh weg, ihr seid Kinder!”

Gutzkow’s condemnation stood in stark contrast to Mundt’s opinion of Kühne’s work. Whereas Gutzkow had condemned the Hegelian style in which the book was written regardless of its purpose, Mundt believed that using the Hegelian form was the best way to capture the essence of that system and provide a very accurate and truthful representation of an important period in the development of the German spirit. “Sie bezeichnet… den Culminationspunkt eines mit Speculation getränkten und übersättigten Nationalcharakters.” Mundt had concluded by observing that this was a courageous account of the crucial battle that was taking place between the stability of the system and the freedom of man to exploit his alternatives. Gutzkow, however, saw no such courage at work. For him the book simply replicated the archaic belief that art served only itself and that the artist remained fundamentally apart from the world of reality, a belief which Gutzkow was determined to eradicate.

---

211 Gutzkow, “Eine Quarantäne,” 767.


213 Ibid., 216.
Heinrich Laube was the third and final member of the Young Germans who reviewed the works of the other Young German writers in his capacity as editor of a major journal. The reviews produced during Laube’s tenure with Brockhaus at the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* are singularly uninformative likely due to the heavy hand of Heinrich Brockhaus in determining what could and could not be published. However, as editor of *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, Laube produced some lengthy and insightful reviews. Laube’s reviews were very different from those published by Theodor Mundt in *Literarischer Zodiacus* and Karl Gutzkow in *Phönix*. Whereas Gutzkow and Mundt devoted most of their attention to the critical examination of the works in question, Laube tended to treat his reviews as a platform from which to advance his own views on certain subjects, while at the same time providing his audience with short passages from the work under consideration.

Laube’s review of Gutzkow’s “Briefe eines Narren an eine Närin” was primarily an aside on the way in which new legal and moral codes were being formed. Laube believed that his was a crucial epoch in the transformation of human society. This was the time for every concerned writer to contribute his opinions on every subject and once all views were aired a new code would emerge:

darum müssen wir sie erinnern, eiligst aufzusitzen auf den Schreibesel, damit sie vor Abschluß der großen Weltrechnungen ankommen im Publicum... [W]enn alle einzeln aufgegangen sind, da ist der Baum grün, wenn alle Schriftsteller zusammengekommen sind, dann haben wir eine Versammlung, und so wie der grüne Baum Früchte zeitigen wird, so wird unsere Versammlung Gesetze bechließen, und über Nacht wird der Sommer und über Nacht wird der Herbst da seyn...214

---

214 Heinrich Laube, “Briefe eine Narren an eine Närin. Hamburg bei Hoffmann und
Turning finally to the work before him, Laube was extremely complimentary towards Gutzkow:

Dieser Briefsteller ist aber darum so liebenswürdig, weil er so viel weiß und so wenig wissen will, weil er so reich ist und doch zu Fuß geht, weil er nicht blos gelehrt, sondern auch gebildet, nicht blos gebildet, sondern auch poetisch ist.... Ich schrieb früher über den Verfasser und seine Briefe Folgendes: 'Es ist erquickend, wenn man in dem Wirthshaustreiben der heutigen Welt einen Mann von Bildung findet, einen Mann der poetischen Humanität entdeckt....' 215

Laube seemed particularly fascinated by the way in which Gutzkow's work appeared to be an unfettered exercise in freedom, though he cautioned that so much freedom could be superfluous and some order would be necessary before the new social laws could emerge. Laube provided only a few excerpts from Gutzkow's work at the end of his review because "[e]s ist nichts mit den Auszügen, man bringt ein paar Blüthen und verlangt, daß die Leute den Frühling bewundern sollen." 216 In conclusion, Laube reminded his readers of his comments on Heinrich Heine's Französische Zustände. There he had argued that it was natural in an era of great change for each author to follow a narrow direction and for each to have his own circle; yet each circle would have points of contact with the others and thus, ultimately, a new world would be formed. 217

Campe, 1832, "Zeitung für die elegante Welt," Nr. 42 (28.2.1833), 165. Although Gutzkow was not identified as the author in the article due to the fact that the piece was published anonymously, Laube indicated in his review that he knew the identity of the writer. One can see in this and subsequent pieces written by Laube the heavy influence of Romantic imagery: spring, awakening, night, and day are prominently featured in Laube's essays and novels.

215 Ibid., 166.

216 Ibid., 168.

Laube was similarly complimentary toward Ludolf Wienbarg’s 1833 travel book *Holland in den Jahren 1831 und 1832*. Once again the bulk of the review was devoted to Laube’s views on the value of travel but he nonetheless found time to observe that the book in question was an excellent example of the travel novella, the genre popularized by Heine’s *Reisebilder*. Laube marveled at Wienbarg’s ability to provide a comprehensive overview of the present situation in Holland:

[W]enn man mit dem Buche zu Ende ist, sieht man den ganzen Holländer mit den Lineamenten des alten Friesen und Batavers, mit dem zornigen Auge des protestantischen Eiferers, des kecken Wassergeusen, mit dem trostlosen Lächeln des egoistischen Kaufmannes, mit den plumpen Beinen des indifferenten Weltbürgers auf den Brücken...

Laube was most impressed by Wienbarg’s ability to consider all that was important in Holland: art and politics, the cities and the rural areas. He concluded, “unsere Reisen näherten sich einem höhren Standpunkte.”

---


218. Laube would venture into the field of travelogues himself in 1834 with his *Reisenovellen* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1834). Butler believed that Laube’s efforts were so completely modeled upon Heine’s *Reisebilder*, that it was impossible to determine anything about Laube himself from these works. Butler, *The Saint Simonian Religion*, 223-240. The romantic belief that travel was the greatest exercise in human freedom features prominently in the work of Laube and Theodor Mundt. The format of the *Reisebilder*, a combination of political commentary and travel guide, was utilized by each of the ‘Young German’ authors.

219. The Wassergeusen were the Dutch freedom-fighters who had opposed the rule of the Spanish Hapsburgs in the sixteenth century.


221. Ibid.
Laube first turned his attention to Theodor Mundt's work in May 1833. This review parenthetically provided several interesting insights into his own opinion on the new literature. Laube observed that by virtue of the fact that Mundt’s most recent work, “Madelon, oder die Romantiker in Paris,” was concerned with new material and viewpoints it had already raised itself above the great mass of literature being produced. Further, though many commentators had condemned the young writers for their proximity to the French Romantic school, Laube applauded this trait in Mundt observing that “[d]ie romantische Schule in Frankreich hat einen so überwältigenden Einfluß auf die französische Literatur erlangt... sie bewegt sich auf einem Terrain, das bunt und interessant ist wie die Laterna magica.... Das geistige Wesen der neueren Novelle wird ebenfalls in Anspruch genommen: es entwickeln sich neue Begriffe, Ideen, Ansichten...”222 Once again Laube concluded by returning to his favourite theme, the importance of continual challenges to the traditional system in the establishment of a new order. Mundt’s latest book was exemplary because it had successfully brought together both historical-philosophical understanding and poetic talent. New blood flowed through its characters, the surroundings were enticing and the fantastic entanglements of the characters wove new laws.223

In July 1833 Laube addressed another of Mundt’s short novellas “Der Basilisk, oder Gesichterstudien” which he considered to be a fine work in which an unpalatable subject, an


223 Ibid.
incestuous familial relationship, had been handled deftly. Laube commented that even more than “Madelon” this work represented an important progression for Mundt. “Es ist Sonnenschein und Grün, Vogel und frische Luft da, wie ein schwerfälliger Strom hat sich der Styl seine neuen Bahnen gebrochen und schattige angenehme Ufer gesucht. Die kleinen Gedanken haben sich emancipirt und sind selbstständige Sätze geworden.” Though Laube noted that he had condemned Mundt's earlier journalistic style, he observed that Mundt had emancipated himself from this in “Basilisk” and had finally produced a work of great stylistic merit.

4.

Ludolf Wienbarg did not serve as an editor for a major journal during the crucial years prior to the ban. Thus he was not in a position to review the latest works of Gutzkow, Mundt and Laube. However, in 1835 he was a standing contributor to the Literarische und kritische Blätter der Börsen-Halle. During this period Wienbarg's opinion of Gutzkow's work was clearly expressed in an article entitled “Lucinde, Schleiermacher und Gutzkow.”

---


225 Ibid. Laube’s condemnation of Mundt’s journalistic style stands in stark contrast to Gutzkow’s belief that journalism was an invaluable educational medium. Gutzkow would later refer to himself as a “Feuilletonisten.” Karl Gutzkow, In bunter Reihe. Briefe, Skizzen, Novellen (Breslau: Schottlaender, 1878), 209. Heinrich Heine also believed that “Es ist die Zeit des Ideenkampfes, und Journale sind unsere Festungen.” Heine quoted in Friedrich Andrae, “Bis unter den Zipfel der Nachtmütze,” Die Zeit, Nr. 2 (10.01.1992), 13.

226 This article was also published in Zur neuesten Literatur. Ludolf Wienbarg, “Lucinde, Schleiermacher und Gutzkow,” Zur neuesten Literatur (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835), (Berlin: Aufbau, 1964), 272-280.
observed that Gutzkow's writings in the *Phönix* literature supplement were 'epoch-making' in their importance. Gutzkow was "der jugendliche Templer, der kühnste Soldat der Freiheit und der anmutigste Priester der Liebe, den Deutschlands Boden trägt."\(^{227}\) Wienbarg defended Gutzkow's desire to make Schleiermacher's *Vertraute Briefe* on Schlegel's *Lucinde* known to the public, arguing that he was not motivated by malice or hostility as his critics alleged. Rather, Gutzkow wanted to resurrect Schleiermacher's reputation which had been irreparably harmed by the pietist zealots who wished to claim him as one of their own. Gutzkow saw the true Schleiermacher, whose early writings had established him as the defender of a new doctrine of free love. As Wienbarg observed, "[t]apfrer Gutzkow, du hast dem Andenken Schleiermachers und der Liebe, die ach! so schlecht und ordinär geworden ist in deutschen Landen, daß sie kaum mehr diesen heiligen zaubervollen Namen verdient, du hast ihnen beiden einen wackern Ritterdienst geleistet."\(^{228}\)

Shortly after these flattering remarks appeared, Wienbarg moved to Frankfurt in order to facilitate a closer collaboration with Gutzkow. This led to the creation of their first joint venture, a new literary journal to be entitled *Deutsche Revue*. The prospectus for the *Deutsche Revue* entitled "Menzel und die junge Literatur" further underscored the degree of respect which Wienbarg held for Gutzkow.\(^{229}\) In the prospectus Wienbarg wrote that he valued

\(^{227}\)Ibid., 276.

\(^{228}\)Ibid., 278. See Chapter Four for further discussion of the religious implications of this passage.

Gutzkow’s friendship, unlike Menzel, and recognized that Gutzkow was “ein Vorbild unausgesetzter ideeller Tätigkeit, einer bis zur Durchsichtigkeit wahren, mit allem Zarten und Hohen sympathisierenden Gesinnung....”

Wienbarg fiercely defended Gutzkow against Wolfgang Menzel’s accusations that Wally was a dangerous and immoral piece of work. Wienbarg wrote of Menzel that

[eJr nahm die ‘Wally,’ einen kürzlich erschienenen Roman Gutzkows zur Hand, knetete daraus einen alarmierenden Popanz, ein Ungeheuer der Irreligiosität und Sittenlosigkeit, und nachdem er, der deutsche Mann, eingängig eine persönliche Infamie dem jungen Autor angeschmitzt hatte, gab er dem ganzen monströsen Gebäck seiner Hände den Namen Gutzkow, ad libitum junges Deutschland. Warf’s darauf zur Zermalmung unter die Hufen seine Rosse.

Wienbarg thus argued strenuously against Menzel’s arbitrary dismissal of Gutzkow’s entire body of work on the grounds that the spectre of immorality had apparently appeared in Wally. In the final analysis Wienbarg rejected Menzel’s critique as stupid and malicious thereby establishing himself as one of Gutzkow’s staunchest and most consistent supporters.

5.

The foregoing survey of the journalistic exchanges among the so-called Young German authors provides a preliminary overview of the issues which more often than not divided Mundt, Laube, Gutzkow and, to a lesser extent, Wienbarg. Heinrich Laube emphasized the democratic nature of literary production. All of the new literature would work together to create a new world order. Literature would thus be the vehicle by which a social

\[^{230}\text{Ibid.}, 286.\]

\[^{231}\text{Ibid.}\]

\[^{232}\text{Ibid.}, 290.\]
transformation would be effected. Because of his belief that all literature was useful Laube welcomed all new author's to contribute to the new literature regardless of their approach. Therefore he commended the works of Mundt, Wienbarg’s travel novella, and the works of Gutzkow, because of each author's willingness to tackle new and controversial topics.

Whereas Laube consistently emphasized the democratic nature of literary production, Karl Gutzkow tended to reject all but the most serious of the new literature. Gutzkow’s journalistic efforts returned constantly to the theme of substance over noise. Gutzkow too believed that the new literature was building a new society; however, he did not believe that the work of literary dilettantes had any place in the creation of that new world. Only the literature that was produced with the most elegant style and with the greatest attention to the role of the author as a creator of artistic truths could help the world move forward. Emancipation would not come overnight and neither would it be facilitated by the noisy outpourings of the vast majority of Gutzkow’s contemporaries. With the principle of substance over noise firmly in mind, Gutzkow thus condemned the work of Laube for its dilettantism and of Mundt for its failure to contribute anything but noise. The only exception to this pattern of criticism concerned Mundt’s Madonna which Gutzkow commended precisely for its boldness and willingness to proffer an alternate artistic reality. With respect to Wienbarg, Gutzkow’s views are less easy to pinpoint. Certainly he seemed to hold Wienbarg in a higher regard than the other so-called Young Germans, but his comments appeared to be tainted by personal jealousy making it difficult for him to judge clearly the artistic merits of Wienbarg’s writings.

Gutzkow was insistent that the new literature must create entirely new and challenging realities. Theodor Mundt was the precise opposite of Gutzkow. Mundt’s journal articles reveal
a cautious approach. Criticism must not be too destructive (as opposed to Gutzkow’s belief that criticism must be surgically applied to destroy the remnants of the old world), characterizations should not venture beyond the realm of possibility, women must remain feminine, and authors must take care to ensure that their works did not bring unnecessary criticism upon the new literature. Mundt thus refused to endorse the works of either Gutzkow or Laube, remained reserved about Wienbarg especially as he moved closer to Gutzkow, and enthusiastically endorsed only Kühne whose work Gutzkow had rejected out of hand.

Because Ludolf Wienbarg produced very few articles and did not review the works of the other so-called Young Germans, it is not possible to assess his attitudes toward each of the other authors from this source. However, his attitude toward Gutzkow was evident in his strident defence of the latter’s work on Schleiermacher’s Vertraute Briehe. Wienbarg considered Gutzkow’s work to be epoch-making in its importance and viewed Gutzkow himself as one of the greatest defenders of German freedom. Wienbarg was also one of the few men to defend Gutzkow’s Wally in print against the accusations of immorality levelled by Wolfgang Menzel.

To substantiate the preliminary assessments offered above on the differing agendas of Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube, Theodor Mundt, and Ludolf Wienbarg, it is necessary to probe their major works more deeply. In addition, it is important to move from the personal exchanges among the four men to consider more substantive issues. Personal exchanges might reveal recurrent themes in each man’s thinking, but they were frequently subject to personal rivalries and professional jealousies which detract from their reliability. The remaining chapters will consider the positions of the so-called Young German authors on several of the substantive
socio-political issues with which their biographers frequently link them.

Jeffrey Sammons notes that most Young German scholarship has focused upon similar themes: "the relationship of literature to life and its prophetic mission, the emancipation of women, religious liberalism and Saint-Simonianism." For purposes of clarity this study will divide these key socio-political questions into three separate issues: the emancipation of women; religious emancipation, including the issue of Saint-Simonianism; and political emancipation, which encompasses the relationship of literature to life. However, it should be emphasized that not all of the 'Young Germans' made such a clear separation. For Wienbarg in particular the three problems were synonymous. More importantly, among the 'Young German' authors who did see these as separate issues there was significant disagreement regarding the relative importance of each question and the means by which these goals would be reached. The remainder of this study will examine the widely divergent positions of the so-called Young Germans on questions of female, religious, and political emancipation.

---

CHAPTER THREE:

The Question of Female Emancipation in the Works of the 'Young German' Authors

Women figure prominently in the journals and novels of the Young Germans. The so-called Young Germans frequently reviewed the works of prominent female writers. Their journals also offered commentaries on the position of women in society and female characters were common in their novels. Women thus played a variety of significant roles for the writers of 'Young Germany.' Along the way, Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg provide a fascinating, if often contradictory, look at the place of women in Vormärz society and the broader question of female emancipation. Perhaps most surprising is the generally sympathetic treatment accorded to women as a whole and to women writers in particular by the so-called Young Germans.234 This conflicts with the assertions of several recent historical studies on the position of women in Vormärz society. These studies have argued that any form of female

234 Three female contemporaries figure most prominently in the works of the Young German authors. These women were Rahel Varnhagen von Ense who was born Rahel Levin (1771), married Karl August Varnhagen von Ense in 1814, and died in Berlin in 1833; Charlotte Stieglitz, born Charlotte Willhöft (1806), married the writer Heinrich Stieglitz in 1828, and committed suicide on December 29, 1834; and Bettina von Arnim who was born Katherina Elisabetha von Brentano (1785), the granddaughter of Sophie Laroche, married Achim von Arnim in 1811, and died in 1859. The Young Germans counted the emergence of these women among the most important happenings of their age. Gutzkow noted in 1839 that "wer da erwägt die akademische Bildung, die Träumerei einer doktrinellen Erziehung, die Julirevolution, die polnische, die erstickten und gebundenen revolutionären Kräfte, die neue soziale französische Philosophie, die Lamennaische Verbindung der Religion mit der Politik, die Grundzüge einer neuen Gesellschaft durch den Saint-Simonismus, Rahel, Bettina, den Tod der Stieglitz, der hat der Blitze genug in der Hand, die in der schwülen Atmosphäre Deutschlands zünden mußten." Karl Gutzkow, Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, 1830-1838, (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1839), GWIII, 186-187.
emancipation was viewed with deep suspicion during the *Vormärz* era, even among relatively progressive thinkers such as G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831).235

The preceding assessments appear to be substantiated by the restrictive laws which confronted the women of the *Vormärz*. For example, the Prussian Civil Code made it illegal for women to take part in public meetings during the nineteenth century, a provision which clearly demonstrates the deep-rooted suspicion that greeted any sign of a female public sphere. Those women who did attempt to blend the traditional female vocation of marriage and family with more individually satisfying lives, many of which revolved around literary careers, found a series of obstacles confronting them. Rahel Varnhagen noted in an 1819 letter to her sister:

> For men employment is, at least in their own eyes, not only to be regarded as important, but [it] is also something which flatters their ambition and gives them a chance to get on, whilst being inspired by social contact; we only ever have before us the fragments which pull us down, the small tasks and services which must relate to our husband's standing and needs.... Of course one loves, shares and cherishes the wishes of one's own family, submits to them, makes them one's greatest worry and most pressing preoccupation. But they cannot fulfil us, rally us, rest us in readiness to further activity and suffering. Nor can they strengthen and invigorate us throughout our lives.236

It is therefore not surprising to discover that historical studies devoted to the female writers of the *Vormärz* have generally concluded that women were either dismissed, viewed with suspicion, or treated with outright contempt. References from Friedrich Schiller's circle to

235Ute Frevert confirms this view noting that women such as Sophie Mereau, Caroline Michaelis and Dorothea Mendelssohn were "outsiders, lone warriors, and yet also products of a society barely able to conceal the systematic contradiction between its programme of universal human rights and its insistence on a specific 'female estate' unaffected by this programme." Ute Frevert, *Women in German History: From Bourgeois Emancipation to Sexual Liberation* (Oxford: Berg, 1989), 60.

236Rahel Varnhagen von Ense quoted in *ibid.*, 56-57.
Caroline Michaelis (Schlegel-Schelling) as "Dame Lucifer" and "Evil One" seem to underline this deep-rooted antipathy towards female writers.\textsuperscript{237}

Writing by and for women is a genre which has recently attracted the attention of numerous contemporary scholars. In the early 1980s a new analytical typology, 'gynocriticism,' was created in order to undertake "a sustained investigation of literature by women,... the study of women as \textit{writers},... the history, styles, themes, genres, and structures of writing by women, the psychodynamics of female literary creativity, the trajectory of the individual or collective female career, and the evolution and laws of a female literary tradition."\textsuperscript{238} Most recently gynocriticism has been used to evaluate the contributions of and attitudes towards women's literary production during the Biedermeier period.\textsuperscript{239} These scholars reached several conclusions about the female writers of the \textit{Vormärz}. Most importantly, Katherine Goodman and Edith Waldstein believe that women writers were only accepted in a few limited genres, in particular letter writing, fairy tales, moral weeklies, and family novels. Here women were condoned precisely because their lack of education and worldly experience made their writing less vulnerable to hypocrisy and ulterior motives. Women seemed to represent a "natural German style"\textsuperscript{240} closer to \textit{Geist} than \textit{Bildung}. Women apparently wrote only in popular and


\textsuperscript{239}Goodman and Waldstein, \textit{In the Shadow of Olympus}.

\textsuperscript{240}Ibid., 6-7; here the authors are paraphrasing Christian Fürchtegott Gellert (1715-
non-esoteric forms; thus Goodman concludes that “while women had not been educated in traditional ‘high’ forms of literature, when forms and themes emerged in which they felt competent they were not shy to set pen to paper.” Ute Frevert provides additional evidence in support of this argument when she observes that even though Sophie Laroche stepped beyond the traditional female sphere with her literary career “her novels [were nevertheless] aimed at bourgeois women and girls, her letters and educational articles extolled self-contentment and the virtuous fulfilment of duty.” Furthermore, the literary genres open to and popular with women were only marginally respectable, thus women generally received worse reviews than their male counterparts and no critical acclaim. Finally, Goodman and Waldstein conclude that even in the relatively supportive and pro-feminine environment of the romantic school of writers whose goal it was to blend the “perfection of masculinity and femininity into humanity as a whole,” women were given only a relatively minor role in

**1769** and his manual on how to write letters. Gellert was an eighteenth century novelist whose collection of fables Fabeln und Erzählungen (1746/1748) became famous throughout German-speaking Europe for its effective critique of common character flaws. Gellert also wrote Das Leben der schwedischen Gräfin von G** (1747-1748) one of the first novels to place a woman at the centre of its plot.

**241**Ibid., 8. Emphasis added.

**242**Sophie Laroche (1730-1807) gained fame during her early years as a letter-writer but following the death of her husband in 1788 argued strongly in favour of socio-economic independence for women; Frevert, *Women in German History*, 44. Laroche was the grandmother of Bettina von Arnim, a female writer whose works several of the Young Germans considered to be deeply influential.

**243**Ibid., 50.

**244**Goodman and Waldstein, *In the Shadow of Olympus*, 9-11; the reference to the Romantic School is drawn specifically from the work of Friedrich Schlegel.
literary production. The only place where a few select women were able to play a leading role during the Biedermeier era was within Salon culture. Frevert notes that within the culture of the salon it was possible for the "normal social barriers between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, Jews and Christians, men of letters and merchants, officers and civilians [to be] blurred; women too had the chance to be accepted as individuals and to win respect."  

These general assumptions concerning the marginal place of women writers appear to be borne out when one confronts the almost total absence of literature by women in the literary histories of the Vormärz. Ernest K. Bramsted's *Aristocracy and the Middle Classes in Germany: Social Types in German Literature 1830-1900*, does not mention women writers despite devoting an entire chapter to the family journal, a format which certainly fits into Goodman and Waldstein's list of the genres to which women felt comfortable contributing. Indeed Waldstein and Goodman go to some length to discuss the involvement of women in the production of such journals, not only as contributing writers but also, in the case of Sophie Laroche, as an editor. Bramsted's only mention of prominent women is a one-line reference to the salon of Rahel Varnhagen von Ense. Most interesting of all was the fact that even though Bramsted attempted to recreate common social types in literature, he evidently did not consider women to be a social type worthy of reconstruction. The argument might be made,

245 Frevert, *Women in German History*, 55.


however, that Bramsted merely reflected the assumptions of his own era, given that his study was originally published in 1937. The same cannot be said for Peter Hohendahl whose *Building a National Literature: The Case of Germany 1830-1870* has been acclaimed as a major achievement in literary history. Again one finds no mention of literature by the women writers of the *Vormärz* in Hohendahl's study. Further, though he attempts to recreate the institutional structures which determined the status of writers and their works, Hohendahl does not even mention salon culture. Thus this avenue for considering women's literary expression is closed off.²⁴⁸

In addition to the recent scholarship on female literary production during the *Vormärz* era, a considerable volume of contemporary scholarship has been devoted to examining the nature of social change and gender roles during the *Vormärz*. Scholars have paid particular attention to the role and place of the new bourgeoisie and to the habits, wishes, and goals of this group. From this research it is possible to reconstruct the Biedermeier female sphere in some detail. At a time when men were increasingly finding a world beyond the narrow sphere of home and work women remained tied to the more traditional domain of *Kinder, Küche und Kirche*. Ute Frevert has argued that “all those areas, such as education and individual achievement, which endowed the bourgeoisie with self-confidence and conviction, shut women out. They worked quietly and unobtrusively in the home and family, and only now and then, on their husbands' arms, did they decorate a ball or concert with their pleasing appearance.”²⁴⁹


²⁴⁹ Frevert, *Women in German History*, 34.
Frevert further argues that only through marriage and motherhood could women achieve anything worthwhile and gain any influence; yet even here Section 184 of the Prussian Civil Code mandated that the man was the head of the household and all decisions regarding the conjugal home were his and his alone.\textsuperscript{250} Frevert cites several examples of women, among them Rahel Varnhagen von Ense and Sophie Laroche, who ultimately bowed to the power of tradition despite having attempted to assert their own identity beyond the prescribed areas of home and family.

Frevert argues that the so-called Biedermeier period was even less tolerant of the possibility of a women's public sphere than the period before 1815. The reaction to the Napoleonic occupation was to cling even more tightly to traditional male and female roles. According to Frevert

\textit{...male and female preserves were drawn more and more sharply, and the catalogue of womanly duties regulated down to the finest detail.} The model of the family and marriage that emerged fitted neatly into the new political climate of Restoration, and drew on the strict gender-specific differentiation of roles and characters of the pre-Romantic age without, however, incorporating the products of the Enlightenment and doctrine of natural laws.\textsuperscript{251}

Lia Secci has argued that there was no substantial lessening of these attitudes until the revolutions of 1848 at which time there was a brief interregnum during which it was permissible for women to enter into the public sphere. Following the failure of 1848, however, many exclusively female organizations disbanded and the voice of women in the public sphere

\textsuperscript{250} \textit{Ibid.}, 42-43.

\textsuperscript{251} \textit{Ibid.}, 63.
was noticeably quietened.\textsuperscript{252}

Given that the arguments of the preceding historians have been drawn primarily from the literature produced during the Biedermeier period, it would seem reasonable to assume that the ‘Young Germans’ would reflect these attitudes. The ‘Young Germans’ might be expected to treat women writers as trivial and peripheral to the main literary tradition or ignore them altogether; to write poor reviews of works by women; to deny that women were capable of ‘high’ literature. In addition, they should reflect many of the Biedermeier attitudes towards the role and place of women in their female characterizations. The works of the Young German writers do provide insights into all of the issues raised by Frevert, Waldstein and others, yet the opinions they express seldom support the assumptions of contemporary historians regarding Biedermeier attitudes towards the social position of women. Eda Sagarra has interpreted the unusual Young German attitudes towards women as a sign that though “feminism was rare in Germany… the Young German movement… proved an interesting if short-lived exception to this rule.”\textsuperscript{253} Certainly all of the so-called Young Germans were aware of the issues concerning female emancipation. Even so, it is not possible to go as far as Sagarra and label all of the


\textsuperscript{253}Eda Sagarra, \textit{Tradition and Revolution: German Literature and Society, 1830-1890} (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 20. Sagarra bases this claim primarily upon the fact that she believes the ‘Young Germans’ were Saint-Simonians. Under the influence of Barthélemy Prosper Enfantin (1790-1864) the Saint-Simonians argued that man and woman together make up the ideal social individual. They also advocated marriage based on free choice, love, and personal preference and insisted that marriage must meet the physical needs of both man and woman equally.
‘Young Germans’ as early feminists. The attitudes which they expressed towards their female contemporaries and the attributes which they incorporated into their fictional female characterizations varied widely, from the fairly traditional views identified by Frevert and others to ideas which seem to approach the opinion expressed by Sagarra.

1.

Two female contemporaries featured prominently in the work of Theodor Mundt: Charlotte Stieglitz and Bettina von Arnim. Mundt was deeply affected by the actions of Stieglitz, a writer and poet who committed suicide in order to inspire her writer-husband Heinrich to break out of his tedious existence and produce a truly monumental literary work. Charlotte Stieglitz’ diary was excerpted in Theodor Mundt’s *Literarischer Zodiacus* shortly after her death. In his introduction to the diary Mundt praised Stieglitz as a product of the newest ideas of the time and added that she represented everything that was great and notable about the age.\(^{254}\) This introduction also served to give notice of Mundt’s forthcoming biography of Stieglitz entitled *Charlotte Stieglitz. Ein Denkmal*. Even the short excerpts of Stieglitz’ diary which Mundt provided revealed a complex woman whose concerns ranged from the question of women’s emancipation to the nature of Christianity, and who fiercely defended her right to be treated as an individual. Stieglitz also observed that the apparent discrepancy between male and female intellectual capacity was simply a product of the fact that “\([\text{w}]\)enn der arme Junge längst schon über seinen Büchern schwitzen muß, dann lehnt das Mädchchen sich faullenzend zum Fenster hinaus und guckt im *dolce far niente* sich das Leben

\(^{254}\)Theodor Mundt, “Charlotte Stieglitz,” *Literarischer Zodiacus* (July 1835), 64.
und die Welt an!"\textsuperscript{255} Given this state of affairs, Stieglitz wondered when the emancipation of women might ever be achieved.

Despite Goodman and Waldstein’s hypothesis that women did not tackle esoteric topics, Stieglitz’s diary contained a series of comments on the role of Christianity in society. She observed that the stupid people did not truly understand Christianity. All since Socrates had pointed to a hereafter but few realized that in its Christian form religion need not be a mysterious and intimidating institution. Christianity was simply the global domination of mercy, inner strength and understanding. Stieglitz also remarked pessimistically on the prospects for a successful German nationalist movement in her diary. Stieglitz believed that it was the nature of the German to be led about by the hand, ever willing to please his master. Likening the true German to a dog, Stieglitz observed:

\begin{quote}
Der Hund ist der ächte Deutsche. Er bellt, springt an, läßt sich nicht schrecken durch die Peitsche, springt wieder an, dreht sich um sich selbst herum, gleichsam um sich zu zügeln und übriggroßen Eifer an sich zu halten. Der Hund ist das deutsche Thier. Der Hund ist, woraus der Mensch am meisten machen kann, und seine Aehnlichkeit ist gemütlich. Was war ***; als der treue Hund Goethes? --- Der Hund giebt seine Natur auf und schließt sich lieber an den Menschen. Er ist großmütig, läßt sich von kleinen Kindern necken, geht lieber hinweg, als daß er ihnen was zu Leide thäte. Es wäre eine Aufgabe: die Philosophie des Hundes!\textsuperscript{256}
\end{quote}

Until this willingness to be dominated ended, Stieglitz saw little hope for a successful

\textsuperscript{255}Ibid., 66.

\textsuperscript{256}Ibid., 67; the name of the person whom Stieglitz labelled “das treue Hund Goethes” was omitted from Mundt’s reprint of the diary, either by Mundt or the Vorzensur. It would appear likely, however, that the person to whom Stieglitz referred was Bettina von Arnim given that the diary was written around the time that the controversy over Arnim’s Goethes Briefwechsel mit einem Kind was raging.
Of all the excerpts provided by Mundt the most interesting was a letter from Stieglitz to a Professor Scheidler in Kissingen in which she responded to Scheidler’s commentary on one of her works. The professor had evidently referred to her as ‘ein Stückchen Rahel.’ Stieglitz’ response read as a defence of individuality as powerful as any undertaken by Mundt himself. Stieglitz remarked that she personally never viewed people as part of a crowd, for the most valuable attribute of humanity was variety. While acknowledging the greatness of Rahel and the obviously complimentary tone in which the comment had been intended, Stieglitz added that

Ich für mein Theil will lieber eine Butter- oder Gänseblume sein und mich von der ersten hungrigen Ziege mit Kopf und Kraut verzehren lassen, wenn ich nur einmal ein Ganzes dagewesen bin; nur kein Blatt einer Rose oder Stengel eines Lotos! --- Und Gott sei Dank! in dieser wunderbar reichen Menschenwelt gibt es auch Sonnenblumen und Nachtschatten, Dornen und Disteln dicht neben einander.... Ich verstehe und erkenne die Menschen nur als Individualitäten.257

Stieglitz thus acknowledged that she would rather be a lowly buttercup or daisy than be remembered as a single petal of a greater flower. Moreover, one of mankind’s greatest gifts was the gift of individuality. The world should celebrate its individualism and not encourage everyone to emulate a few great figures.

Mundt offered these diary excerpts without additional comment but it was clear that he viewed Charlotte Stieglitz as a remarkable example of the literary capabilities of contemporary women. A similar attitude was evident in Mundt’s encounter with the work of Bettina von Arnim. Von Arnim’s Goethes Briefwechsel mit einem Kind (1835) created an enormous

---

257Ibid., 68. The letter was dated September 27, 1834.
controversy when it was first published. Many critics rejected the work outright arguing that she had violated a sacred trust by writing of her affair with Goethe. Though Mundt did not review the work personally in *Literarischer Zodiacus*, he did publish a review written by Ferdinand Gustav Kühne and in the subsequent month's *Zodiakallichter* offered his own opinion on the controversy. Kühne’s unusually long five-page review appeared in the April 1835 issue of *Zodiacus*. The majority of the review was devoted to an examination of Bettina von Arnim’s character and motivation rather than her literary talent. He did, however, note that Bettina's literary pedigree was solid, as she was the sister of Clemens Brentano and grand-daughter of Sophie Laroche. Kühne concluded that her book was surprisingly illustrative of the complexity and breadth of Goethe's work.

Evidently Kühne’s relatively sympathetic review branded him as pro-Bettina and by extension anti-Goethe, and prompted such a storm of protest that Mundt felt compelled to address the issue himself the following month. The appearance of Bettina’s book had divided Berlin into two camps, those who enthusiastically hated the book and those who

---

258 Wolfgang Menzel argued that Bettina’s work was fundamentally unfeminine and violated the basic elements of trust and decency; quoted in Karl Gutzkow, “Charlotte Stieglitz. Ein Denkmal,” *Deutsche Revue*, Nr. 1 (1.12.1835), 40.

259 Kühne worked closely with Mundt on *Literarischer Zodiacus* for several years. After *Zodiacus* ceased production in 1836 Kühne went on to a successful career as editor of Lewald's *Europa*.

260 The usual length of reviews in *Literarischer Zodiacus* was two to three pages. Only Gutzkow’s *Wally, die Zweiflerin* and Kühne’s *Eine Quarantäne im Irrenhause* received reviews approaching the length devoted to von Arnim’s work.

enthusiastically embraced it. Though Mundt did not state which side he favoured, his opinion was evident in the way in which he described Bettina: “den genialen, romantischen, mystischen, prophetischen, wundersam, herumirrlichtelirenden Kobold Bettina, die Sibylle der romantischen Literaturperiode, und doch das von herzinniger Liebe gequälte Kind Goethe’s.”

Mundt observed that the debate had gone too far for an objective critique to make any difference so instead Zodiacus would simply publish the battle reports from each side. He did take this opportunity to launch a savage attack on a correspondent for the Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung who, despite praising the original femininity of Bettina's work, had used his critique to dismiss all of the pro-Bettina forces as “unwürdiges Gesindel.” Mundt’s retort was brief and pointed: “[w]arum, warum in aller Welt, Sie böser Orthodoxer? Kann man nicht, bei aller großen Verehrung für Goethe, abweichende Ansichten haben über seine Bedeutung für die nächstliegende Zeit...?”

In this response one sees Mundt’s ongoing insistence on the right to express divergent opinions, the same insistence which led him in the November 1835 edition of Zodiacus to condemn those who spoke of a ‘Young German school’ of writers.

Mundt’s encounters with his female contemporaries demonstrate that he was certainly tolerant of female writers. Stieglitz’ work in particular represented everything that was new and exciting about his age. Bettina’s work, though fundamentally representative of the older

---


263 Ibid., 329.

264 Ibid.

Romantic school of writing, was nonetheless valuable since it challenged the existing consensus on Goethe.

Turning to the female characters which Mundt created in his novels, one finds a similar challenge to the accepted definitions of femininity and the female role. This was most clearly evident in Mundt’s controversial novel *Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen*. Mundt’s *Madonna* is a highly uneven work, a peculiar mixture of fact and fiction, where key figures from the past and present meet and interact with fictional characters and fictional situations created by the author. The ostensible centre of the story revolved around Mundt’s conversations with a woman named Maria (Madonna, to whom the title refers) whose life story was interwoven throughout the narrative.\(^{266}\) However, Maria’s life story was merely a stepping stone from which Mundt could tackle a variety of diverse topics including the potential emancipation of women.

---

\(^{266}\) E.M. Butler claimed that Maria was a real person with whom Mundt had a brief affair during his travels in Bohemia in the summer of 1834, an affair which left him racked with guilt since his true love, Charlotte Stieglitz, remained unaware of the liaison. However, she did not provide any substantive evidence supporting the existence of such a person beyond a vague statement that she believed the story to be true; E.M. Butler, *The Saint Simonian Religion in Germany. A Study of the Young German Movement*, 2nd Edition (New York: Howard Fertig, 1968), 335-336. In fact, the life of Maria, who was abandoned by uncaring parents at a young age after a rigorous indoctrination into the Catholic faith, and was subsequently raised by a worldly and irreligious Aunt who provided her with an expensive education, then attempted to make Maria the mistress of an older man, is remarkably similar to the life of Bettina von Arnim. Von Arnim was abandoned to an Ursuline convent, raised by her grandmother Sophie Laroche, from age thirteen to twenty-six, and became Goethe's mistress while she was still quite young. Mundt's ongoing fascination with Bettina, was evidenced by a series of *Literarischer Zodiacus* articles which, beginning in January 1835, gave notice that Bettina's book was completed and would be available to the public soon. Thus it seems to be far more likely that Maria's life was in fact based on the life of Bettina.
By far the most interesting, if also the most frustrating, insights into Mundt's attitudes towards emancipation were revealed in a chapter entitled "Bohemiconymphomachia."\textsuperscript{267} The stated intent of this section was to reveal the mysteries of the women of Prague, women who, according to Mundt, reflected the very essence of mysticism and sensuality.\textsuperscript{268} Evidently Mundt believed that the key to the mysteries of the women of Prague could be found in a story that had first been captured in a sentimental fashion by the poet Egon Ebert---a story about the eighth-century Bohemian Handmaidens' War.\textsuperscript{269} It was then that the only true exploration of the consequences of the emancipation of women had taken place. In his own time, Mundt argued that the issue of female emancipation had been trapped in the philosophical debate over Saint Simonianism, preventing an examination of the real issues surrounding the question of emancipation.\textsuperscript{270} Mundt thus endeavoured to retell the story of the Handmaidens' War in a letter to Maria so that the contemporary reader could ponder the lessons therein. In the retelling of this story many of Mundt's opinions on women and on emancipation were clearly evident.

\textsuperscript{267}Theodor Mundt, \textit{Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen} (Leipzig: Gebrüder Reichenbach, 1835), 302-343. This section was published in its entirety under the title "Unterhaltungen in Prag" in the January 1835 issue of \textit{Literarischer Zodiacus} as a way to publicize the forthcoming release of Mundt's book. The voice of the author is omnipresent in this section which begins "[i]ch beschloß, um mich für die Langeweile des Egon Ebert'schen Mägdekriegs zu rächen, mir selbst einen zu Papiere zu bringen...." \textit{Ibid.}, 301.

\textsuperscript{268}Mundt, \textit{Madonna}, 299; Mundt believed that it was only possible to tell this story while in Prague where he was free of the restrictions imposed by the censor.

\textsuperscript{269}Literally "an den Böhmischen Mägdekrieg."

\textsuperscript{270}Mundt, \textit{Madonna}, 301.
The Bohemian Handmaidens’ War was triggered by the death of the queen of Bohemia, Libussa, a woman who was evidently well-educated, deeply intelligent, and loved by all of the women of Bohemia for her efforts to improve their lives. Libussa had created an association to educate young girls and free them from the stultifying assumptions of their parents. Though Libussa was profoundly mourned by some, others had celebrated the end of the unnatural rule of a woman. Among those who celebrated Libussa’s death was her husband, Przemysl, who was relieved that he was finally free of his brilliant wife, who had so often made him feel inadequate because of her mastery of complex philosophical topics. Together Przemysl and his friend Hinchvoch celebrated their lack of *Geist* by ordering the disbanding of Libussa’s association for women and thereby giving men complete freedom from educated women. Przemysl instructed the women to return to their fathers’ houses, pay attention to their spinning wheels, and help their mothers to cook and clean. “Was habt ihr mit den Künsten zu schaffen und mit der Wahrsagung und mit der Wissenschaft der Pflanzen und Kräuter. Ihr seid arme Leute Kind. Geht! Geht!”271 However, having tasted freedom the young women could not return to the stifling world of their parents, thus they turned to Wlasta, Libussa’s handmaid, to lead them to their freedom. Wlasta rallied the women with a rousing speech concerning the value of freedom and the necessity of fighting to defend the ideals of liberty; her speech concluded with the revolutionary cry of “[l]iberte pour toutes les femmes!”272

The next sequence of events which Mundt narrated demonstrated the mixture of

---


272 Cited in French in Mundt’s original text; *ibid.*, 312.
understanding and cynicism with which he regarded female emancipation. Following her speech about the value of liberty the spirit of Libussa entered the body of Wlasta and told the women about the future of women's emancipation. The struggle for women's freedom would be marked by great calamities, eternal wars, and titanic despair. Wlasta's lifetime would be an era of love, but still women would remain unfree. The next centuries would bring pious images of young German women praying in dark cells, enraptured women who had surrendered themselves to the power of God. Yet still women would not be free, for the world of the Church was the realm of great associations of men, associations which continued to debate whether or not women were individuals. Next would come Joan of Arc, yet she would be denied even by the women of her era since those women had no fatherland and thus could not understand how Joan could be possessed by the spirit of the fatherland. The following years would see the emergence of the bourgeois era, an era which would invest women with considerable value. They would knit, sew, pour tea, and speak pleasantly; yet they would not be free. In the bourgeois era they would be dominated by associations of free men. Looking further forward still Wlasta told of a man named Hippel who believed that women should have a fatherland, a place in the state, and a real place in free open associations. Hippel was

273 The use of the term *Vaterland*, though clearly inappropriate in the time of Joan of Arc, was Mundt's.

274 Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel (1741-1796) was the administrator of the territory of Danzig in the late 1700s. His work *Ueber die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Weiber* (1792) argued that all of the supposed weaknesses of women were actually creations of the society in which they lived. Hippel thus called for the education of women to prepare them to accept their legitimate civil rights and responsibilities. Hippel's work was recently published in English under the title *On Improving the Status of Women*, ed. T.F. Sellner (Detroit: 1979).
thus the first man truly inspired by the spirit of liberalism. Finally, the spirit of Libussa told the women of the culmination of their quest. She told of events in Paris among a group of men who called themselves Saint-Simonians. What the liberals had conceived and Hippel had written, the Saint-Simonians would implement. In Paris, Enfantin awaited a truly free woman who would be taken into the society of men to create “eine gesellschaftliche Person, das ist nicht mehr der Mann allein, sondern Mann und Frau, und alle Geschäfte des Lebens werden daher paarweise verrichtet.”

Mundt’s interpretation of the struggle for emancipation was interesting for several reasons. It revealed a clear understanding of the key issues facing women in their attempt to gain recognition as equals. Mundt’s depiction of the subordinate role offered to women by the Church hierarchy was, at least in the case of the Catholic women’s orders, an accurate assessment. While acknowledging that the acceptance of women’s orders within the Church was an important step, Mundt still recognized that the continuing subordination of those orders meant that this could not be viewed as a major step in the quest for emancipation. Mundt’s analysis of the problems confronting women during the bourgeois era seems remarkably progressive. He recognized the stultifying effect of bourgeois conventions on women and did not assume that because bourgeois men had gained some freedoms that women had automatically been empowered too. Mundt’s account focussed attention upon the rigorous expectations placed upon women, the necessity of being educated but only within a sharply

---


276 Given the time period in question (prior to the appearance of Joan of Arc during the Hundred Years War) Mundt must have been referring to the Catholic Church.

112
confined domain, the endless social obligations, and the over-riding awareness that the bourgeois public sphere was an exclusively male preserve. Mundt also introduced the ideas of Hippel, Saint-Simon and Enfantin, all of whom believed that a genuine equality of men and women was possible. By introducing the ideas of the Saint Simonians, Mundt appeared to acknowledge that real emancipation might soon be realized.

After providing an overview of the fate of women's emancipation, Mundt returned to the story of the Bohemian Handmaidens' War. Under the leadership of Libussa, the women determined that they needed to demonstrate their new-found freedom and confidence by choosing their own mates. Wlasta chose Przemysl but was dismissed by him—told to return to her handmaid's duties and pray for forgiveness for her impudence. Wlasta then vowed vengeance on all men:

Auf, auf, zur Rache, ihr Schwestern! rief sie aus. Zur Rache an allen Männern! Kein einziges dieser Ungeheuer darf am Leben bleiben, so lange wir böhmischen Mägde walten in diesem Lande! Zur Rache, zu den Waffen! Jede suche sich ihre Waffe, damit wir gerüstet sind!... Jetzt will ich euch sagen vom freien Weibe, was es ist! Das freie Weib ist die Amazone, die gegen die Männer ficht! Die Amazone, mit Schwert und Bogen und Pfeil, ein freies Weib! Sie ist unabhängig, sie streitet für ihre Freiheit gegen die Männer!277

The end of this speech also marked the end of the narrator's letter to Maria. A simple narrative told the remainder of the story. The war encompassed the whole land as the women rose up against their husbands and fathers, building their own castle, and proclaiming the independence of their state, with Wlasta as its queen. Next they passed an Amazonian edict which ordered that every male child born have his right hand cut off and right eye poked out to make him unfit

---

277Mundt, Madonna, 337.
for battle. Finally, the women defeated the men on the battlefield and instituted an ethical-social revolution which made the men entirely subordinate to the women. The rule of Wlasta was so onerous that the males eventually revolted and engaged the women in battle once more. Eventually, after a horrendous battle, the biblical word came down: “Er soll Dein Herr sein! und die Jungfrauen, die nicht durch das Schwert fielen, wurden geheirathet, und gelobten Treue und Gehorsam, und ein sanftes Gemüth.”278 At this point the narrative ended without further explanation.279

Mundt never clarified his motives in producing this piece. In later years, he did not mention Madonna or his reasoning when he wrote it, likely due to his anxiety concerning his Young German connections. Yet Mundt chose to excerpt this section in its entirety in Literarischer Zodiacus to announce the forthcoming publication of Madonna. Thus one can reasonably conclude that he considered the piece to be of great interest to his audience.280 However, what remains unclear is how Mundt intended this material to be received. According to a superficial reading Mundt was anxious to reveal the foolhardiness of any attempt to achieve women’s emancipation. After all, the fate of the Bohemian handmaidens can hardly be considered encouraging. E.M. Butler thus concluded that this piece was evidence of Mundt's belief in the essential absurdity of feminism.281 Yet it was not the rule of women as such which

278Ibid., 341-342.
279Ibid., 343.
280Only one additional chapter was excerpted during Mundt’s years as editor of Zodiacus, that being the introductory “Posthorn Symphonie,” an enthusiastic call for action within the new literature.
led to their downfall; it was the onerous and tyrannical regulations imposed by Wlasta. As such the story could also be interpreted as a general condemnation of dictatorship, rather than a particular attack on the rule of women. It was only when the women attempted to reduce all men to complete subservience that their rule collapsed.

While his account of the struggle for the emancipation of women was admirable in its scope, Mundt's portrayal of the character of Wlasta was problematic. At one level, Mundt acknowledged the basic intelligence of Wlasta and certainly presented a flattering picture of her organizational and military talents. Yet at another level, the character was frustratingly under-developed. The only motive given for her behaviour was a fierce sense of loyalty to Libussa; Mundt failed utterly to develop any other aspect of Wlasta's personality or to offer any insight into her thoughts and feelings. In general Mundt appeared to be deliberately inflating those parts of Wlasta's personality which were guaranteed to provoke the reader. Indeed, as in much of Mundt's work, this might have been his intention—to highlight interesting phenomena and to provoke discussion, rather than offer any concrete suggestions for change.

Similar inconsistencies are evident in the characterization of Maria, the ostensible heroine of the novel. Maria spoke directly to the reader only twice during the novel. On the first occasion Maria told her life story in a letter entitled 'Confessions of a Worldly Soul.' On the final occasion she revealed the outcome of a particular story begun in the earlier letter. Maria told a relatively straightforward story, chronologically ordered, of her life from childhood to adulthood. The early years of her childhood had been shaped by unfeeling parents.

---

282 The title of this section, "Bekenntnisse einer weltlichen Seele," was obviously inspired by the sixth book of Goethe's Wilhelm Meister: "Bekenntnisse einer Schönern Seele."
and a rigorous indoctrination into the Catholic faith. As she entered adolescence Maria was sent to live with an aunt in Dresden where she was provided with opulent surroundings and an expensive education. Maria was exceptionally well-educated for a female child and her assertion that, "[d]as Leben ist Lernen, und wenn man ausgelernt hat, wird das Leben Genießen," seemed to contradict the later conclusions of Ute Frevert that the women of the Biedermeier period expected to find fulfilment only in their duties as wives and mothers. Maria herself acknowledged that her love of learning and especially her awareness of history set her apart from many of the other women of her age. "Diese Überzeugung, die ich gewann, eröffnete mir zugleich einen freieren Blick über die Weltgeschichte und deren Fortschritte, da mir bis dahin, wie jedem Mädchen, alles historische Interesse ziemlich fremd geblieben war." However, Maria's education had only been provided in order to make her a better mistress to the nobleman who had been funding her lessons, thus the traditional expectations of her time remained more or less intact.

The discovery of her intended future provoked in Maria a spiritual crisis. Maria felt trapped between the Catholic upbringing of her early years, the liberating nature of the knowledge she had gained through her education, and her guilty enjoyment of the pleasures afforded by her present lifestyle. Over-riding all of these concerns was the knowledge of what her future held. In one of the more interesting observations in Maria's letter she revealed that she longed at times to be a man, because only then could she escape her fate:

\[\text{283 Mundt, Madonna, 200.}\]

\[\text{284 Ibid., 204.}\]
Ich dachte, wenn ich ein Mann wäre, wollte ich fortlaufen, und mich lieber in eine Bodenkammer bei einer armen Weberfamilie einmiethen, als hier bleiben! Hier, wo ein zweideutiges Weib der raffinirten Unterhaltung eines Grafen Opfer erzieht. Und am andern Morgen war immer Alles wieder vergessen, was ich gedacht hatte.285

Here Mundt revealed Maria’s awareness of the limitations of her era and her gender.

At the mid-point of the letter Mundt’s generally empathetic portrait of Maria's crisis gave way to a graphic depiction of the attempted seduction of Maria by the nobleman and the consummation of her relationship with her tutor, the details of which seemed completely at odds with the complex characterization Mundt had been building earlier. As Maria surrendered to the world of the flesh she forgot all of her earlier concerns and gave herself over completely to hedonistic pursuits. One could perhaps read this as a endorsement of sensualism (as in fact the censor did) except that by the end of the letter her doubts and concerns had returned and it became obvious that her exploration of worldly pleasures had only served to complicate her life further. This fact did not, however, prevent Mundt from applauding her sensualism for the remainder of the novel, even after Maria announced that she had finally found happiness by being baptized into the Protestant Church.

Mundt thus provided a very inconsistent and contradictory picture of his heroine. He did not explain how Protestantism could provide a satisfactory home for such an educated and worldly soul, nor did he reconcile her earlier experiences with her belated conversion. Indeed, the introduction of Protestantism seemed to be a device to placate the censor rather than an integral part of the plot. Additional writings by Mundt, however, would seem to indicate that

285Ibid., 214.
his unsatisfactory ending was symptomatic of a more deep-rooted inability to come to terms with the implications of a life of sensualism.

In September 1835, in his capacity as editor of *Literarischer Zodiacus*, Mundt reviewed Heinrich Laube’s *Liebesbriefe*, an exploration of the Saint-Simonian idea of the emancipation of love. Here Mundt argued that a woman could never be truly committed to the emancipation of love for “[d]ies ist im höchsten Grade unpsychologisch und mortificirt alle Eigenthümlichkeit der weiblichen Natur. Denn das Weib, welches liebt, ist eifersüchtig, und kann, wie die Liebe überhaupt, nicht dulden, daß man andere Götter habe neben ihr.” Thus, though Mundt himself had created a character in Maria who was committed to a life of sensualism, he was unwilling or unable to acknowledge that a woman could be satisfied by such a life, hence the belated conversion of Maria to Protestantism.

Overall, Mundt’s writings provided a confusing and oftentimes contradictory interpretation of female emancipation. He was clearly aware of the limitations which bourgeois society placed upon the women of his era, but the psychological impact of those limitations was barely explored. Mundt hardly mentioned Maria’s motivations. She retreated into a world of sensualism only to be saved in the end by her discovery of the Protestant faith, yet the reader does not know why her new faith provided a satisfactory resolution of her psychological crisis.

---


287 Mundt’s characterization of Maria appears to have been influenced by the Romantic writers’ interest in exploring the implications of a life of irreligiosity and immorality. Like many of the early Romantics Mundt explored Maria’s life from childhood to maturity in order to demonstrate the implications of a life of sensualism. In doing so, however, he produced an inconsistent and contradictory characterization.
In addition, by retelling the story of the Bohemian Handmaidens’ War, Mundt apparently denied that women could achieve emancipation on their own. Men such as Theodor von Hippel and the Saint-Simonians would achieve their emancipation for them. Finally, despite his characterization of Maria, Mundt ultimately rejected the idea that a woman could ever be satisfied by a life of sensualism, considering this to be in the highest degree unfeminine.

2.

Unlike Theodor Mundt, Karl Gutzkow developed a much clearer and more consistent position on female emancipation. Gutzkow’s views were inspired in large part by his interaction with his female contemporaries. The life and death of Charlotte Stieglitz featured prominently in Gutzkow’s work, as it did in the work of Mundt. In February 1835 Gutzkow devoted the feature article in Phönix to a tribute to Charlotte Stieglitz.288 Noting that few events since the death of Karl Sand289 had moved Germany and its writers more than the originality of the death of Stieglitz, Gutzkow explored the implications of such a sacrifice and in doing so illuminated the complex relationship between male and female literary production. The core of Gutzkow’s argument was his belief that Heinrich Stieglitz had been paralyzed both

---

288Karl Gutzkow, “Cypressen für Karoline [sic] Stieglitz,” Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland, Literaturblatt Nr. 8 (25.02.1835), 189-191; Gutzkow’s use of the name Karoline reflected the fact that he had never met Stieglitz personally, a fact to which he admitted in a December review of Charlotte Stieglitz. Ein Denkmal; Karl Gutzkow, “Charlotte Stieglitz. Ein Denkmal,” Deutsche Revue, Nr. 1 (1.12.1835), 40. Heinrich Stieglitz (b.1801) left Berlin shortly after his wife’s death, travelling first to Munich then Rome and finally Venice where he became a prominent political figure in 1848; Stieglitz died of cholera in 1849.

289Karl Ludwig Sand (1795-1820) was the young student who assassinated August von Kotzebue in Mannheim on March 23, 1819, leading to severe repression, especially against the freedom of the universities and the Burschenschaften. Sand’s action also led to the imposition of the Karlsbad Decrees of 1819.
by the greater talent of his wife and the lack of any true inspiration. Heinrich’s work was dull and uninspired, dismissed outright by Wolfgang Menzel for its lack of originality. Heinrich had been unable to give voice to his muse because he lacked the depth of insight that his wife possessed. Thus Charlotte elected to provide him, by her death, with a tragedy equalling the blindness of Milton or the poverty of Homer for its inspirational value. Gutzkow concluded by imploring Heinrich to use this sacrifice properly and not to waste his wife’s gift.290

In one of the last articles Gutzkow wrote before the Reichstag ban prohibited the distribution of the works of the Young Germans,291 he returned to the subject of Charlotte Stieglitz. In this article Gutzkow devoted some time to an examination of the quality of her work. Though Gutzkow observed that she was neither a thinker like Rahel, nor a poet like Bettina, he did note that she possessed a strong will, an unusual power of toleration, and an educated mind:

Manches, was aus ihrem Munde kommt, ist artig gesagt: Stil und Urteil sind scharf ausgeprägt. Man sieht hier eines jener schönen weiblichen Wesen, die uns zum Glück noch oft begegnen: nicht originell, nicht begünstigt von der Natur, etwas ernst, schwer und nachdenkend im Begreifen: nicht einmal besonders arrondiert in den weiten Gebieten des Wissenswerten; aber glau [sic] und munter sich dafür interessierend, zuweilen gespornt vom edelsten Ehrgeiz, sinnig zuhörrend bei ernstem Gespräch und, aus tiefster Naivität, zuweilen


291 The Reichstag ban eventually prevented the publication of the Deutsche Revue in which this article was to have appeared. Gutzkow tried twice to evade the ban, once by publishing the journal under the title Deutsche Blätter für Leben, Kunst und Wissenschaft; on this occasion, however, Gutzkow’s publisher Löwenthal, under increasing pressure from the censor, refused to distribute the work during the sensitive months after the federal ban. Later in 1836 the article was published in a somewhat edited form, along with “Cypressen für Karoline [sic] Stieglitz,” in Gutzkow’s, Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur, Bd. II (Stuttgart: P. Balz’sche Buchhandlung, 1836), 114-136.
Upon reviewing some of Gutzkow’s comments on Charlotte Stieglitz, several of the arguments of the feminist school seem well-founded. In Gutzkow’s eyes Stieglitz’ power came not from her literary talents, but rather from her naiveté and occasional flashes of noble ambition. Further, Gutzkow seemed to pay no attention to the depth of thought found in her diaries. Though he found Stieglitz’ writing to be stylish, she remained simply a representative of the feminine way of writing and nothing more.

However, it was clear from subsequent comments on Bettina von Arnim and Rahel Varnhagen von Ense that Gutzkow did not hold the same attitude towards all women writers. As an aside to his comments on Charlotte Stieglitz, Gutzkow also addressed Menzel’s critique of Bettina von Arnim’s *Goethes Briefwechsel mit einem Kind*. Menzel had attacked von Arnim’s motives, noting that “Bettina liebte Goethe; das ist gut: sie gibt das Geheimnis ihres Herzens heraus, das ist unweiblich.”293 Gutzkow began his rebuttal by noting that *Goethes Briefwechsel mit einem Kind* was one of the most notable literary phenomena of the age. Bettina’s only crime had been her willingness to break with convention. Why should she not share her joy in Goethe with the German public?294 Gutzkow thus acknowledged that a woman was capable of producing a remarkable piece of literature. Indeed he was so intrigued with Bettina’s work that he and Wienbarg extended to her an invitation. In a letter dated September


293 Wolfgang Menzel quoted in *ibid.*, 42.

15, 1835, Gutzkow requested that Bettina join them in producing the *Deutsche Revue*, the journal then in the planning stages that was to represent the crowning achievement of the new literature. However, the intervention of the censor stifled the production of the *Deutsche Revue* before its first edition and thus eliminated the possibility of collaboration among Wienbarg, Gutzkow and von Arnim. Nonetheless, two years later Gutzkow recorded that he was once again in contact with Bettina and had been privileged to visit her. For two hours he had been entranced by the depth and breadth of her knowledge. "Wir sprachen über alles und hätten doch, als wir schieden, erst anfangen mögen! Diese Vielseitigkeit, diese Gedankensprünge, diese geistreiche Formgebung im Momente, dieses neckische Spiel mit der Wahrheit oder mit dem Schein derselben --- es bezauberte."  

Many years later Gutzkow's devotion to Bettina's work was still evident. In a review of Bettina's *Königsbuch* which appeared in the *Telegraph für Deutschland* in 1843 Gutzkow defended the author from accusations of communism:

One [critic] has reflected upon this section of the book, and called it communistic, one hears what is spoken and remarks upon this amazing new word—communism! Is the highest most beautiful love among mankind communism? then it bears mentioning that communism will find many new adherents.

295 Gutzkow and Wienbarg to Bettina von Arnim (Frankfurt am Main: 15.9.1835), *BdfG*, 228; the only other writers to receive such an invitation were Ludwig Börne and Heinrich Heine: Gutzkow and Wienbarg to Börne (Frankfurt am Main: 14.9.1835), *BdfG*, Anm. II (88), Gutzkow and Wienbarg to Heine (Frankfurt am Main: 15.9.1835), *BdfG*, 62.

296 The report of this visit was not published until 1840; Karl Gutzkow, "Ein Besuch bei Bettinen," *Telegraph für Deutschland*, Nr. 12 (January 1840); *GWIII*, 115.

Despite this continuing and remarkable support from Gutzkow, recently published analyses of von Arnim's work still argue that breaking with tradition and attempting to enter the male-dominated world of the German literary establishment was "enough to deny Bettina von Arnim entry into the literary canon of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."\textsuperscript{298} Bettina von Arnim's exclusion was not a product of a systematic exclusion of women; rather, her work appears to have suffered the same fate as much of the new literature, produced by both male and female writers: it was consigned to obscurity as an interesting experiment, but lacking the substance of the Nachmärz writers.\textsuperscript{299}

The controversy surrounding \textit{Goethes Briefwechsel mit einem Kind} and the death of Charlotte Stieglitz offers an excellent opportunity to see the divergent views of Gutzkow and Mundt with respect to literary production by women. While Mundt saw Stieglitz as representative of everything that was new and exciting about his age, Karl Gutzkow viewed her simply as a noble representative of feminine literary production. She was neither a great thinker nor a poet of the quality of Bettina von Arnim. On the other hand, Gutzkow believed that Bettina had produced one of the most remarkable books of the day. Whereas Mundt saw Bettina as a representative of the older Romantic school, Gutzkow perceived a depth and breadth of knowledge and a talent which made her worthy of inclusion among the best of the new literature.

\textsuperscript{298}Edith Waldstein, "Goethe and Beyond: Bettine von Arnim's \textit{Correspondence with a Child} and Güntherode," in Waldstein and Goodman, \textit{In the Shadow of Olympus}, 113.

\textsuperscript{299}This is the argument advanced by Peter Hohendahl concerning the fate of the Young German literature. Hohendahl, \textit{Building a National Literature}, 108-111.
Another woman who figured prominently in Gutzkow’s work was Rahel Varnhagen von Ense. Her writings, like those of Bettina, came under attack from Wolfgang Menzel in 1835. Though Gutzkow was inclined to dismiss Menzel’s criticisms outright since Rahel “hat zu viel Freunde in Deutschland gewonnen, als daß ich ihre Rechtfertigung zu übernehmen brauchte,” he nonetheless spent some time in several issues of the *Literaturblatt* reflecting upon Rahel’s contributions. Gutzkow observed that Menzel’s criticism of Rahel was motivated by the fact that his three-year absence from Germany had left him out of touch with the changes which had taken place. He was thus criticizing what was new, namely the work of Charlotte Stieglitz, Bettina von Arnim and Rahel Varnhagen von Ense, without really understanding its value.

Gutzkow gave more detailed consideration to the importance of Rahel Varnhagen von Ense in an article entitled “Rahel, Bettina, Charlotte Stieglitz.” This article confronted the impact of Rahel’s letters. Gutzkow noted that her letters had been dismissed with disdain by many of her male contemporaries during her lifetime and she had been forced to live as a solitary thinker. However, a closer look at her work revealed that Rahel’s letters could provide

---


301 Gutzkow had contracted with Hoffmann & Campe to publish this and several other essays in the second volume of *Öffentliche Charaktere*, but the Prussian ban prevented the publication of the work. Though several of the planned articles were subsequently edited and published in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur* (1836), this article was not. The version cited here can be found in Gutzkow’s collected works; Karl Gutzkow, “Rahel, Bettina, Charlotte Stieglitz,” *GWIII*, 98-112.

302 Rahel’s letters were collected, edited, and published posthumously by her husband under the title *Rahel: ein Buch des Andenkens für ihre Freunde* (Berlin: Duncker and Humbolt, 1834).
a tremendous source of change. Most importantly, Rahel challenged the traditional assumptions regarding morality, the social order and religion:

Die Neuerungslust... las aus den Briefen der Rahel eine zartkeimende Saat neuer titanischer Ahnungen heraus..... Noch nie hat es politische Umwälzungen gegeben ohne Angriffe auf die gleichzeitigen moralischen, gesellschaftlichen und religiösen Begriffe.... Jeder große Prophet kam in die Verlegenheit, von einem schwärmerischen Anhänger politisch gedeutet zu werden.303

The degree to which Gutzkow viewed his female contemporaries as literary equals was further evident in the July 25 edition of the *Literaturblatt*, in which he reviewed George Sand’s *Lélia: Ein Roman nach dem Französischen*. Though ordinarily a harsh critic during his time as editor of the *Literaturblatt*, Gutzkow was evidently entranced by Sand’s work. He commented that, despite too many allegorical elements, the novel contained a power of truth that was staggering; the gender of the author was irrelevant and the novel demonstrated that it might be possible for a woman to enter into the inner circle of the new literature. “Ist es möglich, daß eine Frau sich so in den innersten Kreis der Bewegungsideen versetzen kann! Über Moral, Staat, Religion, Sitte und Herkommen tragen ihre Urtheile alle die halb lächelnde, halb wehmütige Physiogmonie der neuen Zeit.”304 Gutzkow concluded by noting that as soon as a new work by Sand appeared he would immediately give notice in the *Literaturblatt*.

Evidently Gutzkow’s interest in George Sand did not wane in later years. In the preface to the second edition of *Wally* he acknowledged the depth of his debt to Sand. According to


Gutzkow, the character of Wally represented "the French witch Lélia, in German garb." Indeed there was more than a passing similarity between the two strong female characters, especially in their frequent doubts about the value of religion in a changing society. Finally, in his autobiographical *Rückblicke auf mein Leben*, Gutzkow returned again to the subject of Georges Sand, reaffirming once more her pioneering role in the new European literature.

The seriousness with which Gutzkow treated female writers was also reflected in the fictional characterizations of women in his novels. Gutzkow's female characters were depicted as complex individuals who were capable of a remarkable degree of esoteric thought. The most infamous of Gutzkow's female characterizations was Wally, the skeptic. Gutzkow divided *Wally, die Zweiflerin* into three sections. In the first and second parts, Gutzkow's voice is omnipresent as the narrator who described Wally's life and actions. The third and final part utilized a very different format. The third part of the novel consisted of Wally's diary, through

---

305 Cited in Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres, text notes to Karl Gutzkow, *Wally, the Skeptic*, transl. Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres (Frankfurt am Main: Herbert Lang, 1974), 114n.

306 Other biographers of Gutzkow insist that Wally was more likely an amalgam of several women whom Gutzkow knew, most importantly Charlotte Stieglitz whose death was mirrored in Wally's own suicide, and Rahel Varnhagen. See Peter Müller, "Introduction," *Gutzkows Gesammelte Werke*, Bd. 2 (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1911), 188-189.


308 The title of Gutzkow's novel has been translated as *Wally the Skeptic* or *Wally the Flirt*. There is, however, one textual reference which clarifies the translation. Shortly before her suicide Wally made the following comment, "Noch sechs Monate hielt Wally ein Leben aus, dessen Stütze weggenommen war. Sie, die Zweiflerin, die Ungewisse, die Feindin Gottes, war sie nicht frömer als die, welche sich mit einem nichtverstandenen Glauben beruhigen;" Karl Gutzkow, *Wally, die Zweiflerin* (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835), GWII, 305. This is the only use of the title word "Zweiflerin" in the novel and in this context, ‘skeptic’ would seem to make far more sense than ‘flirt.’
which she spoke directly to the audience, and a long treatise entitled “Confessions on Religion and Christianity,” which Wally was reading while writing her diary. In this final part Gutzkow’s voice was almost entirely absent and the image of Wally which emerges is markedly different than that which had appeared in the earlier chapters. The picture of Wally in the first two parts of the novel is one of a selfish elitist, a woman who thrived upon childish games and was easily bored by intellectual conversations. “Wally tanzte bis in die Nacht. O welch ein Glück, sich mit dem faden Mittelgut in ewiggleichen Kreisen herumzudrehen!” Very early in the narrative the reader is presented with a concise summary of Wally’s character. Gutzkow depicted his heroine as shallow, frivolous, and incapable of serious intellectual thought:

Er gab sich willig dem Spotte Wallys hin, die viel zu leichtsinnig war, auf dergleichen Debatten etwas zu geben, zu eitel, um eine allgemeine Unterhaltung interessant zu finden, und die überdies weder sang noch spielte. Wally hatte Ideen, aber nur momentan; sie verschmähte es, die Geistreiche zu scheinen, weil sie wußte, daß sie schön war. Flüchtig waren ihre Bewegungen, liebenswürdig, ohne Pedanterei ihre Kapricen. Cäsar fühlte das und badete sich in dem oberflächlichen Schaume, den Wally von den Ideen nur gelten ließ. Cäsar hatte recht, sie für unfähig zur Spekulation zu halten. Er nahm sie wie ein

---

309 The first two parts of the novel are divided into short chapters, usually two to three pages in length; the final part is divided into shorter journal entries, with the treatise on religion appended. The final pages of the novel are occupied by an apparently unconnected essay “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit,” which appears to be Gutzkow’s reflections upon his own novel. There is considerable disagreement about the purpose of this section. Several scholars, including Johannes Proell, *Das junge Deutschland. Ein Buch deutscher Geistesgeschichte* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1892), 573, have argued that the essay was included in order to extend the novel beyond the twenty folio sheet length that was subject to the approval of the Vorzensur; in 1874, however, Gutzkow added the subtitle “As an Explanation” to this section indicating that he had always intended the essay to clarify his intentions in the novel. The essay itself was originally published in *Phönix* as “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit,” *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland*, Literaturblatt Nr. 29 (25.07.1835), 693-695.
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humoristisches Capriccio der animalistischen Natur.\textsuperscript{311}

Throughout the early chapters of the novel Wally’s actions seem to confirm this dismissive portrayal of her character and intellectual capacity. More importantly this characterization seems to provide additional evidence in support of the image of the \textit{Vormärz} woman which has been sketched by Frevert. Wally was depicted as a beautiful ornament incapable of much beyond a decorative function. Subsequent chapters show that Wally was consumed by the quest for a suitable husband but in the meantime was quite content to occupy herself with the men of the banal social circle in which she moved.

There were indications, however, subtly underlined by Gutzkow’s narrative, that Wally did not fit the typical image of a Biedermeier woman. Early in the narrative the audience was told that Wally enjoyed reading much of the new literature, from Heine’s \textit{Salon}, which she regarded as childishly simple and evidence of French philosophical backwardness, to “[e]inige Schriften vom Jungen Deutschland... von Wienbarg, Laube, Mundt.”\textsuperscript{312} Later, the narrative revealed that Wally was deeply preoccupied both with religious doubt and with misgivings regarding the expectations placed upon women by the society in which they lived. In a letter to a confidant, Wally wrote of her concerns regarding the position of women in German society.

\textsuperscript{311}\textit{Ibid.}, 205-206.

\textsuperscript{312}It is interesting to note that Gutzkow did not include himself among the Young Germans and took this opportunity, via Wally’s comments on Wienbarg, Mundt and Laube, to make judgements about them. Thus, Wienbarg was too democratic, Laube would rather outdo the nobility than do away with it, and Mundt was unintelligible to anyone other than himself. As to Heine, Wally commented “hier sind all die gelehrten, bemoosten Karpfen der deutschen Philosophie mit Frühlingspetsilie und Vanille zubereitet. Man sollte die Bonbons in Aphorismen aus Heines „Salon‘ einschlagen”; \textit{ibid.}, 197.
This was one of the rare opportunities provided in the first book to hear Wally’s thoughts without Gutzkow’s narration:


Wally continued that the problem for contemporary women was that no one demanded anything of them or wanted anything from them. Their upbringing had left them in a cage which they were not permitted to leave. Women were expected to move about gracefully with charm and delicacy within the prison that had been created for them. “Diese Gefangenschaft unserer Meinungen --- ach, war Spreu für den Wind! Rechte will ich in Anspruch nehmen, für wen? für was?”314 This was perhaps the clearest statement from Gutzkow, via the character of Wally, regarding the stultifying effect of the Biedermeier woman’s existence. In his portrayal of Wally, Gutzkow allowed his audience to witness the expectations which were placed upon the women of the *Vormärz* era, as well as illuminating the negative psychological repercussions of these expectations. Moreover, by creating a woman who was capable of such deep contemplation of her condition, Gutzkow was challenging traditional assumptions which saw

313*Ibid.*, 227, emphasis added; this section, concerning the male vocation closely mirrored Rahel Varnhagen von Ense’s comments to her sister regarding the criteria by which men and women were judged.

women as incapable of esoteric or philosophical thought. Clearly, Wally's thoughts ranged far beyond the traditional realm of Kinder, Kirche und Küche.

In book two, however, Wally returned to her frivolous existence, having finally found a suitably wealthy husband. Yet she was only able to postpone her doubts, not conquer them. In book three, Wally's diary, the reader was once again invited to contemplate her tortured existence. Wally found herself trapped in a loveless marriage, Gutzkow's description of which appears to confirm Ute Frevert's description of a typical bourgeois marriage: a marriage which represented "not a lovematch, but an operation planned with military precision and with clearly defined goals and tasks."315 Finding no fulfilment in her duties as a wife, Wally attempted to bury herself in her social obligations. Ultimately, however, this too failed and her diary entries revealed that she grew more preoccupied than ever with religious doubts.

Wally's battle with religious doubt was an ongoing struggle which had appeared periodically in books one and two. In the diary, however, Wally's doubts emerged full blown, triggered by her reading of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments.316 Lessing's edited collection of the

315 Frevert, Women in German History, 40-41.

316 The so-called Wolfenbüttel Fragments (named after the town where Lessing served as a librarian) were written by Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768) over the last few years of his life. Reimarus had written that Christianity's ethical and practical focus had been distorted by the Apostles and by Jesus' own preoccupation with the Jewish vision of the Messiah. According to Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres, Lessing's interest in the Fragments began in 1768 when he met Reimarus in Hamburg. Lessing's edited collection of the Fragments appeared between 1774 and 1787, though he attributed them to Johan Lorenz Schmidt to protect Reimarus' surviving family. Karl Gutzkow, Wally, the Skeptic, trans. Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1974), 125n. Gutzkow evidently had ulterior motives in discussing the so-called Wolfenbüttel Fragments. In his autobiography he indicated a desire to make the Fragments understandable to the general public by publishing a new edition of them in 1835. When he could not find a publisher willing to handle the controversial fragments he
Fragments seized Wally’s imagination though she lamented the impact of censorship on the availability of the document:


Despite the positive impact of the Fragments on her mood, Wally was unable to find the answers to her questions on religion either in the Fragments or in another treatise entitled “Geständnisse über Religion und Christentum.”318 In fact, Wally became even more skeptical as a result of reading these documents.

Wally’s diary also contained insights into other key issues of the era. Her diary was quite critical of Bettina von Arnim and Rahel Varnhagen von Ense, even though Gutzkow had praised their work. While Gutzkow had commended the revolutionary impact of Rahel's work, Wally dismissed her as incapable of producing anything substantive. Bettina meanwhile was admired for her willingness to behave according to her impulses, but “[e]in freies Weib ist nur
decided to raise people’s awareness of them through Wally; Gutzkow, Rückblicke auf mein Leben, GWIV, 174-175. This is another example of fiction serving as camouflage for ideas that could not be discussed in any other medium.

317 Gutzkow, Wally, die Zweiflerin, GWII, 277-278.

318 Unlike the Wolfenbüttel Fragments “Geständnisse über Religion und Christentum” was not an actual treatise, rather it was created by Gutzkow in order to illustrate the religious beliefs of his characters. At the 1835 hearings which led to the eventual banning of Wally, Gutzkow was accused of expressing his personal beliefs through this essay. This he denied, claiming that the opinions expressed were merely a compilation of thoughts previously expressed in the novel.
erträglich mit Spekulation." Again, Gutzkow allowed Wally to represent the contradictions of her age, desperately seeking truth and meaning herself, she nonetheless attacked Rahel for her demonically sinister way of continually looking for the truth. "Will sie es nur anders machen als die andern? Oder wurde ihr diese Originalität angeboren? Sie gibt nirgends nach, sie ist rastlos in ihren Bestrebungen, die verschiedenen Seiten der Wahrheit zu entdecken und konnte nicht anders enden, als entweder in einem Wahnsinn, der sich mit der Bewegung im Tretrade vergleichen läßt, oder als Anhängerin des Pietismus." Eventually Wally followed precisely the path she had charted for Rahel; unable to find answers to her growing list of questions, she ended her doubts by committing suicide, an act which could either be regarded as a sign of feminine weakness or a courageous, even fitting, end for a women who could no longer live under the repressive expectations of her era.

Gutzkow's novel also introduced another female character to the reader: Delphine. Whereas Wally can be seen as an amalgam of several different women, fictional and factual, the character of Delphine was based on a friend of Gutzkow and his publisher Carl Löwenthal from

319Gutzkow, Wally, die Zweiflerin, GWII, 283.

320Ibid., 283-284.

321Suicide featured prominently in the Young German novels; Gutzkow seemed to adhere to Rahel Varnhagen’s interpretation that the living should not pass judgement upon those who choose suicide as an option for “this concerns those who have nothing to be happy about; let each search his own heart as to whether such people are many or few in number;” Rahel Varnhagen von Ense, Rahel. Ein Buch des Andenkens für ihre Freunde, vol. 1 (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 1834), 576-577 quoted in English in Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres’ text notes to her translation of Wally. Karl Gutzkow, Wally, the Skeptic, trans. Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres, 126n. This was the section of Rahel’s book which Wally was struggling to comprehend when she ended her own life.
In his autobiography Gutzkow noted that Löwenthal had encouraged him to create a female character who embodied all of Frau Ladenburg's attributes. “Lebensfroh, poetisch gestimmt, wie wir beide [Gutzkow and Löwenthal] waren, hatte ich auf seinen Wunsch [Löwenthal] sogar einen weiblichen Charakter hereingezogen, der vollständig, die Dame verherrlichend, nach dem Leben gezeichnet war.” Unlike the character of Wally whom Gutzkow allowed to speak directly to the audience, Delphine appeared only in the pages of Wally's diary. Nonetheless, Wally sketched a remarkably complete picture of Delphine, who, she observed, “ist so verschieden von mir.” The first diary entry on Delphine described a women who was not exceptionally good-looking, nor overly intelligent; rather her charm was ascribed to her self-surrendering helplessness and her Judaism. Rather than commend her helplessness, however, Wally argued that Delphine needed to read more in order to improve...

---

322 The use of an actual person created considerable trouble following the publication of *Wally*. Gutzkow's unwillingness to change the name and mask the reference to Frau Ladenburg in the second edition of *Wally* provoked a heated exchange between Gutzkow and Löwenthal in 1851. At Löwenthal's insistence Gutzkow reluctantly changed the name to the hardly deceptive 'Adolphine' in the 1851 and 1874 editions of the novel; Löwenthal to Gutzkow quoted in Heinrich Houben, *Gutzkow-Funde: Beiträge zur Literatur und Kulturgeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Wolff, 1901), 188.

323 Gutzkow, *Rückblicke auf mein Leben*, GWIV, 176; Paul Müller maintains that Delphine also bears more than a passing resemblance to Rahel and to another female companion of Gutzkow's, Charlotte Birch-Pfeiffer, who was eleven years his senior and the object of his affections for many years; Müller, "Introduction,” *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, GWII, 188-189. The fact that Löwenthal suggested the inclusion of a character based on Frau Ladenburg would seem to contradict the defence he offered at the Mannheim trial. There Löwenthal was acquitted on the grounds that he was unaware of the novel's content prior to its publication.

324 Gutzkow, *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, GWII, 270.

325 The issue of Delphine's Judaism is dealt with in Chapter Four.
her mind and allow her to sustain a logical discussion for more than a few minutes. "[S]ie sollte sich durch vielfache Lektüre darin zu bilden suchen, was über die Musik und das bloße Gefühl hinausliegt.... Cäsar muß ihr Bücher geben." Despite the fact that it was Cäsar’s books which were ultimately responsible for all of Wally’s doubts, she clearly believed that it was better to be exposed to such ideas than to remain ignorant. Hence the reader was given another indication that Wally believed the role of women needs to be modified.

Gutzkow created an immensely complex image of women in Wally, die Zweiflerin. Wally and Delphine reflected all of the elements of Biedermeier femininity which have been delineated by Ute Frevert. Both were constrained by traditional assumptions regarding the woman’s role as ornament; both saw marriage as their highest calling; and Wally was suspicious of Rahel and Bettina, accusing both of engaging in unfeminine behaviour. Yet both were fascinated by the prospect of pushing the acceptable boundaries of female behaviour. Indeed the most difficult decision Wally was forced to make concerned her moral inability to consummate her relationship with Cäsar. Moreover, Gutzkow’s Wally was extremely well-read, capable of deep philosophical contemplation, and clearly aware that she had been unnaturally repressed by the limits which her society had imposed upon the feminine sphere. This would seem to indicate a level of social awareness on Gutzkow’s part, for which few contemporary writers have given him credit.

The overall impression which one receives from Gutzkow’s work is one of an era

---

326 Gutzkow, Wally, die Zweiflerin, GWII, 271.
which contained many contradictory impulses, and as such exerted a considerable psychological toll on its citizens. Whether or not Gutzkow’s characterization of Wally provides support for female emancipation is more difficult to judge. The fact that Wally was unable to live with her new-found skepticism and philosophical awareness would seem to support the need for a fundamental revision of women’s roles in society. The vehicle by which that revision would be realized was, however, unclear. Certainly Wally was unable to effect such a change by herself and the society in which she lived showed no signs of facilitating this change. However, Gutzkow believed deeply that literature itself would be the medium which would transform society. Through the creation of characters which challenged traditional assumptions, society would be forced to confront alternate realities and slowly an entirely new order would evolve. Thus, just as the transformation of Wally’s character resulted from her encounter with the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, Biedermeier society’s transformation would be affected by contact with works such as Gutzkow’s *Wally*. In this vision of emancipation both male and female writers would participate, since Gutzkow counted Bettina von Arnim and George Sand among the greatest talents of the new literature.

3.

Whereas both Gutzkow and Mundt were relatively sympathetic towards female writers, Heinrich Laube was evidently less charitable towards some of the works by his female contemporaries. In 1833 Laube reviewed Charlotte von Glümer’s *Wahrheit und Dichtung. Eine Sammlung historischer Novellen aus alter und neuer Zeit* which featured a collection of works by women. Laube began by expressing the opinion that the average woman was only capable of writing family history due to her natural inability to address tragedy without trying
to heal it. Such statements certainly seem to confirm the assertions of the literary historians Goodman and Waldstein that women were considered incapable of serious literature. He went on, however, to note that a truly exceptional woman could potentially produce a masterpiece of literature, "so könnten wir manches Neue lernen und manche neue Freude erfahren." The main problem, however, was that when women took up literary careers they often wrote like men, becoming in the process "literarische[n] Hermaphroditen." Instead of women attempting to write like men and men, in turn, attempting to write like women, Laube observed that a truly worthy literature must attempt to combine both masculine and feminine writing. "[D]ann könnte man versuchen, das Gespinst in einander zu schlagen, und die schönste menschheitliche Cultur würde sich ergeben." This line of argument puts Laube clearly into the romantic school of criticism, whose adherents regarded neither male nor female writing as adequate and instead sought an entirely new type of literature which blurred the boundaries of the masculine and the feminine sphere. Claims such as this might also indicate that Laube was initially drawn to the Saint-Simonian belief in an ideal social type that was man and woman together; there is, however, insufficient evidence at this point to suggest that Laube’s views on women were coloured by Saint-Simonian doctrines.

Insofar as the present work was concerned, Laube concluded that it was neither good nor bad, as was the case with most of the literature of the time, it simply existed. On the basis

---

327 Heinrich Laube, "Wahrheit und Dichtung. Eine Sammlung historischer Novellen aus alter und neuer Zeit," Zeitung für die elegante Welt, Nr. 148 (1.08.1835), 591.

328 Ibid.

329 Ibid.
of this review, however, it is not possible to support the hypothesis that Laube treated female writers more harshly than their male counterparts. He was equally critical of the works produced by the majority of male writers of the time. Laube claimed that the vast majority of this work could be reviewed with a three-word literary history: “man schrieb dies, das und jenes, es schrieben viele Tausende, aber sie schrieben blos dies, das und jenes.”

Despite his somewhat negative depiction of the new literature by women, Heinrich Laube’s fictional works feature an overwhelming number of female characters. The two-part novel *Die Poeten*, the first section of Laube’s three volume opus *Das junge Europa*, is particularly illustrative of the nature of his characterizations of women. *Das junge Europa* is a complex novel written entirely in the form of letters between the major characters. The use of this format allowed Laube to establish a clear dialogue between supporters of the old social order and proponents of a revolutionary new order. The novel itself follows the lives of a small society of poets assembled at the fictional castle Grünschloß during the period of the July Revolution of 1830 and the Polish uprising. It features six major female characters: Clara, Camilla, Alberta, Constantie, Desdemona and Julia. In addition, a number of other women play minor roles in the narrative. The six primary characters are, however, the most informative with respect to Laube’s views on women and their possible emancipation. Taken together, these six women represented an interesting cross-section of Biedermeier society.

The lives of the six women were inordinately complex. Hence a brief overview of each

---


woman is helpful in clarifying their roles in the narrative. Clara, though promised by her father to an unidentified stranger, was the first lover of the novel’s hero—Valerius. Camilla was described as an enthusiastic and curious women who was attracted to Valerius at the beginning of the story and who would eventually become his partner in a free union based only on love at the end of the novel. Alberta was Camilla’s best friend. Though engaged to another of the novel’s characters she was also the lover of Hippolyt, the amoral anti-hero of the work. Constantie was of noble birth, a former mistress of Hippolyt and bent on vengeance due to the latter’s betrayal. Desdemona was another of Hippolyt’s conquests, an actress who had been driven from her home by the jealous Constantie. Finally, Julia was the only woman depicted as strong enough to resist Hippolyt’s advances. She was responsible for Hippolyt’s fateful flight to Paris and his involvement in the revolutionary events taking place there.

According to E.M. Butler Laube’s intent in *Die Poeten* was to “stage-manage a Saint-Simonian society on the lines laid down by Enfantin in the *Enseignements*.”332 Thus the final agreement between Camilla and Valerius to undertake a free union based upon love alone, without the official restrictions of marriage, appeared to Butler as the completion of Prosper Enfantin’s ideal society in which man and woman would unite out of love, free choice and personal preference. There can be little doubt that Laube was attracted by certain elements of

---

332 Butler, *The Saint-Simonian Religion*, 218. The *Enseignements* represented Prosper Enfantin’s own additions to the original doctrine of Henri de Saint-Simon. *Le Nouveau Christianisme* (1825) the seminal work on Saint-Simonianism said only that religion was a morality based on love. Enfantin extended this idea further in 1828, concluding that man and woman together made up the basic social unit, but that union must be based upon free choice, personal preference and love. Moreover, that union must meet the physical needs of the woman. Robert B. Carlisle, *The Proffered Crown: Saint-Simonianism and the Doctrine of Hope* (Baltimore, MD: John’s Hopkins: 1987), 154.
the Saint-Simonian doctrine early in his career, especially the idea of free love and the belief that man and woman together made up the ideal social type. His book reviews offer ample evidence of Laube’s commitment to the importance of combining feminine and masculine attributes in a single form.\(^3\) Similarly, Laube noted in October 1833, immediately after the publication of *Die Poeten*, that the doctrines of Henri de Saint-Simon represented the most important speculation of his time.\(^4\) It is apparent that elements of a Saint-Simonian worldview can be found in *Die Poeten*. A closer examination of those elements, however, reveals the incomplete nature of Laube’s understanding of the Saint-Simonian ideal of femininity. In the final analysis, Laube’s characterizations represent a fundamentally traditional view of the role of women, not a revolutionary one.

Free love was a constant theme throughout *Die Poeten*, as evidenced by the many lovers taken by each of the novel’s primary male characters: Valerius, Hippolyt and Constantin. All three men seem to be entirely preoccupied by the emotional and physical attributes of love. This preoccupation was aptly summarized by Valerius who observed: “Ich bin der Liebe treu, nicht aber der Geliebten. Weil ich eben die Liebe liebte, so liebte ich die schöne Alberta, die muntre, geistreiche Camilla.”\(^5\) Among the female characters, however, there appeared to be less enthusiasm for such ideas. The character of Camilla, however, seems at first glance to

---

\(^3\)Laube, “Wahrheit und Dichtung,” 591-592.

\(^4\)Heinrich Laube, “Der Meßkatalog,” *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, Nr. 198 (10.10.1833), 792. See Chapter Four for a more complete discussion of Laube’s fluctuating interest in the Saint-Simonians.

represent the Saint-Simonian ideal of a woman drawn into an intimate relationship by love, free choice and personal preference:

\[\text{Du sollst mich nicht heirathen, wenn Du nicht willst, das Heirathen ist auch wirklich nicht hübsch, es ist wirklich philisterhaft.} \]
\[\text{Ich will bei Dir bleiben, so lange Du mich magst, und magst Du mich nicht mehr --- nun --- nun so will ich die Vergangenheit noch einmal allein leben und doch glücklich sterben.}\]

Thus Camilla evidently acknowledged that marriage was unnecessary and further accepted that her relationship with Valerius might be temporary. Later in the same conversation she added that it gave her considerable pleasure to be part of the great social revolution and especially to be involved in its inception. Further, she was overjoyed when people acknowledged and envied her free and unfettered love-life with Valerius.

On this and several other occasions, however, Camilla expressed reservations about her new arrangement with Valerius, reservations which seem to undermine the ideal of a perfect Saint-Simonian union. “Meine guten Eltern sind todt, ihnen mach’ ich keine Sorge durch dies neue ungewöhnliche, darum verdammte Leben….\(^{336}\) Camilla’s description of her relationship as ‘ungewöhnliche’ and ‘verdammte’ hardly seems to indicate a deep commitment to her newfound relationship. Rather, Camilla appears as a woman desperate not to lose the man she loved and therefore willing to acquiesce to an abnormal and damned relationship. Similarly her pledge to Valerius was not truly representative of the Saint-Simonian ideal. Valerius was free to leave the relationship if the time came when he could no longer tolerate Camilla; there was,

\(^{336}\)Ibid., II, 159.

\(^{337}\)Ibid.

\(^{338}\)Ibid.
however, no reciprocal promise made by Valerius that would allow Camilla to leave the relationship if she discovered that her physical needs were not being satisfied, an important element of Enfantin’s Enseignements.

Other inconsistencies in the characterization of Camilla can also be found. Laube appeared to have been establishing Camilla as ‘la mère suprême,’ the one true woman, for whom the Saint-Simonians searched. However, even Butler acknowledged that this characterization did not work.339 If Camilla was the one true woman then, according to Enfantin, Valerius should have abandoned all other women and devoted himself to her. However, the novel ended with Valerius unable to choose between Camilla and Clara, his first love. Thus when Valerius left Grünschloß to join the revolutionary forces fighting in Poland, Clara still believed that Valerius would remain true to her as he had promised. One is thus left to conclude that Laube’s attempt to imbue his characters with Saint-Simonian ideals was at best imperfect. While free love certainly featured prominently in the novel, Laube offered only a superficial interpretation of that ideal.

Closer consideration of Laube’s female characters reveals a degree of shallowness in all of his characters. The female characters, Camilla included, shared several common traits. All were unusually beautiful. Alberta was:

"schön wie Diana, spröde wie Diana, göttlich wie Diana.... Albertas Auge ist das Mährchen [sic] von tausend und einer Nacht und die langen dunkeln Wimpern beschatten es wie die träumersche Palme Arabiens zur Zeit der Dämmerung, fein und schlank, fast unmerklich gebogen ist die Nase, aber die zarten Flügel zittern mitunter wie Lotosblätter, die Brahma’s Odem durchbebt, und dann hebt sich so herausfordernd der kleine Mund mit seinen vollen Lippen,

und um seine spielenden Winkel hüpfen kleine üppige Tänzerinnen.340

The description of Clara was equally flattering:

Clara lag halb entkleidet auf dem Sopha, ihr dunkelbraunes Haar war zur Hälfte aufgelöst und schmiege sich schmeichelnd wie ein sehnsüchtiger Trieb, dem man Gewährung gestattet, um Hals und Busen, ihre weiße Hand und der schöne, zur Hälfte entblößte Arm spielten damit.341

Constantie "bleibt das schönste Weib was ich [Hippolyt] gesehen. Linie, Muskul, Form, Auge, Wort, Geist, Gefühl --- Alles ist straff an ihr; sie ist der Gedanke eines Mannes, der weibliche Form gefunden."342 Camilla had:

...ein äußerst liebreiches Gesicht, lächelnde schalkhafte Augen, eine zierliche Stumpfnase, einen kleinen üppigen Mund, der viel schwatzt und lacht und blendend weiße Zähne zeigt. Ihr volles lichtbraunes Haar flattert in zurückgestrichenen Locken in einen vollen, feisten, schneeweißen Nacken, der wie zum Kopfen gemacht ist.343

If the women of Die Poeten were uniformly beautiful, they were also uniformly depicted as shallow thinkers, entirely preoccupied with the men of Grünschloß. Only two women challenged this generalization to some degree: Camilla and Julia. Camilla was described as having “viel Verstand, faßt sehr schnell und ist munter über und über.”344 Valerius was drawn to her because of her intellect as well as her appearance. Even so, Camilla’s letters

340Laube, Die Poeten, I, 44-46. These descriptions once again reveal the degree to which Laube was indebted to the language and imagery of the early Romantic writers, especially in his use of extravagant metaphors and classical analogies.

341Ibid., I, 59.

342Ibid., I, 132.

343Ibid., II, 18-19.

344Ibid., II, 18.
revealed no great intellect, but rather a near-total preoccupation with holding on to Valerius at all costs.\textsuperscript{345} However, Laube’s characterization of Julia created the image of a far more complex woman who was capable of a much deeper understanding of the issues surrounding free love and the emancipation of women. Julia’s letters to her mother revealed the degree to which she was capable of understanding the complex problems of her era:

\ldots nur die stärksten und edelsten Weiber einen Uebergang zu besserem freierem Gesellschaftsleben dadurch bilden könnten, daß sie sich der Ehe nicht unterwürfen, die neuen Begriffe aber auf alle Weise unterstützten, weil nach der politischen Revolution die sociale vor den Thoren läge, durch welche das Weib eine gesellschaftliche Stellung erlangen würde. Das Christenthum habe das Weib nur zur Hälfte frei gemacht, sie müsse es ganz werden.\textsuperscript{346}

 Nonetheless, these ideas were not conceived by Julia herself. Rather, they had been explained to her by Valerius and in the exposition which followed she confessed that “ich verstehe wenig oder gar nichts davon, und sie würden mich wie alles Ändern beunruhigen.”\textsuperscript{347} Thus even this brief intimation that the women of Grünschloß were capable of understanding the revolutionary nature of their social situation was eventually disproved.

 Though Laube’s Saint-Simonian society was at best incomplete, he nonetheless came closer than any of the other Young German writers to appreciating the possibility of such a development. Though the inadequate texturing of the female characters leaves the contemporary reader with the impression that Laube was describing a personal fantasy rather

\textsuperscript{345}Camilla to Julia, \textit{ibid.}, I, 75-89; Camilla to Julia, I, 151-159; Camilla to Ludovico, II, 36-39; Camilla to Alberta, II, 81-83 and II, 118-122; Camilla to Valerius, II, 161-166; Camilla to Valerius, II, 182-185.

\textsuperscript{346}\textit{Ibid.}, II, 53-54.

\textsuperscript{347}\textit{Ibid.}, II, 54.
than creating a new world, in his own era, as flawed as the characterizations might have been, Laube must be credited with advancing a revolutionary new conception of the relationship between man and woman. However, Gutzkow’s admonition that Laube tended towards dilettantism and failed to explore the full potential of his words, 348 seems to be an accurate appraisal of his efforts to construct a Saint-Simonian society. Moreover, subsequent writings by Laube reveal the degree to which his fascination with the world of the Saint-Simonians represented a passing phase in his personal development. 349

4.

Ludolf Wienbarg wrote very little on the subject of women, so little in fact that one could legitimately conclude that he paid no attention to the writings of the women of his era. He did join with Gutzkow in inviting Bettina von Arnim to collaborate with them in the production of the Deutsche Revue. However, it remains unclear to what extent this occurred at Gutzkow’s insistence. Wienbarg did offer an opinion on the emancipation of women in an 1835 essay entitled “In Sachen der deutschen [sic] Weiber gegen die deutschen [sic] Männer,” 350 part of the collection of essays which Wienbarg published under the title Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis. For Wienbarg the emancipation of women was inseparably linked to the religious


349 See Chapter Four for a more detailed treatment of this issue.

350 Ludolf Wienbarg, “In Sachen der deutschen [sic] Weiber gegen die deutschen [sic] Männer,” Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835), 181-208; each of the essays in Wanderungen was listed under a sign of the zodiac (hence the title of the collection). This essay bore the name of Sagittarius (der Schütz), the Archer.
questions of his age, in particular to the current state of Christianity versus the original intent of the faith. Wienbarg believed that the state of servitude in which the women of his era found themselves was entirely due to the political motivations of the papacy. Since its inception the papacy had arbitrarily been making laws for their followers which denied the true nature of femininity and which emphasized the dark secrets of the female sex. This had led men to mistrust women and force them into an unnaturally subordinate role, a situation which would not be easy to rectify. Wienbarg saw no hope for improving the status of women in the Saint-Simonian emancipation programme. Ridiculing the Saint-Simonian quest for the one perfect woman, Wienbarg argued that the goals of the French sect were laughable. “Bei keiner Sekte trug das Lächerliche mehr die Schleppe des Erhabenen.”

Wienbarg did, nonetheless, see some hope in the future. The emancipation of women would be an integral part of the achievement of a broader programme of emancipation for all oppressed groups. For the time being Wienbarg asked all women to allow him to be their voice in the struggle for emancipation and asked all men to reflect upon the important role which women, as wives and mothers, had played in the development of society. “Denkt nur an Göthe’s Mutter. Man sieht schon aus ihren Briefen, daß die Poesie ihres Sohnes aus ihrem Herzen keimt.” In the interim, Wienbarg requested that women remain patient until the time was right for men to rectify the situation:

O Weiber, tragt und duldet uns feige Despoten noch eine Weile. Freilich steht's in eurer Macht, uns sammt und sonders aus dem Hause und aus Deutschland zu jagen.... Aber laßt Gnade vor Recht ergehen. Wir gedenken, an unserer Besserung zu arbeiten, und werden uns bemühen, nicht allzuschimpflich von euch abzustechen. Und sind wir wieder, was unsere Väter, und haben wieder Muth zum Muthe und Muth zur Freiheit und freie Hand zu schalten und zu walten, dann wollen wir euer Loos auch bürgerlich verbessern, gleich dem Loose aller Unterdrückten und an Recht und Freiheit Gekränkten.354

Wienbarg's comments on the emancipation of women would thus seem to place him closer to the opinions of Mundt than those of Gutzkow. Women would have to wait for the leading male intellectuals of the era to effect their emancipation.

In his essays, Wienbarg seldom made reference to individual women. Generally women were only referred to as a social group, as in the quotation above. In "Das goldene Kalb," however, a short story published in Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis,355 a woman named Mathilde F. provided the focal point around which the story unfolded. Mathilde F. was identified by Wienbarg as an acquaintance whose charming and mysterious, even implausible, nature had continually amazed him.356 She was so remarkable that Wienbarg noted that if he was the father of the Saint-Simonians (presumably either Henri de Saint Simon or, more likely, Prosper Enfantin), upon meeting Mathilde he would believe that she was the one true woman for whom the Saint-Simonians had been waiting—the mother of the movement. Together with

354Ibid., 207-208.

355Prior to the official publication of Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis, "Das goldene Kalb," was excerpted by Gutzkow in Phönik: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland. Excerpts were published in each daily issue from 14.07.1835 to 23.07.1835.

356Ludolf Wienbarg, "Das goldene Kalb," Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835), 43. This story was listed under the zodiac sign of Taurus (der Stier).
Enfantin, they would create the one true union between male and female—the “couple révélateur.”

On the other hand Wienbarg argued that if he were a Catholic poet he would likely see in Mathilde the appearance of a new Madonna.

The form of “Das goldene Kalb” is unusual in that Mathilde’s letters to Laura H. provide the background material for a first-person commentary by Wienbarg on the socio-political situation of his era. In the first letter Mathilde described the situation in which she found herself and discussed the position of her father, a banker who had recently entered into the service of the monarchy. Mathilde decried the materialistic dreams of her father who boasted to his acquaintances that an elegant lamp had cost forty gold coins, but could not afford one penny for oil to put in the lamp. Meanwhile the king devoted all of his time to writing meaningless prayers which failed to illuminate the life of the people. The letter continued with Mathilde’s observations on the city in which she and her father lived. Just beyond her window she saw much misery: the ‘beggars-palace’ where a number of poor families were forced to live together, and the tailor who was still working at three in the morning just to keep his family alive. Mathilde resolved to take money to the tailor in the morning, but before she could do so the man committed suicide out of desperation.

---

357 Ibid.

358 Ibid.

359 Ibid., 29-34.

360 The location of this scenario is not identified in the early letter but subsequent references place the story in Norway.

marked the end of Mathilde’s first letter.

In a subsequent letter Mathilde provided more information about herself. She explained that her father was trying to arrange her marriage to a nobleman from the ‘first family’ in the land.\textsuperscript{362} She commented, however, that she would rather jump in the river than marry the count:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Mathilde’s misery continued to unfold in subsequent letters, eventually culminating in a full-blown spiritual crisis, similar to the crises which both Gutzkow and Mundt had created for their most famous female characters. At the root of Mathilde’s dilemma was her inability to comprehend the unfairness of the current social order in which the poor suffered endlessly amidst the conspicuous consumption of the wealthy. Finally Mathilde concluded that the poor would be rewarded in heaven:

\begin{quote}
Christus ist nicht für die Reichen gestorben, nur den Armen ist sein Blut am Kreuze herabgeträufelt, nur den Armen hat er die Pforten des Himmelreiches erschlossen --- den Reichen nicht.... Wahrlich, redet er seine Jünger an, wahrlich ich sage euch, ein Reicher wird schwerlich in’s Himmelreich kommen. Und weiter sage ich euch, es ist leichter, daß ein Kameel durch ein Nadelöhr gehe, denn daß ein Reicher in’s Reich Gottes komme.\textsuperscript{364}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{362}Ibid., 59-60.
\textsuperscript{363}Ibid., 60.
\textsuperscript{364}Ibid., 64-65.
Unlike Gutzkow’s Wally, who found suicide to be the only answer to her spiritual crisis, or Mundt’s Madonna, who found solace in the Protestant Church, Mathilde was momentarily saved from despair by the intercession of Karl B., the poverty-stricken son of a shepherd who shared her sense of social injustice. Karl offered to sail away with Mathilde so that they might create a true union based on their shared belief in a more egalitarian society. Mathilde agreed. However, the ship carrying Karl was lost at sea thus ending her chance for happiness and bringing the story to a close.\textsuperscript{365} Mathilde’s final letter indicated that she had lost hope and was destined to remain a prisoner in her father’s house, at the mercy of his decisions regarding her future.

In Mathilde F. Wienbarg created a woman of great complexity, evidently more intelligent than Gutzkow’s Wally and Mundt’s Maria, and gifted with a sense of social justice which was entirely lacking in the characterizations of Mundt and Gutzkow. Mathilde’s theological doubts and her social conscience were products of her own intelligence, whereas dominant male characters provided the ideas which preoccupied both Wally and Maria. Nonetheless, there was no satisfactory resolution for Mathilde F. Once her escape route was blocked she remained at the mercy of her father’s determination to carry through the arranged marriage with the count. Such a conclusion was entirely consistent, however, with Wienbarg’s previously stated belief that the emancipation of women could only come as part of a greater process of socio-political emancipation from the stultifying effects of Church and monarchy. So long as the traditional system remained firmly in place women such as Mathilde F. would be

\textsuperscript{365}\textit{Ibid.}, 72.
unable to secure their own emancipation.

5.

The picture which emerges out of the confrontation between the writers of the so-called Young German school and the question of female emancipation is a complex one. It is evident, however, even in this preliminary survey, that the assertions of the feminist literary critics simply do not hold up to close scrutiny. Women writers were not dismissed outright as incapable of serious literature, they did not receive harsher reviews than their male counterparts and, at least in the case of Bettina von Arnim and Rahel Varnhagen von Ense, they played far more than a minor role in literary production. The only consistent bias demonstrated by the Young German authors was an opposition to poor quality literature and in this the gender of the author was irrelevant. However, the writers of Young Germany tended to consider each female writer whom they encountered differently. Gutzkow appeared to have been the most willing to consider female authors as capable of great literature, yet Mundt was the only one of the so-called Young Germans who permitted a female writer to speak for herself in his journal. Laube did not consider women incapable of serious literature, but his ideal literature would have combined both feminine and masculine tendencies. There was thus a considerable difference of opinion among the ‘Young Germans’ regarding their female contemporaries.

Turning to the fictional characters created by the Young Germans one finds a similar diversity of attitudes. Both Mundt and Gutzkow were clearly aware of the limitations which Biedermeier society placed upon women, an awareness which they conveyed to their audience through their female characters. Yet while Gutzkow allowed his audience to understand the depth of the psychological crisis which this society provoked in women such as Wally, Mundt’s
readers were given no opportunity to hear Maria’s thoughts on this subject. Instead Maria retreated into a world of sensualism, an act which Mundt applauded, only to be saved in the end by her discovery of the Protestant faith, a very traditional resolution. Mundt’s readers might therefore have concluded that no fundamental changes were necessary to the existing social order. Gutzkow’s readers, however, could not fail to see the catastrophic consequences of the repressive Biedermeier social order. Similarly Wienbarg’s depiction of Mathilde F. provided a clear picture of the negative repercussions of the traditional social order. Laube’s characters, however, seemed to be designed to titillate his readers, rather than offer a carefully thought out solution to the key social problems of his era.

The Biedermeier period was an important transitional era in the search for a new conception of the female social sphere. However, the era contained many contradictory impulses. As products of this period the ‘Young German’ authors could not help but mirror these contradictory influences. Each of the so-called Young Germans expressed an interest in and a concern for the emancipation of women. They were also aware that the women of their era were already moving beyond the traditional realm of Kinder, Kirche und Küche and that this process was likely to continue. Likewise there appeared to be, in varying degrees, an awareness of the psychological ramifications of Biedermeier attitudes towards women. However, Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg disagreed as to how or even whether the process of emancipation would take place.

Because of the nature of the social transformation which Karl Gutzkow envisioned and the means, namely literature, by which he assumed that the transformation would be achieved, he was able to allow women to take an active role in the struggle for emancipation. Gutzkow
was able to admit that women such as George Sand and Bettina von Arnim could be equal participants in the creation of a new social order. Ludolf Wienbarg, however, denied that role to women, insisting that their emancipation would be brought about as part of the broader campaign for human emancipation which was already underway led by men such as himself. This belief also implied that there were no concerns specific to women in the struggle for emancipation and that political emancipation would address all of the outstanding injustices of the age, a somewhat naïve assumption that Theodor Mundt rejected outright in his discussion of the struggle for emancipation.

Mundt did agree with Wienbarg that women would not be the primary agents in the emancipation process. His account of the state of the emancipation struggle indicated clearly that he viewed female-led movements as an invitation to disaster. He thus placed the burden of emancipation on men such as Theodor von Hippel and the Saint-Simonians. However, though Mundt advocated emancipation on the Saint-Simonian model he appeared to be unable to accept the possibility of the fully emancipated women whom the Saint-Simonians described. There was thus a lingering conservatism evident in Mundt’s conception of the new female sphere which was not present in the work of either Wienbarg or Gutzkow. Nonetheless, in his consideration of the Saint-Simonian model Mundt would appear to stand closer to Heinrich Laube than to Gutzkow or Wienbarg, both of whom rejected such models outright.

Unlike Mundt Laube went considerably further in exploring the possibilities of a Saint-Simonian society. Yet here too one finds a somewhat one-sided advocacy of Saint-Simonian ideals. Free love, free choice and personal happiness were celebrated in the male characters. Yet the romanticized characters which Laube constructed made his female characters appear to
be at most reluctant participants in this new social order, an indication that Laube had not entirely abandoned the traditional beliefs of his era concerning the role and position of women. Moreover, Laube’s female characters displayed the lowest level of awareness of the psychological implications of their condition and the most frivolous attitude towards the new social values advanced by the men of their society. This again reflected Laube’s rudimentary understanding of the key issues facing the women of the Biedermeier period.

Despite the diversity of attitudes expressed by the ‘Young Germans,’ Eda Sagarras’s assertion that they were one of the few feminist groups that Vormärz Germany produced is questionable.366 Certainly their awareness of the problems facing the women of their era was an important step forward in the struggle for emancipation. The fact, however, that only Karl Gutzkow was willing to recognize that women could play a role in their own emancipation, would seem to cast doubt upon the Young Germans as proto-feminists.367 Again it would appear that though all four men expressed an interest in the question of female emancipation, the so-called Young Germans held widely divergent views on this issue. These differences of opinion can be seen even more clearly in the ‘Young German’ writings on religious issues.


367 Even Gutzkow later denied that female emancipation was viable, arguing in his Zur Philosophie der Geschichte (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1836) that the emancipation of women was the silliest idea his age had ever thought up. Cited in Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres’ text notes to Wally, the Skeptic, 114n.
CHAPTER FOUR:

Religious Emancipation and Saint-Simonianism in the Works of the Young German Writers.

The connection between Young Germany and the question of religious emancipation is a crucial one. The so-called Young Germans lived at a time of considerable religious change. Doubts concerning the validity of Christianity in the contemporary world had appeared full-blown in the early nineteenth century along with calls for various forms of religious emancipation. The issue of religious tolerance was viewed by many as a necessary step towards a more modern world, yet examples of intolerance remained abundant. Perhaps predictably, it would be religious intolerance which provoked the draconian reaction of the Mannheim tribunal towards Karl Gutzkow’s *Wally, die Zweiflerin*. This reaction led to the total suppression all of Gutzkow’s writings and also of four other authors who, in the final analysis, had little or nothing to do with the content of the offending work. Clearly then, the ‘Young Germans’ were perceived to be a very real threat to the institutions of Christianity.

The apparent challenge presented by the work of the ‘Young Germans’ to the religious status quo has been one of the most studied aspects of the young literature. Most conclusions on Young Germany and religion derive from the pioneering work of E.M. Butler whose 1926 thesis alleged that the Young Germans represented the first, and likely only, intrusion of the Saint-Simonian religion into Germany.\(^\text{368}\) Despite Butler’s narrow definition of Saint-

\(^{368}\)E.M. Butler, *The Saint-Simonian Religion in Germany: A Study of the Young German Movement*, 2nd Edition (New York: Howard Fertig, 1968); Butler’s thesis rests on a relatively narrow definition of Saint-Simonianism. Though she acknowledged the social aspects of the doctrine, including the idea of possibilism and the dominant role of technology in

154
Simonianism, most subsequent historians of the Young German movement have accepted her conclusions without question. Eda Sagarra argues, with specific reference to Butler, that Saint-Simonianism provided an important part of the overall programme of the Young Germans.\footnote{Eda Sagarra, \textit{Tradition and Revolution: German Literature and Society 1830-1890} (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 138-149.}

Ernst Bramsted commends Butler's interpretation, adding that Gutzkow's \textit{Wally} is perhaps the best reflection of the Saint-Simonian spirit of the Young Germans.\footnote{Ernest K. Bramsted, \textit{Aristocracy and the Middle-Classes in Germany: Social Types in German Literature 1830-1900} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 78.} Paul Lawrence Rose, while rejecting Butler's depiction of the Young German programme as a continuation of the liberal political goals championed by Ludwig Börne, says nothing about her primary assertion---that the Young Germans were first and foremost Saint-Simonians.\footnote{Paul Lawrence Rose, \textit{Revolutionary Anti-Semitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner} (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990), 172.}

Butler's thesis has been accepted for so long and with such unanimity that historians apparently no longer question its premises or the evidence she used to reach her conclusions.

Butler's thesis, as convincing as it can sound at times, was based on very limited society, she excluded these issues from her analysis of the Young German works. Instead, Butler was concerned with only those aspects of the doctrine which relate to the new Christianity that the Saint-Simonians hoped to create. Specifically, Butler was looking for evidence in the works of the Young German authors of the rehabilitation of the material world, in particular the gratification of human need in the here and now, in the flesh as well as the spirit. Butler was also anxious to demonstrate that the Young Germans supported the idea that men and women, while different, were nonetheless equal, and that, under the new religion, men and women would unite out of love, personal preference, and free choice---not the property-family links common to bourgeois marriages during the Biedermeier period.

\footnote{Butler concluded that the gloomy pessimism of \textit{Wally} was concrete proof that this work was not written in the Saint-Simonian tradition; Butler, \textit{The Saint-Simonian Religion}, 307-308.}
evidence and a series of questionable generalizations. In Butler’s chapter on Ludolf Wienbarg, for example, she argued that while Wienbarg’s angle of approach differed from that of the Saint-Simonians there was nothing in his ideas “which actually runs counter to the Saint-Simonian creed.”\textsuperscript{372} The fact that Wienbarg did not contradict the Saint-Simonians can hardly be taken as evidence that he was an adherent of the doctrine. Likewise, Butler saw in Wienbarg’s work only “a remarkable resemblance to Enfantin’s ideal, as interpreted by Heine.”\textsuperscript{373} Resemblance certainly cannot be taken as proof of Wienbarg’s Saint-Simonianism. In fact in the entire body of Wienbarg’s work Butler was only able to find two overt references to the doctrines of Saint-Simon. The first was a single reference from Wienbarg’s 1835 collection of essays \textit{Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis} which stated: “[n]icht der Mann allein, Mann und Weib sind das gesellschaftliche Individuum.”\textsuperscript{374} Few would argue that this is a virtual paraphrase of Prosper Enfantin; however, Butler entirely ignored the context of the passage. Wienbarg was paraphrasing the Saint-Simonians in order to demonstrate that the social order that they projected could never offer a viable solution to the problems afflicting his society.

Wienbarg’s second reference to the doctrines of Saint-Simon came much later, in an 1840 review of Heinrich Laube’s new novella \textit{Jagdbrevier}:

\begin{quote}
Soll ich von Laube als von einem Repräsentanten der Emancipation des
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{372}Butler, \textit{The Saint-Simonian Religion}, 408.

\textsuperscript{373}Ibid., 411; emphasis added.

This ringing denial of the Saint-Simonian position did not dissuade Butler; she attributed this attack to the first faint sign of Wienbarg's mental deterioration and to the psychological impact of the proscription of Young Germany. The Saint-Simonian Religion, 415.

There is no doubt that both of these issues affected Wienbarg and if Butler had demonstrated a pattern of Saint-Simonian sympathies in Wienbarg's writings prior to 1835 then her argument might have been convincing. This pattern, however, did not exist. While Butler's analysis of Wienbarg was the weakest of the five studies, a fact which she herself acknowledged, similar evidentiary problems plague each part of her argument. Substantial doubt is therefore cast upon her claim that the so-called Young Germans were, without exception, adherents of the doctrines of Henri de Saint-Simon and Prosper Enfantin.

The intent of the above discussion is not to deny that the Young Germans were deeply concerned with the religious developments of their age. It is simply to argue that this involvement was not solely, and in some cases perhaps not at all, predicated upon the doctrines

---


377 Ibid., 428.
of Saint-Simon and Enfantin. In her haste to find evidence of Saint-Simonian thought in the works of the Young Germans, Butler overlooked the fact that the Saint-Simonians were not the only group concerned with the rehabilitation of matter.\textsuperscript{378} Several recent studies have argued that Heinrich Heine's thoughts on religion and philosophy in Germany ultimately had more influence on the Young Germans than the ideas of the Saint-Simonians.\textsuperscript{379} This study will also argue that the thought of Friedrich Schleiermacher was enormously influential in shaping the political beliefs of several of the 'Young Germans.'

The late eighteenth century saw the development of several overlapping currents in German religious thought. The first current was characterized by a return to the pantheistic doctrines of Benedict Spinoza (1632-1677). The pantheists had argued that God was identical with the world, manifested in the plants, the animals and, most importantly, in man. Because man was a thinking creature who knew how to distinguish himself from nature, divinity

\textsuperscript{378}I have chosen the term 'rehabilitation of matter' over the more traditionally Saint-Simonian 'rehabilitation of the flesh,' since both Heinrich Heine (from whom at least one of the Young Germans seems to have taken his religious inspiration) and Theodor Mundt emphasized the former term to underscore their distinctiveness from French materialism. Heinrich Heine, \textit{History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany}, ed. Paul Lawrence Rose (North Queensland: James Cook University, 1982); originally published in several volumes in Germany under the title \textit{Der Salon}.

\textsuperscript{379}See for example Hannelore Burchardt-Dose, \textit{Das junge Deutschland und die Familie: zum literarischen Engagement in der Restaurationsepoche} (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter D. Lang, GmbH, 1979), 240-246. Butler in contrast saw Heine's ideas almost exclusively as a product of his early fascination with the Saint-Simonians and thus argued that contact with Heine was essentially the same as contact with the doctrines of Saint-Simon; Butler, \textit{The Saint-Simonian Religion}, 88-169 and 407. Few contemporary historians, however, would argue that Heine's philosophy of religion was entirely a product of his contact with Prosper Enfantin, contact which did not begin until the early 1830s.
attained self-consciousness through man.\textsuperscript{380} While the pantheism of Spinoza had been effectively discredited throughout much of the eighteenth century, it experienced a powerful revival at the turn of the nineteenth century, so much so that Heinrich Heine would claim in his History of Religion and Philosophy in Germany that pantheism was the secret religion of Germany.\textsuperscript{381}

The culmination of pantheistic thought can be found in Heine’s writings. There is some evidence to support the claim that Heine’s pantheism, at least in the first half of the 1830s, was inspired by the work of the Saint-Simonians. His dedication of Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie to Prosper Enfantin must certainly be taken as a sign that he was intrigued by his ideas. There was, however, only one direct reference to the Saint-Simonians in Heine’s Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie:

\begin{quote}
The Saint-Simonians understood and wanted something of the kind [promotion of the material world], but they stood on an unfavourable soil, and the Materialism which surrounded, suppressed them. They were better understood in Germany, for Germany is the most propitious soil for Pantheism.\textsuperscript{382}
\end{quote}

By the end of his treatise on religion, however, Heine seemed to have moved beyond the simple equation of pantheism with Saint-Simonianism towards a more complex pantheistic doctrine, which was heavily influenced by G.W.F. Hegel. In the closing passages Heine observed that sensualism was part of the progressive Hegelian philosophy in which nature and

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{380}Heine, History of Religion and Philosophy, 53-58.
\textsuperscript{381}Ibid., 60-61.
\textsuperscript{382}Ibid., 62.
\end{footnotes}
spirit were reconciled.\textsuperscript{383} Through the steady progress of history various religious systems had been tested. From Catholicism to Lutheranism, through the idealism of Leibnitz and Christian Wolff, Germans had experimented with all of these faiths and had found each of them to be in some way lacking. By the time of Hegel, however, they had arrived once again at their 'secret religion'---the union of the spirit and the flesh which was achieved through pantheism.

Heine's thoughts on philosophy and religion were definitely influential in shaping the views of at least one of the Young German authors. Heinrich Laube maintained an active communication with Heine and wrote frequently of the tremendous influence which Heine had had upon him. In December 1833 Laube was able to review the first volume of \textit{Der Salon} prior to its official publication in Germany in January 1834. Laube's review commended Heine's ability to convey the entire scope of historical development in a few carefully chosen words.\textsuperscript{384} He also remarked on Heine's exploration of the doctrine of sensualism and claimed that he himself had advocated a similar philosophy in his recently completed work \textit{Das junge Europa}.\textsuperscript{385} However, Laube's most flattering remarks were reserved for the way in which Heine presented his own pantheism to the reader. Laube noted that, "[z]u einem besonderen Vergnügen hat es sich Heine gemacht, seinen Pantheismus gereimt und ungereimt zum

\textsuperscript{383}Ibid., 122; emphasis added.


\textsuperscript{385}Ibid., 991. Laube's reference was to the first installment of \textit{Das junge Europa: Die Poeten} (1833). The final two volumes had not been written at this time.
Vorschein zu bringen.... [D]ie Poesie hindurch... ist eine kostbare Perle aus der Nordsee.\textsuperscript{386}

While Heine’s work was undoubtedly influential, other religious currents were equally important in shaping the attitudes of the Young German authors towards religion. As discussed in Chapter One, the teachings of Friedrich Schleiermacher had a great influence on Karl Gutzkow and Ludolf Wienbarg.\textsuperscript{387} Schleiermacher’s \textit{On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultural Despisers} argued that religion was a highly individualistic conception, a communion with the organic unity of the universe which could be articulated by any number of religions, none of which had all of the possible revelations of the truth. Schleiermacher was greatly influenced by Friedrich Schlegel in the formulation of \textit{On Religion}.\textsuperscript{388} Both men saw religion and art as the only two areas which view the universe as an organic whole in opposition to the utilitarian and materialist ethic of civil society. Schleiermacher’s religion was thus egalitarian, cosmopolitan and rehabilitated the natural world. It has also been viewed by some historians as an attempt to bridge the gap between the realities of public life in the late eighteenth century Prussian state

\textsuperscript{386}\textit{Ibid.}, 992. For his part Heine maintained a friendly correspondence with Laube, remarking in a July 1833 letter that Laube was one of the few men who truly understood the deeper questions which his work explored. Heine to Laube; Paris 10.07.1833 quoted in Jan-Christoph Hauschild (Hrsg.), \textit{Verboten! Das Junge Deutschland 1835. Literatur und Zensur im Vormärz} (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1985), 65.

\textsuperscript{387}Gutzkow produced a new commentary on Friedrich Schleiermacher’s preface to Schlegel’s \textit{Lucinde} entitled \textit{Schleiermachers Vertraute Briefe über die 'Lucinde.' Mit einer Vorrede von Karl Gutzkow} (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835). On the contact between Gutzkow, Wienbarg and Schleiermacher see Chapter 1(4).

\textsuperscript{388}Schlegel lived with Schleiermacher from December 1797 until September 1799 during which time \textit{On Religion} was conceived and written.
and the ideals of the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{389}

The re-emergence of pantheistic doctrines was not the only major religious development of this period. Standing alongside the pantheism of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries was the second major religious phenomenon in Germany: the resurgence of pietism. Inspired by the writings of Philipp Jacob Spener (1635-1705), the pietists advocated a focus on an awakened ministry, prayer meetings, increased devotional and charitable activity, and an emphasis on one of the key tenets of Luther’s teachings: the priesthood of all believers. Spener was also a strong believer in the second coming and therefore argued in favour of a complete withdrawal from worldly, materialistic activities and of a descent into a spiritual asceticism. The emphasis on the irrational and the asceticism of pietism appealed to many writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, including Gotthold Lessing and Novalis. Koppel Pinson has argued that German pietism, in both the Reformed Churches and the Lutheran Church, represented German Protestantism’s return to its roots, to the original intent of Martin Luther’s teachings.\textsuperscript{390} However, divisions among the pietists resulted in the creation of two factions: the traditional pietists who emphasized subjective religious experience and the unity of the Christian brotherhood, and the Fundamentalist pietists who believed in the brutality of man in the state of nature and therefore demanded his complete surrender to the absolute, literal truth of the biblical revelation. The latter group, led by Ernst Hengstenberg

\textsuperscript{389}Frederick C. Beiser, \textit{Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought, 1790-1800} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 240-244.

(1802-1869), equated any opposition to the established political authorities as a sinful rebellion against an order which had been divinely ordained.\footnote{John E. Toews, *Hegelianism: The Path Toward Dialectical Humanism, 1805-1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 245-251. Schleiermacher was a supporter of traditional pietism but rejected the Fundamentalists’ dogmatic insistence on the literal truth of the Gospels.}

In varying degrees pietism, the pantheistic doctrines expressed by Heine, and the individualistic religious conceptions put forward by Schleiermacher and the early Romantic writers exerted influence upon the Young Germans.\footnote{Historians who have considered the religious forces operating on the Young Germans sometimes include D.F. Strauß as a major influence. Strauß published the highly controversial *Das Leben Jesu* in 1835, arguing that the gospels did not have the credibility that a historian should require of his sources. Eitel Dobert has argued that this was a crucial influence on Gutzkow as he wrote *Wally*. Eitel Dobert, *Karl Gutzkow und seine Zeit* (Bern: Francke, 1968), 82-83. However, over forty years earlier Franz Schneider had produced an article that convincingly argued that Gutzkow could not have read Strauß’ work because publication problems delayed the appearance of the work until late summer 1835—after the publication of *Wally*. Thus it is highly unlikely that Strauß’ work had any significant impact on any of the Young Germans in the period prior to the ban. Franz Schneider, “Gutzkows *Wally* und D.F. Strauß *Leben Jesu*: eine Richtigstellung,” *The Germanic Review*, 2 (April 1926), 115-119.}

However, each of the Young German authors approached the key questions related to religion and society in a very different way.\footnote{In the period after 1815 the relationship between Church and State became an important issue for many reform-minded groups. As the bureaucratic states grew in size they attempted increasingly to bring the Churches under their control. The Stuttgart government, for example, attempted to prescribe the length of sermons and when confessions could be heard. This in turn provoked considerable opposition to state interference in religious matters. The so-called Young Germans, however, remained silent on matters of Church and State preferring instead to focus on the larger issue of the relevance of religion in a rapidly modernizing society. On the issue of Church and State see R.M. Bigler, *The Politics of German Protestantism: The Rise of the Protestant Church Elite in Prussia, 1815-1848* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972).} In addition, as one moves through the literature on religion produced by Gutzkow, Laube,
Mundt and Wienbarg it becomes clear that some issues were of greater importance than others to each man. Thus it is again impossible to establish a single Young German position on religious emancipation.

1.

As with other issues, Ludolf Wienbarg seldom wrote on specifically religious matters. In *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* he did, however, include several essays treating the state of religion in his time.\(^{394}\) In addition, his comments on Gutzkow’s preface to Schleiermacher’s “Vertraute Briefe” on Schlegel’s *Lucinde*\(^{395}\) provide additional clarification of Wienbarg’s personal views on religion, views which appear to have been influenced heavily by the pantheistic doctrines of Friedrich Schleiermacher. In “Wollust und Grausamkeit” Wienbarg contemptuously rejected the God whom the majority of people accepted:

Und über dem ungeheuren Schmerze der Schöpfung [sic], die sich selbst zerstört, erhebt sich der einsame Thron eines Wesens, dessen gefühllose Ewigkeit durch keine Welle der Lust und des Schmerzes ausgehöhlt wird. In ächter Tyrannenlaune schuf er die Welt, um sich an dem tragischen Gaukelspiel des ringenden flüchtigen Daseins ironisch zu weiden. Er zündete die Brautfackeln an, lud die Gäste ein und ließ die Bluthochzeit beginnen, die niemals aufhört. Er selber lacht vom hohen sichern Balkon der Unsterblichkeit göttlich ruhig in die weite ewige Bartolomäusnacht heraus.... Ihr Gott ist schrecklich heilig, schrecklich ewig, schrecklich selig. Er is nicht der meinige.\(^{396}\)

---

\(^{394}\) In particular Ludolf Wienbarg, “Wollust und Grausamkeit,” *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835), 75-101; Wienbarg, “Das goldene Kalb,” *ibid.*, 30-72. “Wollust und Grausamkeit” was placed under the sign of Gemini, the twins, evidently in order to indicate the inseparability of lust and cruelty; “Das goldene Kalb” was listed under the sign of Taurus, the bull.


Wienbarg's revulsion with this Christian God appears to be rooted in his inability to understand how any god could remain so aloof from worldly suffering. How could the Christian God abandon man to a fleeting and often miserable existence with only the promise of a better life after death? To Wienbarg this was intolerable; he expected that his God would share in both the pain and the pleasure of the world which he had created.

Having thus thoroughly discredited the God of the present, Wienbarg went on to discuss his own beliefs regarding the nature of God, beliefs which even Butler has acknowledged add up to an extreme form of pantheism. Most importantly for Wienbarg, his God was a participatory figure who involved himself in the activities of both man and beast alike. His God suffered as nature suffered, rejoiced as nature rejoiced:

Der Gott, an den ich glaube, theilt mit mir die Bürde der Sterblichkeit, indem er zugleich meiner schwachen Brust einen Theil seiner Ewigkeit anvertraut. Er taucht sich in die Schmerzen und Freuden der Welt, er erniedrigt sich in die Leidenschaften und Triebe, er erniedrigt sich nicht allein zum Menschen, selbst zum Wurm und empfindet den Todesschmerz des unter meinen Füßen zertretenen Geschöpfs.... Ja, ich wage es auszusprechen, Gottes ist die Gebrechlichkeit so gut als die Kraft, die flüchtige Lust sowohl als die ewige Seligkeit, der Tod sowohl als das ewige Leben; und nichts Ungöttliches gibt es auf der Welt als die absolute Schwäche, die sich selbst verläßt und daher auch von Gott verlassen wird.

The key to deciphering Wienbarg's personal religious philosophy lies in the phrase 'die sich selbst verläßt und daher auch von Gott verlassen wird.' In this statement one can observe a fully developed pantheistic philosophy where God resided within every man. Just as Friedrich

---


Schleiermacher had argued, man carried the spirit of God within him and religion thus became a very individualistic communion with that spirit. Furthermore, one can also find in Wienbarg’s writings evidence of the Romantic belief that the spiritual realm existed within the world of nature. This was most evident in Wienbarg's claim that God shared not only in the pains of mankind, but also shared in and experienced the sufferings of the lowly worm. God was thus made to be an integral part of the world of matter.

"Wollust und Grausamkeit" concluded with a blatant attack on religions which advocated denial in this world: "Gebt euch nicht dem mönchischen Glauben hin, Gott gefälliger und tugendhafter zu werden durch bloße gewaltsame Schwächung und Unterdrückung eurer Leidenschaften." This comment can be read as an attack on the doctrines of both Catholicism and Lutheran pietism, with their advocacy of abstinence and the denial of pleasure in this world. Wienbarg went on to argue that God stood closer to man when he was in the throes of passion than when he prudishly denied himself pleasure. "Was ihr Laster scheltet, ist fast immer göttlicher, als eure Tugend, eure scheinheilige Erhabenheit, eure eunuchische Lasterlosigkeit." This overt celebration of sensualism, though interpreted by Butler as evidence of Wienbarg's Saint-Simonianism, was entirely consistent with a pantheistic worldview. If Wienbarg’s God embraced the material world then it stood to reason that worldly passions would not have shamed or humiliated that God. This was, however, a much

399 Ibid., 100.

400 Ibid.

401 There may have been another factor influencing Wienbarg’s belief that one stood closer to God in lust than in virtue. As a doctoral candidate at Marburg, Wienbarg was a
stronger advocacy of pure sensualism than any of the other Young Germans ever expressed. Here again it would appear that Wienbarg drew much of his philosophy from Schleiermacher, a fact that becomes increasingly evident upon reading Wienbarg's essay on Schleiermacher's "Vertraute Briefe."

Wienbarg's "Lucinde, Schleiermacher und Gutzkow" appeared in the middle of the Gutzkow-Menzel feud and therefore it was Wienbarg's defence of Gutzkow which drew the greatest attention at the time. The article is, however, equally interesting for historians seeking to understand Wienbarg's interpretation of Friedrich Schleiermacher. Wienbarg considered Schleiermacher's "Vertraute Briefe" to be the inspiration for a new doctrine of love. However, Schleiermacher's work was so radical that it had immediately been buried, condemned to obscurity until it was resurrected by Gutzkow. Schleiermacher's aim had been to save love from the lamentable state into which it had fallen:

...selbst auf das graue Papier fiel ein wundersamer träumerischer Glanz, ein widerscheinendes Rosenlicht von Küssen... wohlbekannte liebende Gestalten schwebten flüsternd und kosend an den Zweigen vorüber, Romeo mit Julie, Abälard mit Heloise, Petrarca mit Laura, und in der Mitte schritt der göttliche Schleiermacher, mit bekranztem Haar, umringt von Schülern und Schülerinnen, eifernd gegen die Unnatur der Herzen, gegen das heuchlerische Verderbnis der Sitten, gegen die unanständige Prüderie der Weiber, gegen das Misere unserer heutigen Liebe, predigend mit kühnem und keuschem Munde das hohe Evangelium einer Liebe, wie sie selbst ihn beseligte und wie sie nicht minder den ewigen Gesetzen der Natur also dem Standpunkt der fortgerückten und entwickelten Menschheit angemessen erscheint.\(^{402}\)

scholar of Plato who himself had struggled with the relationship between man and the spiritual realm. While it is commonly held that Plato advocated an extreme form of asceticism as the best way to commune with the spiritual strata, there was also a period when Plato argued that immersion in physical sensations was in fact the best way to reach the level of the One. Wienbarg, however, made no reference to Platonic justifications in his later religious writings.

Wienbarg clearly believed that Schleiermacher was an early proponent of the rehabilitation of matter. Indeed, the portion of the article devoted exclusively to Schleiermacher concluded that “[d]ie Liebe soll auferstehen, ihre zerstücker Glieder soll ein neues Leben vereinigen.”

Wienbarg’s attacks extended not only to the God of the present era and religions which advocated abstinence and self-denial instead of the rehabilitation of matter, but also to the contemporary Church and its priests. In “Das goldene Kalb” Wienbarg argued that the Church had been hopelessly corrupted. Its priests no longer preached the gospel from the mount. They were priests only in the sense that bourgeois society persisted in calling itself Christian. “Sie heiligen das Unheilige, den Zustand der Ungleichheit, den Christus verdammte.” The inequality evident in bourgeois society and the corruption in the priesthood should play no role in a true religion.

Though Wienbarg did not leave a large volume of writings on religious themes it is nonetheless possible to draw several conclusions regarding his personal religious philosophy and the inspiration which he drew from his contemporaries. Wienbarg clearly found much of his religious guidance in the early work of Friedrich Schleiermacher. However, the philosophy developed by Wienbarg was far more radical than most of Schleiermacher’s writings. Wienbarg’s was an extreme form of pantheism which called for the total resurrection of the material world. As such he was vehemently opposed to any religious doctrines, including Fundamentalist pietism and Catholicism, which focussed on other-worldly rewards. Beyond

403 Ibid., 273.

this, Wienbarg also objected to the degree of corruption which had entered the contemporary religions and to the fact that the clergy no longer taught the true Christian doctrine. This led Wienbarg to reject contemptuously the Christian Churches and the doctrines that they preached.

2.

As opposed to Wienbarg who wrote relatively little on religion, Theodor Mundt left a considerable volume of work dealing with a variety of religious topics. Mundt commented on German anti-Semitism, on religious tolerance, on the state of Christianity in general, and specifically on the doctrines of Henri de Saint-Simon. In October 1835 Mundt remarked upon a series of events which seemed to him to be an irrational manifestation of anti-Semitism. Accusations had been levelled by Wolfgang Menzel and others that Gutzkow's publisher Carl Löwenthal, who was Jewish, was deliberately attempting to undermine Christianity by printing and distributing Wally, die Zweiflerin. According to his accusers, Löwenthal's Judaism drove him to attack Christianity at every opportunity. Mundt, however, denied such accusations strenuously and argued that Gutzkow, a Christian, must be held solely responsible for the content of his work and any of its destructive repercussions.⁴⁰⁵

In the same issue, Mundt remarked upon a startling occurrence in Hamburg. A well-known Hamburg coffee-house had closed its doors to Jews. To ensure that their clientele was

⁴⁰⁵ Theodor Mundt, “Feuilleton,” Literarischer Zodiacus (October 1835), 298. Such accusations were evidently common among the opponents of the Young Germans who sometimes referred to the movement as “Young Palestine.” For more on this topic see Paul Lawrence Rose, “Young Germany---Young Palestine’: The Junges Deutschland Controversy of 1835,” in Rose, Revolutionary Anti-Semitism in Germany, 171-184.
not Jewish the owners had demanded that their patrons obtain an entrance card which provided proof of their religious affiliation. In turn, the actions of the coffee-house had provoked violent reprisals from Jewish youths. Though Mundt did not specifically criticize the behaviour of the owners, he did note sarcastically that he supposed that it would henceforth be possible for him to sit all day long and rejoice in his Christianity while enjoying a cup of coffee. In closing Mundt wondered what Gabriel Rießer, whose battle for Jewish emancipation was well-known, would make of this situation.

The more general issue of tolerance did not escape Mundt’s attention. In the July 1835 issue of *Literarischer Zodiacus* he responded to an article from the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes* in which a Professor Zeune from Berlin had remarked upon the frequency with which the word tolerance was heard in Prague. It was, according to the Professor, as common

---


407 Gabriel Rießer (1806-1863) was aware of Mundt’s comments and despatched a letter to him dated 12.11.1835, a letter which Mundt published in the December issue of the *Zodiacus*. Rießer observed that he was not, as Mundt had assumed, mortified by the situation, as anyone who fought for the rights of an oppressed class could not be offended by every individual aggravation. Rießer offered the following analogy by way of explanation:

Denken Sie sich, es widerführe Ihnen im Leben irgend eine Unbill, die Sie nicht abwehren könnten, und ein Anwesender, Sie seinen Freund nennend, belegte diese Unbill mit dem schwersten Namen und setzte dann in behaglicher Ruhe hinzu, es könne die Ihnen angethanen Krankung doch wohl schwer gebilligt werden!... Würden Sie nicht dem vonnehmern Freunde für seine Freundschafft bestens danken und ihn bitten, sich um Sie und Ihre Krankungen fortan nicht zu bekümmern?

Rießer further added that he could not abide the fact that damage had been done to this shopkeeper by Jewish youths; Gabriel Rießer to Theodor Mundt (12.11.35), *Literarischer Zodiacus* (December 1835), 466.
as bread and butter. Mundt’s response was that tolerance was indeed a very important part of
the daily lives of the citizens of Prague and, moreover, the city’s authorities were intelligent
enough not to fear the significance of this word. However, in Berlin tolerance was largely
misunderstood and its pursuit misguided.\footnote{Theodor Mundt, “Feuilleton,” \textit{Literarischer Zodiacus} (July 1835), 92.}

In this case, as in his exchange with Gabriel Rießer, a recurrent trait was evident in
Mundt’s attitude towards religious tolerance. Mundt displayed a frustrating unwillingness to go
beyond a mere reporting of events and always seemed to avoid committing himself to any
controversial stance. He reported such incidents in a resigned way, implying that it was not
within his power to change people’s attitudes. In the case of the anti-Semitic coffee-house he
passed the matter off to Gabriel Rießer rather than challenge the owners himself. In fact he
implied that the policy would not prevent him from patronizing that particular coffee-house. In
this way, Gutzkow’s repeated accusations that Mundt failed to take his social responsibilities
seriously might once again be justified.

In reviewing the second volume of Heine’s \textit{Der Salon} Mundt offered a detailed
accounting of his own thoughts on religious change and the place of Christianity in the modern
world. Once again Mundt ultimately positioned himself on the side of order. Mundt’s review
began with a description of Heine’s approach to the study of religion, noting that Heine had
taken on the twin towers of spiritualism and sensualism. Mundt focussed on Heine’s belief that
the most important goal of Christianity was the attainment of pure spirituality. Heine had
argued that it was this which had made mankind so miserable and had given rise to much of the
social unrest present in Europe. Heine had therefore concluded that the solution to many of these problems could be found in the rehabilitation of the flesh. In response to this claim Mundt noted that Heine’s arguments rested upon “einen ganz materiellen Pantheismus, den man auch atheistisch nennen könnte, wenn es nicht fast unanständig wäre, in unserer gebildeten Zeit einem Gentleman noch den Vorwurf des Atheismus zu machen.” Having established Heine’s position, Mundt made very clear his own opposition to the doctrine of rehabilitation of the flesh, if it implied the complete extermination of Christianity as Heine intimated:

Rehabilitation der Materie heißt allerdings das große Wort, welches zu lösen und zu verarbeiten die heutige Menschheitsepoche vor allen berufen ist. Aber sind nicht gerade in der wahren Idee des Christenthums selbst die tiefsten und einzigen Elemente zur Versöhnung dieser großen eingerissenen Kluft zwischen Welt und Geist… gegeben?

The nexus of Mundt’s argument lay in his belief that the curse of the flesh was only a caricature of the true Christian ideal. For Mundt, Christianity had already abolished this curse when God revealed himself to the world in the flesh of Christ, at which point “Materie ist zur Stätte des Geistes geheiligt worden.” Mundt’s conclusion was that the reconciliation of spirit and flesh

---


410 Ibid., 321.

411 Ibid.

412 Ibid.; for clarification of this point Mundt referred the reader to his novel Madonna, Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen, pages 386 through 397. This section, sub-titled Cur deus homo?, was a lengthy narrative on the relationship between matter and spirit, beginning with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden and concluding with the death of Christ. Here again Mundt emphasized that God sanctified equally the spirit and the flesh and both came together in every man, thus every man was Christ. There is some irony in this defence. The very passage which Mundt considered to be a defence against the sensualism of the Saint-Simonians was singled out by the Berlin censor as an attack on Christianity. Pages
lay in the positive revelation of Christianity itself. It did not require an entirely new doctrine, whether that be the pantheism of Heine or Saint-Simonianism, to complete this resurrection:

Wir bedürfen keiner neuen Religion, weder vom H. Heine, noch vom St. Simon.... Diese Wiedereinsetzung der Materie, wenn sie sich anders über den bloß diabolischen Sinn neuromantischer Poeten hinauserheben soll zu einer wahren Idee, ist nur in und mit dem Christentum zu vollbringen und liegt in demselben vorbedeutet. 413

The influence of Hegelian philosophy is clearly evident in Mundt’s critique of Heine. The reconciliation of the spirit and the flesh had already been achieved, but it had not penetrated the modern world. This position was most succinctly summarized by Hegel’s pupil Eduard Gans (1797-1839) who also criticized the Saint-Simonian attempt to establish a new religion and argued instead that the task of the present age was not to discover a new religious principle but to complete the historical realization of the old. 414

In order to clarify further his disagreement with Heine on religious issues, Mundt featured a lengthy article by Alexander Jung in the August 1835 issue of the Literarischer Zodiacus. This article also introduced an unsettling element of anti-Semitism into the debate on Heine’s motives. Jung argued that Heine’s exile in Paris had imbued him with worldly qualities that detracted from his true German nature and, further, his Judaism prevented him from truly understanding Christian doctrine: Heine “kann gerade darin den Juden noch nicht

389 to 393 and pages 394 and 395 were specifically mentioned in the ban issued by the censor on April 30, 1835. See Appendix B(ii) and B(iii).

413 Mundt, “Der Salon,” 322.

414 Gans paraphrased in Toews, Hegelianism, 229. Early in 1835 Gutzkow had ridiculed Gans for his rigid adherence to Hegel’s system; Karl Gutzkow, “Gans und die Doktrinäre,” Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland, Literaturblatt Nr. 6 (11.02.1835), 141-143.
verleugnen.... wir sehen in ihm den eingefleischtesten Juden, dem das Wort Christi: es lebet der
Mensch nicht vom Brode allein, viel zu wenig verschlagsam erscheint, und der sich daher von
Herzen nach den Fleischtopfen Aegyptens sehnt."⁴¹⁵ Having thus placed Heine firmly among
the anti-Christian sensualists, Jung concluded by restating the position taken by Mundt in his
review of Der Salon: "Die Idee des Christenthums aber ist und bleibt ewig: die Einheit des
Göttlichen und Menschlichen."⁴¹⁶

The passages from Mundt's review of Der Salon represent the clearest expression of
his religious beliefs and unquestionably set him apart from the Saint-Simonian camp. Mundt
defended strenuously the notion that Christianity was an evolutionary process and that true
Christian ideals still had much to offer the world. The problem for Mundt was that Christianity
had been hijacked onto an entirely spiritualistic track. Thus, as with Wienbarg, it was possible
to detect a latent attack on the denial of gratification and emphasis on pietism afflicting
contemporary Christianity in Mundt's comments. More clearly than Wienbarg, however, Mundt
was committed to the idea that Christianity could be resurrected through the historical
actualization of the pre-existing reconciliation of spirit and matter.

Mundt’s spirited defence of Christianity in the face of what he perceived to be Heine's
enthusiastic depiction of Saint-Simonianism makes it all the more difficult to interpret his
intentions when he wrote the religious passages of his most important work, Madonna,
Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen. Undoubtedly the author himself viewed the work as a

1835), 131-132.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 140.
defence of the true Christian values. It was for this reason that Mundt pointed to the work as a clarification of his views on Heine. E.M. Butler, however, labelled the book “the first and most complete expression which Mundt gave to his new philosophy of life [Saint-Simonianism].”  

While acknowledging that Mundt had openly rejected Saint-Simonianism, Butler nonetheless argued, “in spite of the fact that he had rejected Saint-Simonianism and accepted Christianity, he was more truly a Saint-Simonian than a Christian.” Rather than attempt to determine the logic underlying this cryptic remark, it might be easier to reconsider the work in question in order to decipher its religious intent.

_Madonna_ combined a series of factual treatises on a variety of distinct subjects, including Catholicism, art, sculpture, music and Christianity, with a fictional encounter in a moonlit garden between the narrator and Maria, the Madonna of the book’s title. Maria’s life story is interwoven with the narrator’s views on the topics which she raises. The narrator and Maria meet only once and the remainder of the book is constructed around a series of lengthy letters from the narrator to Maria and one letter from Maria to the narrator. This letter, entitled ‘Bekenntnisse einer weltlichen Seele’ tells Maria’s life story and forms the basis for Mundt’s

---

417 Butler, _The Saint-Simonian Religion_, 352; in fairness to Butler the Berlin censor had objected to the book primarily because of its focus on the rehabilitation of the flesh, the central doctrine of the Saint-Simonians. However, the censor also emphasized the difference between the seriousness with which the Young Germans addressed this doctrine versus the naked materialism of French advocates of the rehabilitation of the flesh. See Appendix B(ii).

418 Ibid., 354-355.

419 Despite the ‘fictional’ nature of the novel Mundt wrote that the religious passages in _Madonna_ provided the best representation of his own views on religion. Mundt, “Der Salon von Heinrich Heine,” 321.
analysis of modern society and religion.\footnote{Theodor Mundt, \textit{Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen} (Leipzig: Reichenbach, 1835), 188-260.}

Born to a Catholic family who cared little for her well-being, Maria had been thoroughly indoctrinated into the Catholic faith. While still a young child she was sent to live with her hedonistic aunt where she was provided with an expensive education and luxurious clothes. Later, however, she would discover that these indulgences were being provided by a noble benefactor who wanted to make her his mistress. Though tempted by his attempted seduction, which Mundt described in graphic detail,\footnote{Mundt's graphic narrative prompted the Berlin censor to single out this section as evidence of an "obscene description of nightly sex acts"; Königliche Ober-Censur Collegium, Wilken, von Lancizolle, “Theodor Mundt, \textit{Madonna, Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen},” Berlin, April 30, 1835. See Appendix B(ii) for the complete text of the ruling.} Maria mustered the strength to resist his advances and fled to the safety of an old friend, Mellenberg. Mellenberg was a theological scholar who had secretly been giving Maria lessons in Protestantism. Realizing that they loved each other, Maria and Mellenberg consummated their relationship that night. Though Maria found the experience to be the answer to all of her problems, evidently the effect was less stimulating for Mellenberg since he committed suicide, unable to live with the guilt of his actions.\footnote{This was an interesting reversal of the usual suicide motif wherein it was nearly always the female character who, unable to face the consequences of her actions, committed suicide in desperation. This was certainly true in the case of \textit{Wally}.} Mellenberg's suicide forced Maria to flee Dresden for her father’s home. There she believed that she would live in misery until his death.
After Maria’s autobiographical letter, the narrator reflected upon the various facets of her situation, in particular her feelings following her pleasurable encounter with her sexuality. The key issue once again concerned the relationship between spirit and matter. The narrator commented that he had been moved to reflect upon this question while viewing two paintings in an art gallery: Rembrandt’s depiction of Christ before Pontius Pilate and Titian’s Venus. The former painting caused a great deal of pain:


The narrator had thus reconstructed the salvation of man, but remained unable to comprehend the purpose for which man had been saved. Here Titian’s Venus provided the answer:


Maria spoke once more at the end of the novel in a brief letter entitled “Madonna schreibt.” At this point she revealed that she has finally found happiness by being baptized into the Protestant faith.

Mundt, Madonna, 385-386.

Ibid., 391-392.
Appreciating that Venus represented the unity of spirit and love, the narrator concluded that so
too do all men. All men contain within themselves lightness and darkness; moreover, the two
are integrally connected. Just as the spirit is nothing without the body, neither is the body
anything without the spirit. The two are one, or as Mundt observed "[d]ie Trennung von
Fleisch und Geist ist der unsühnbare Selbstmord des menschlichen Bewußtseins."\footnote{Ibid., 395.}

These passages represent perhaps the clearest evidence that the religious philosophy of
Theodor Mundt, though heavily influenced by Hegel's philosophy, was also influenced by the
epistemology of the early Romantic writers. Like the early Romantics, Mundt saw an Absolute,
which he believed to be the Christian God, at the centre of the natural world. This Absolute
was manifest in all of Its creations; It was neither real nor ideal, neither spirit nor matter, but
rather the identity of both. Every creation thus contained both spirit and matter and to deny
either one would be to deny one's fundamental nature. However, the influence of Hegelian
philosophy convinced Mundt that Christianity itself contained the reconciliation of spirit and
matter within its fundamental canons. Mundt's philosophy of religion was not enormously
different in its inspiration from that of Wienbarg. Both argued in favour of the resurrection of
the material world and both believed that the true teachings of Christianity were very different
from the adulterated doctrines which were being taught in their time. However, Wienbarg's
pantheism was so extreme it is doubtful that Christianity could evolve sufficiently to embrace
the full scope of his philosophy.
The religious orientation of Karl Gutzkow is even more difficult to categorize and the substantial volume of work which he produced does little to clarify the issue. His religious upbringing was one of traditional pietism; his father had converted the family during Gutzkow's youth and Gutzkow himself was bound for a career in theology prior to switching to the study of philosophy.\textsuperscript{427} By 1832, however, Gutzkow had declared himself an enemy of pietism and regularly attacked the Fundamentalist pietists in the \textit{Literaturblatt} for the \textit{Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände}, where he served as Wolfgang Menzel's assistant. Butler believed that it was Gutzkow's hatred for the pietist-dominated evangelical party which led him to publish his introduction to Friedrich Schleiermacher's preface to \textit{Lucinde}.\textsuperscript{428} Evidently the evangelical party was preparing to publish a collection of Schleiermacher's works which omitted the preface as a youthful indiscretion. Gutzkow, however, was determined that the public should know just how far removed Schleiermacher stood from the pietist cause.

From the outset, Gutzkow's preface made it clear that Schleiermacher had commended Friedrich Schlegel's book precisely because it called for the reunification of the spirit and the flesh through love. The preface emphasized Schleiermacher's fundamental opposition to

\textsuperscript{427}Gutzkow's father was born-again ('Wiedergeburt' in Gutzkow's words) after the suicide of Lorenz, a friend whose family shared the Gutzkow home. Gutzkow did not explain when this event took place but references in the text to Napoleon's exile on St. Helena would place the event in 1815 when Gutzkow was just four years old. Gutzkow described the events surrounding the conversion and the subsequent 'pietistic gloom' which descended on their household in his autobiographical \textit{Aus der Knabenzeit} (Frankfurt am Main: Literarische Anstalt J. Rütten, 1852), \textit{GW III}, 211-470.

\textsuperscript{428}Butler, \textit{The Saint-Simonian Religion}, 291-292.
religious doctrines which would deny the passions of man:

Der Aufruf ist der: Schämt Euch der Leidenschaft nicht und nehmt das Sittliche nicht wie eine Institution des Staates! Vor allen Dingen aber denkt über die Methodik der Liebe nach und heiligt Euern Willen dadurch, daß Ihr ihn freimacht zur freien Wahl! Der einzige Priester, der die Herzen traue, sey ein entzückender Augenblick, nicht die Kirche mit ihrer Ceremonie und ihren gescheitelten Dienern!429

Gutzkow’s enthusiastic response to both Schleiermacher’s preface and Schlegel’s *Lucinde*, a book which did not receive positive reviews when it first appeared, would seem to indicate that he too advocated the type of individualistic pantheistic religious doctrines which Schleiermacher and others had developed.

However, other writings seem to challenge this assumption. Prior to the publication of Wally430 Gutzkow published an interesting article in the *Phönix* literature supplement that provided additional insight into his religious orientation. The conclusions of this article place Gutzkow closer to the religious conclusions of Immanuel Kant431 than to the full-blown pantheism of the romantic writers. The article, entitled “Jüdische Theologie,” was an inquiry into the differences between traditional Judaism and the reformed Judaism of men such as

---


430But after the manuscript’s completion if one assumes that the printing process took approximately two months and Wally was published in mid-August.

431Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) argued in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) that humans can know nothing of things as they are (noumena), but only things as they appear (phenomena). God was a noumen, thus the transcendental being that was worshipped as God was a mere invention of the human mind. However, in the *Critique of Practical Reason* (1785) Kant argued that practical reason dictated that God was necessary to provide people with ethical and moral guidance.
Moses Mendelssohn, it was inspired by the appearance of a new journal for the scientific investigation of Jewish theology.

Gutzkow argued that rabbis from the old faith actually knew nothing of the basic tenets of their faith. Those teachings had been lost in the pedantic memorization and recitation of the innumerable statutes which composed the Talmud:


Gutzkow argued that the nucleus of reformed Judaism was nothing more than a pure form of deism: Judaism stripped of its dogma. Thus he contended that the proponents of Mosaism, including Mendelssohn and Salomon Maimon, could more easily accept and understand Kant’s position since their faith was free of symbolic books and an insistence on a particular set of revealed truths.

---

432 Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786) stressed the moral and philosophical insights of Moses and the prophets rather than the religious tradition represented by the Talmud. He also rejected many of the rituals prescribed by the Talmud as being relics of an earlier and less mature form of Judaism. Mendelssohn was immortalized by Gotthold Lessing in his 1779 work Nathan der Weise.

433 Karl Gutzkow, “Jüdische Theologie,” Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland, Literaturblatt Nr. 22 (5.6.1835), 525.

434 Salomon Maimon also wrote under the name Salomon Ben Josua (1753-1800). He was a philosopher and rabbi who was a follower of Kant’s philosophical writings. His 1797 work Kritische Untersuchungen über den menschlichen Geist was an investigation into the relationship between the spiritual realm and the world of matter.

Gutzkow's personal religious beliefs were evident in the final passages of the article. He noted that there remained two threads of Judaism. As a religion of revelation Judaism was a rotten decayed vestige, the lowest and most contrary of all contemporary religions. However, as a religion of nature, Judaism had considerable promise:

...als Religion der Natur ist dies Judenthum ein Glaube, der VerheiBung hat. Der Messias, welcher im Judenthume als Offenbarungsreligion geweissagt ist, ist wahrlich erschienen! Der Messias aber, der im Judenthume als Naturreligion liegt, ist noch nicht da; aber der wird es sein, der uns eine Dreieinigkeit predigt: Gott, Freiheit und Unsterblichkeit.... bereitet euch vor, auf die große universelle Weltreligion, deren Taufe und Beschneidung im Handschlage liegen, deren Symbol also lauten wird: Thuet recht und scheuet Niemand! Kant too had spoken of a natural religion where Jesus would serve as the ideal example and religion would need no prophesy or miracles as evidence, nor would it be accompanied by any responsibilities other than moral ones. After reviewing Gutzkow's other writings, it becomes evident that Gutzkow remained a follower of Kant throughout his early literary career, not, as so many have argued, a Saint-Simonian or even a true adherent of Schleiermacher in the vein of Wienbarg.

The interpretation of Judaism offered by Gutzkow in "Jüdische Theologie" appears to have motivated the characterization of the Jewess Delphine in Gutzkow's Wally, die Zweiflerin. Gutzkow characterized Delphine as having no knowledge of traditional Judaism. She was thus free from the anxieties which traditional religions aroused in people. "Ein

436 Ibid.
437 Ibid., 527.
438 The details of the natural religion, including its obviously Christian ethics, were laid down in Kant's 1793 work Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft.
gewisses unbestimmtes Dämmern des Gefühls muß für sie schon hinreichend sein, die Nähe des Himmels zu spüren. Sie braucht jene Stufenleiter von positiven Lehren und historischen Tatsachen nicht, die die Christin erst erklimmen muß, um eine Einsicht in das Wesen der Religion zu bekommen."

In Delphine Judaism became a natural religion whose adherents need no revealed truths to make them happy. With this characterization Gutzkow managed to attack both Christianity and traditional Judaism, while at the same time making clear that true freedom could be gained through a natural religion.

Additional insight into Gutzkow’s personal religious philosophy can be found in the essay “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit.” This essay appeared after the conclusion of Gutzkow's Wally: die Zweiflerin but it was first published in the Phönix literature supplement three weeks prior to the appearance of the controversial novel. This article, as with much of Gutzkow's work, can be read on two levels. Initially, it seems that the essay was a reflection on the nature of literary production in his era. Gutzkow identified three types of literary reality, beginning with the most common and progressing through the more complex and valuable forms. According to Gutzkow the first type of literary production was the literature of reality——literature which faithfully devoted itself to reproducing reality as carefully as possible. This was the genre popularized by the novels of Walter Scott and Bulwer-Lytton, and the dramas of

---

439 Karl Gutzkow, Wally, die Zweiflerin (Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835), GWII, 272; Gutzkow’s positive interpretation of Judaism contributed to the accusations levelled by Menzel and others that ‘Young Germany’ was a Jewish conspiracy against German literature and morals. See Rose, Revolutionary Antisemitism, 173.

August Iffland and August von Kotzebue.\textsuperscript{441} This was the literature which pleased the masses because it reproduced their comfortable world, their concerns (which Gutzkow labelled as petty) and their weaknesses. The literature of reality was the ultimate celebration of egotism.\textsuperscript{442}

The second literary genre was termed the literature of plausibility. Here people who stood slightly above the intelligence of the masses found their satisfaction. Only the basic elements of reality were left intact by the writer; the rest was left to inference and imagination. This literature appealed to the avid reader who liked to consider himself capable of greater mental exertion than the masses. “Schwebend zwischen Himmel und Erde, ganz willenlos hingegben den Capricen des Dichters, freuen sie sich zuletzt, daß nun Alles, was sie gelesen haben, doch entweder nicht wahr ist, oder im entgegengesetzten Falle immer sehr wahrscheinlich bleibe.”\textsuperscript{443}

Gutzkow’s third literary genre was the literature of poetic truth. This was creative even revolutionary literature which was capable of building entirely new realities. The literature of poetic truth broke free of all of the traditional restraints of the state, the family, religion, social mores, and assumptions. “Die poetische Wahrheit offenbart sich nur dem Genius. Dieser lauscht niedergestreckt auf den Boden der Wirklichkeit, und hört wie in den innersten Getrieben der Gemüther eine embryonische Welt mit keimendem Bewuβtsein wächst.”\textsuperscript{444}

\textsuperscript{441}Bulwer-Lytton (1803-1873), English novelist; August Iffland (1759-1814), actor and dramatist; August von Kotzebue (1761-1819), German dramatist and opponent of the liberal ideals of the Burschenschaften.

\textsuperscript{442}Gutzkow, “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit,” 693-694.

\textsuperscript{443}Ibid., 694.

\textsuperscript{444}Ibid.
Gutzkow’s essay concluded with a call for those geniuses who were capable of recognizing and creating poetic truth to go further than they had previously dared in challenging the institutions of reality: law, constitutions, states and customs.445

“Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit” could thus be read as a simple continuation of Gutzkow’s earlier appeals to Germany’s great young writers to take up their role of constructing a new socio-political reality. At another level, however, Gutzkow’s essay perfectly captured the Kantian philosophy and applied it to the existing situation in Germany:

...doch würde Niemand zu behaupten wagen, daß Alles, was geschieht, Alles, was wir als geschehen beobachten können, etwas Anders sei, als die zufälligen Äußerlichkeiten jener offenen Gottesidee. Ich glaube, daß Alles gut ist, was geschieht; glaube aber nicht, daß eben nur das geschehen kann, was geschieht. Unendlich ist das Reich der Möglichkeit, jenes Schattenreich, das hinter den am Lichte der Begebenheiten sichtbaren Erscheinungen liegt. Es gibt eine Welt, die wenn sie auch nur in unsern Träumen lebte, sich ebenso zusammensetzen könnte zur Wirklichkeit, wie die Wirklichkeit selbst, eine Welt, die wir durch Phantasie und Vertrauen zu combineren vermögen. Schaale Gemüther wissen nur das, was geschieht; Begabte ahnen, was sein könnte; Freie bauen sich ihre eigne Welt.446

Here Gutzkow restated the essence of the Kantian philosophy; everything that man perceived was just that, an external perception of an unknowable universal truth. By supreme effort, however, man could construct his world from the appearance of things, mindful, however, of the fact that this universal truth was itself invisible and never lay in what was real.447

That Gutzkow felt it necessary to append this article to Wally might also provide some

445Ibid., 695.

446Ibid., 693.

447Ibid., 694.
insight into the true intent of the religious themes of the novel.\textsuperscript{448} Gutzkow’s essay concluded with the observation that German and French literature were slowly evolving towards the literature of poetic truth. In German literature this was evident in the imaginative female characters which graced the new literature and in the original situations and social mores which seemed to contradict all traditional assumptions. Gutzkow saw this as an occurrence rich in significance for the future development of Germany and considered himself at the forefront of this development.\textsuperscript{449} Given these assumptions on Gutzkow’s part, \textit{Wally} can be read as an attempt to construct a new reality through poetic truth, a reality which was as plausible as any other. The novel was not \textit{per se} an attack on Christianity as much as it was an alternate interpretation of the external appearance of religion. The question which remains, however, is whether or not the text of the novel bears out this hypothesis and, in the process, confirms the preliminary assessment that Gutzkow was in fact a follower of Kant.

\textsuperscript{448}In the 1874 edition of \textit{Wally}, Gutzkow changed the title of this section from “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit” to “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit: Eine Erklärung” thus indicating that his intent in appending the essay was to have it explain the novel’s purpose. Paul Rose argues that the real focus of \textit{Wally} is the Jewish Question; Rose, \textit{Revolutionary Anti-Semitism}, 185. This study does not accept this assessment due to the fact that the Jewish character Delphine does not appear until the third part of the novel by which time Wally’s own religious doubts were well-established. Moreover, Gutzkow’s novel ridicules traditional Christianity and traditional Judaism equally in the novel. At this point there is no indication that Gutzkow is capable of the kind of sophisticated analysis of the Jewish Question which Rose attributes to him. Gutzkow himself remarked in 1838 that though the Jewish Question had weighed heavily on his mind after his discovery that Ludwig Börne was a Jew, a fact which he initially branded ‘unfortunate,’ he was unable to come to terms with this issue until 1838. Gutzkow quoted in Heinrich Houben, \textit{Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang: Ergebnisse und Studien} (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1911; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1974), 101.

\textsuperscript{449}Gutzkow, “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit,” 694.
Religious tensions are central to the narrative in Gutzkow’s *Wally*. It was religious doubt which provoked Wally’s personal crisis, this in turn encouraged her experiments with sensualism and immorality, and finally, it was her religious doubt which was responsible for her suicide. The catalyst of Wally’s crisis was the character of Cásar, who could be safely termed an atheist. As sketched by Gutzkow, Cásar disliked all forms of religion for they were all “das Produkt der Verzweiflung: wie kann sie die Verzweiflung heilen?”450 However, he was reminded that genuine religion, in this instance synonymous with natural religion, could provide positive benefits to society:


Already then, there were signs that Gutzkow was suggesting a simpler religion, free of conflicting sources, much as Kant had advocated in his *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*. It was exposure to such ideas, however, which provoked Wally’s own spiritual crisis—a crisis which revolved around the essence of God. Wally could not understand why God would create mankind but not grant them the ability to grasp His essence. If it was

450 Gutzkow, *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, GWII, 223.

451 *Ibid.* Samuel Hahnemann (1755-1843) was considered to be one of the founders of homeopathic medicine. His major work *Organon der rationellen Heilkunde* was published in 1810.
impossible to know anything of God, why then should she believe in Him? Wally concluded, "[o]der es darf mich niemand tadeln, wenn ich denke, die Existenz Gottes anzunehmen, war eine ganz äußerliche, politische und polizeiliche Übereinkunft der Völker." In these reflections, Wally expressed the essence of the Kantian dilemma; one could never know the essence of God because mankind was not endowed with the power to do this. God, the noumen, would remain forever unknowable.

In her quest to answer her doubts regarding the essence of God Wally acquired a copy of Lessing's edited collection of Reimarus' *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*. "Die Fragmente nehmen meine ganze Aufmerksamkeit in Anspruch. Ihr nüchterner, leidenschaftsloser Ton erschreckt das Gewissen nicht.... Wie der Autor die Bibel zerfleischt, wie er in den glattgescheitelten Mienen jener Fischer und Zöllner, welche das Christentum predigten, den Schalk entdeckt, denselben Schalk, den der gottselige Pietismus so oft im Nacken führt!" The fragments alone, however, were incapable of resolving Wally's doubts for she believed that they did not penetrate the inner nature of Christ’s teachings but rather preoccupied themselves only with the historical revelation of those teachings. Increasingly tormented by her religious skepticism, Wally turned to another confession of religious faith, a document which was included in its entirety in her diary: "Geständnisse über Religion und Christentum." This was the document which the Mannheim tribunal accused Gutzkow of using in order to advance his own religious

---

452 Ibid., 276.  
453 Ibid., 277-278.  
454 Ibid., 278.
beliefs. He, however, denied this charge, arguing instead that he had simply wanted to sketch the logical culmination of Cäsar’s personal philosophy which was incapable of grasping Christianity as an evolving historical phenomenon. In Gutzkow’s defence, “Geständnisse” does not coincide with his previously expressed religious beliefs. Instead it stands as an absolute negation of all aspects of Christianity:

Religion ist Verzweiflung am Weltzweck. Wüßte die Menschheit, wohin ihre Leiden und Freuden tendieren, wüßte sie ein sichtbares Ziel ihrer Anstrengungen, einen Erklärungsgrund für dies wirre Durcheinander der Interessen, für die Tapestierung des Firmaments, für die wechselnde Natur... sie würde an keinen Gott glauben. In progressiver Entwicklung folgt hieraus dreierlei: Der natürliche Ursprung der Religion, die Akkomodation der göttlichen Begriffe an den jedesmaligen Bildungsgrad und zuletzt die Unmöglichkeit historischer Religionen bei steigender Aufklärung.

Revelation, the Gospels, the life of Jesus, the development of the Church, Luther, and the Reformation, were all attacked as misleading and deceptive devices by which the people of the Christian world had been controlled. However, not content with assailing religion, the tract also tackled the issue of philosophy, arguing that it had entirely failed to do any damage to the institution of Christianity. The deists had been too frivolous and witty to do any serious damage to Christianity. “Die naïve Einfachheit kindlicher und glaubensfreudiger Seelen pariert alle Nadelstiche Voltaires, eines Mannes, den man für einen Schneider halten möchte, so furchtsam und eitel war er.” Likewise Kant, Schelling, Schleiermacher and Hegel were all


456 Gutzkow, Wally, die Zweiflerin, GWII, 288.

457 Ibid., 300.
pillaried for their unwillingness to tackle the Christian behemoth explicitly:

Auf der Kanzel gaben sie niemals jenen Glauben preis, den sie auf dem Katheder anatomisch zergliederten. Überall trifft man auf Diakone und Konsistorialräte dieser Art, welche sich wie jesuitische Aale theoretisch winden und hin und her sträuben, praktisch aber sich immer wieder in ihren homiletischen Schleim verstecken.\footnote{Ibid., 301-302.}

Finally, both Saint-Simon and Lamennais were dismissed as mere symptoms of their turbulent age rather than a genuine cure.\footnote{Ibid., 304.}

It remains somewhat puzzling, notwithstanding Gutzkow’s protestations at the Mannheim trial, why he would include such a provocative and inflammatory tract in his novel if he remained a confirmed Kantian at heart. In order to resolve this dilemma one needs to focus upon two issues: the nature of the criticism of Kant and the Deists, and the consequences of this intense statement of religious denial. In critiquing Kant and the other philosophers of religion, the tract did not object to the content of their philosophy but rather to their hypocritical unwillingness to take that philosophy to its logical conclusion: the destruction of Christianity and the liberation of a new vision of creation.\footnote{Ibid.} Furthermore, lost in the Mannheim tribunal's attempt to indict Gutzkow for every word in the tract, was the realization that Gutzkow himself had undermined the allure of such an atheistic philosophy by revealing Wally’s fate. Far from being liberated by her realization that Christianity was a fraud, Wally was destroyed by it:

Noch sechs Monate hielt Wally ein Leben aus, dessen Stütze weggenommen
The novel closed with Wally's suicide.

The alternate reality that Gutzkow had constructed thus ended in tragedy, leaving the reader to conclude that the abject denial of Christianity could only bring disaster. Unlike Mundt's *Madonna* which provided the reader with a positive ending and could thus be read as a ringing endorsement of sensualism, Wally's fate would hardly be inclined to attract a legion of followers. Though the novel held Christianity, or at least the conflict between Christianity and sensualism, responsible for Wally's fate, it also intimated that a natural religion could function as a positive, healing force. Unfortunately Wally was never exposed to such a doctrine; instead she experienced only a soul-destroying form of atheism. In this interpretation, the religious overtones of *Wally, die Zweiflerin* were entirely consistent with Gutzkow's personal advocacy of a natural religion. The religious overtones of the novel also stood in opposition to the beliefs of Ludolf Wienbarg and Theodor Mundt, both of whom endorsed sensualism and challenged the Christian ethical code.

4.

Turning finally to the work of Heinrich Laube, one finds here perhaps the most radical writings on the topic of religion of any of the Young Germans. Like Karl Gutzkow, Laube had been bound for a theological career when he entered university, first at Halle and later at


Breslau. As indicated previously, Laube’s years at Halle were significant for two reasons. First, it was during this time that Laube became involved in the liberal politics of the Burschenschaften, an involvement which would contribute to his eventual clash with the authorities. Second, Halle was a hotbed of religious activity, as an intense theological debate was being waged between the Halle Pietists and Protestant Rationalists over the true nature of Christ.

The theological conflict at Halle left Laube increasingly disillusioned with contemporary Christianity and instead he began to demonstrate an increasing interest in the doctrines of the Saint-Simonians. Unlike the majority of analysts who had focussed on the philosophy and politics of the Saint-Simonians, Laube admitted to a deep-seated interest in their theology. He argued that the Saint-Simonians were pursuing an entirely new direction though this path was rooted in the pantheism and materialism of the past and could also trace its roots to the work of many German philosophers. Despite the fact that the audacity of the Saint-Simonians sometimes concealed their historical genius, Laube believed that it was time that this genius be recognized.

For Laube, whose membership in the Burschenschaften had heightened his interest in liberal ideals, Saint-Simonianism seemed to represent a new and appealing manifestation of the

---

463 Unlike the other Young Germans who evaded persecution until the end of 1835, Laube was arrested in Berlin on July 26, 1834 after a decree of banishment had forced him to flee Leipzig in May of that year.

spirit of freedom. Reflecting back on his awareness of the Saint-Simonians, Laube recalled that the news of the Saint-Simonians in Paris awoke in him once more thoughts of freedom. "Sie sprachen von einer ganz neuen Organisation des Begriffes von Freiheit, sie verbreiteten ihn auf alle Theile der Gesellschaft, auf Familie, Kirche, auf den ganzen Staat.... Es war der Beginn des Socialismus in ausgedehntestem Sinn." In June 1832 Laube applauded the Saint-Simonian vision of a religion that would be a warmer and more beautiful Christianity which did not dwell in dungeons.

Unlike the other Young Germans who remained either silent on or openly hostile towards the Saint-Simonians, Laube continued to display a generally supportive attitude until the latter part of 1833. Early in 1832 he indicated to his publisher Heinrich Brockhaus that he was planning to write an account of Saint-Simonianism. Brockhaus, however, rejected the proposed manuscript and Laube did not pursue the issue. Nonetheless, Laube continued to follow the activities of the Saint-Simonians, planning a trip to Paris to meet with the men of the Salle-Taitbout. Ill-health, passport difficulties, and fear of a renewed outbreak of cholera would combine first to forestall and ultimately to prevent Laube's trip, but throughout 1833 he continued to give notice of the activities of the Saint-Simonians in the Zeitung für die elegante

---

465 Laube reflected upon these influences in his autobiographical Erinnerungen (1869-1875) and Nachträge (1883), indicating in both sources that it was liberalism which provoked his decision to leave the Church and which stimulated his interest in the doctrines of Saint-Simon.

466 Heinrich Laube, Nachträge (Leipzig: M. Hesse, 1883), 284.


Welt. In October 1833, Laube wrote that the doctrines of Saint-Simon represented “die wichtigste Speculation der neueren Zeit.”

It is difficult to determine whether or not Laube was in fact a Saint-Simonian because he seldom wrote on purely religious matters. However, several articles from the Zeitung für die elegante Welt from the year 1833 outline the essence of Laube’s religious beliefs. On January 4, 1833 Laube used his literature column to assess the purpose of literature in general and criticism in particular. Emphasizing the democratic nature of the new literature, Laube announced that socio-political change could be effected through literary production. In the case of theology, however, he believed that the theologians of the day were incapable of effecting the necessary changes to Christianity:

Wie eine trostlose Matrone, der die alten Wochenschriften zur Lecture ausbleiben, welche des Sonntags mit Entsetzen Geräusch auf den Straßen hört, bei der man anzufragen wagt, ob ihr Quartier zu vermiethan sey --- sitzt die alte Theologie da. --- Als sie die bekannte Liaison mit dem Rationalismus einging, erwartete man, sie werde sich noch einmal verjiingen. Umsonst; jene Helden Wegscheider, Paulus, Schuderoff, Röhr haben auch weiter nichts gethan oder gewagt, als ein blank geputztes Schwert aus der Scheide zu ziehen, in der Luft damit herumzufahren und ihre Zuschauer mit dem Blinken und Blitzen zu erfreuen, sie zeigten die Waffe, womit zu helfen ware, ohne sie zu gebrauchen. Sie erklärten mit nüchternen Worten ein altes Christenthum, aber waren zu muthlos oder zu arm, es zu verjüngen.

The German Saint-Simonians, according to Laube, had begun to effect the necessary changes but had been unable or unwilling to go far enough. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider alone had

---

469 Heinrich Laube, “Literatur,” Zeitung für die elegante Welt, Nr. 198 (10.10.1833), 792.


471 Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (1776-1848) published the treatise Der Simonismus und
distinguished himself from the majority by according Saint-Simonianism its due consideration, but a much greater effort would be required in order to effect the necessary degree of religious change. Laube went on to argue that the essential problem with contemporary Christianity was that over the years it had lost sight of the original meaning of the word of God due to layers of man-made tradition. Laube believed that the original word of God had been irreparably damaged because subsequent generations had anointed not just the word of God, but also the body which had spoken that word. Subsequently each generation had added new ornaments to the body until it had turned into a frightful figure which bore no resemblance to the original word. When finally a new generation had rediscovered the essence of Christian doctrine which, according to Laube, was universal love for all mankind, the relic of Christianity tried to defend itself. “Und als eine junge Zeit plötzlich das herrliche Wort wieder auffand in den Ritzen der Erde, das Wort der allgemeinen Menschenliebe, da schrien die Mumienwärter: ‘Wehe der Rotte Korah!’” The only solution to this problem would lie in the complete renewal of theology:

Die Theologie befiedert sich neu, wie die Vögel thun müssen zur Aequinoctialzeit, sie sind krank dabei, sie möchten den neuen Federn gern entrinnen --- aber wer entrinnt dem Gesetze der Weltordnung; durch dicke Bänder werden auch unsere Hüter des Himmels laufen, ehe sie’s glauben werden, daß sie nicht wissen, wo der Himmel ist, und daß so viel Wege dahin führen, als Wege gehen aus menschlichem Geist und Herzen --- aber mit Entsetzen werden sie an einem schönen Morgen die alten schwarzen Röcke

\[ \text{das Christenthum (1832).} \]

\[ ^{472}\text{Laube, “Literatur,” Nr. 3 (4.1.1833), 11.} \]

\[ ^{473}\text{Ibid.} \]

\[ ^{474}\text{Ibid.} \]
Comments made in late 1833 indicated that Laube believed Saint-Simonianism could never effect so complete a renewal. Laube questioned the hierarchical structure which Enfantin was building and he clearly harboured doubts about the way in which Enfantin had introduced the public to the doctrines of Saint-Simon, in particular the idea of emancipation of the flesh. Laube noted that Enfantin had deterred many possible sympathizers with an ill-timed demonstration of the emancipation of the flesh. Enfantin had evidently placed a woman in an easy chair in the 'church' on the Rue Taitbout and instructed her to remove all of her clothes in full view of the assembled crowd. Laube’s conclusion was that the only thing Enfantin had accomplished was to generate near-universal support for the municipal police when they raided and cleared out the room. It was thus apparent that Laube’s infatuation with the Saint-Simonianism of Enfantin was waning by the end of 1833.

Laube’s evolving religious beliefs were evident in several of the major literary projects which he undertook during the years 1833 and 1834, prior to the ban against Young Germany. *Das neue Jahrhundert* was planned as a trilogy; however, only two volumes entitled *Polen* and *Politische Briefe* were published. The third volume was to have been an account of the Saint-Simonians. Laube commented in the preface to *Polen* that “[i]ch denke, im Anfänge des III. Bandes einige vergnügliche Unterredungen über das äussere Leben und Treiben der Simonisten anknüpfen zu können, wenn sich nicht alle gute Christen von meinem ersten Capitel, und

---


meinen lieben Simonisten, abgewendet haben." Brockhaus' objections prevented the completion of this volume but Laube turned his attention to a new trilogy *Das junge Europa*. Butler believed that the first volume of this series, *Die Poeten*, was an attempt to create and evaluate a Saint-Simonian society in action. Whether this was in fact Laube's intent will never be known as neither of his autobiographical works discuss the Saint-Simonian elements of *Die Poeten*. However, as mentioned above, Laube indicated that *Das junge Europa* was an expression of his own religious philosophy, a philosophy which was very similar to that which had been advocated in Heine's *Der Salon*.

*Die Poeten* was to be the first of three novels which explored the most important facets of the new Europe. Only the first volume was completed before Laube's 1834 imprisonment. *Die Poeten* was an exploration of the lives of six men and seven women who together represented a broad cross-section of German youth. Three of these characters were most important in so far as the religious message of the novel was concerned: Valerius, an ardent liberal in politics and in his love affairs, whose stated purpose was to liberate love from the shackles of convention; William, a pietist Christian and strict moralist; and Constantin, a disillusioned nobleman whose failed liaisons had led him to flee to Paris to find inspiration in the ideals of the revolution of 1830. The dialogues among these three men, written in the form of

---


of a series of letters, allowed Laube to undermine the pietist position while applauding the religious tolerance of Valerius. It was William who initiated the discussion of religious matters with the following comment: "[m]eine Religion ist die unzertrennbare Einigung mit dem Höchsten, sie besteht wie die Atmosphäre, auch wenn ich selbst unfähig bin, die geistigen Anknüpfungspunkte fest zu halten." William’s confession of faith inspired the first diatribe on religious matters from Valerius who argued that the faith advocated by William was exclusionary. Even so, he valued religious tolerance so highly that he could never censure someone for holding such a view. He did, however, resent William’s accusation that Valerius’ faith was despotic, when his own words rang of religious despotism.

In the second half of the novel, the debate between William and Valerius was renewed, occasioned by a letter from Constantin in which he remarked on his new-found realizations about Christianity. This letter stands as a virtual paraphrase of the argument which Laube had expressed in January 1833 in the Zeitung für die elegante Welt.

...was Christus gebracht und durch seinen Tod besiegt hat, ist durch die Handwerker entstellt worden. Sein Opfer, wodurch er einen unschätzbaren Schatz von Wahrheiten beglaubigt und der Welt aus Herz gelegt hat, dieses Opfer ist zu einer erdrückenden Kreuz- und Wundertheorie verdreht worden. Man muß sich schämen, wenn man einen Zeisig lustig zwitschern hört --- die ganze Erde ist durch die schwarzbütigen Leute zu einem Sarge eingesegnet worden; Sonne, Mond und Sterne sind Todtenfackeln, der Himmel ist ein großes schwarzes Leichentuch, die Menschen sind lauter Todte oder Todesreife und tragen alle Leid. Es schickt sich nicht zu lachen, wenn man an Gott denkt -- o Du fröhlicher Gott, der so viel Freude ausgossen. Das nennen sie Christenthum. Großer Christus, was würdest du zur Ausgeburt deiner

---
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menschenfreundlichen Gedanken sagen!\textsuperscript{482}

To those rationalists, like William, who would claim that Christianity could be validated by subjecting it to logical proofs, Constantin responded that testing religious truths was a godless idea, if not an illogical one.\textsuperscript{483} Constantin further argued that he himself was not a supporter of natural philosophy in the contemporary sense of the term. Though he worshipped nature and considered it to be the original well-spring of all things, he hated the emotional enthusiasm of adherents of natural religions. He also indicated that he believed that the majority of people were inclined towards a natural religion because they were simply following the herd.\textsuperscript{484} Finally, Constantin's letter concluded with an attack on both Catholicism and Protestantism. He argued that Catholicism might have been overthrown but it had not been humbled; it still executed its offices as ever before, inspiring people to divine heights with teachings that they were never permitted to examine. "[E]r ist der uralte Absolutismus. Ein rüstiger Jüngling, der noch nichts hat, aber Alles erwerben will..."\textsuperscript{485} Protestantism, on the other hand, he dismissed as a timorous cynic that had become precocious and shrivelled.\textsuperscript{486}

For Valerius, Constantin's theology was evidence of one basic fact: the triumph of freedom over the out-dated ideas of the past. However, he argued that Constantin's beliefs were not yet entirely clear. He had rightfully criticized the Rationalists for their timorous

\textsuperscript{482}Laube, \textit{Die Poeten}, II, 125.
\textsuperscript{483}Ibid., II, 127.
\textsuperscript{484}Ibid., II, 134.
\textsuperscript{485}Ibid., II, 140.
\textsuperscript{486}Ibid.
approach, but Valerius believed that they would nonetheless be essential to the purification of Christianity, like the Jacobins of the French Revolution.\textsuperscript{487} Valerius observed that the religion of state \textit{per se} no longer existed. The state was no longer regarded as a godly institution; rather people asked after its utility and its legitimacy. The same principles should therefore be applied to religious matters. "Fragt Niemand nach dem Katechismus, fragt ihn nach seinem Rechts-Breve, laßt Jeden zu im Staate, so Juden als Heiden. Frei ist die Kunst --- die Poesie soll es auch sein, und mein Himmel und meine Hölle sind das Werk meiner Poesie."\textsuperscript{488}

Given Laube's admission that his own religious philosophy had inspired \textit{Die Poeten}, it is possible to see in the novel's advocacy of religious freedom and condemnation of traditional Christianity something of Laube's own views. Moreover, evidence from Laube's next major literary project, the \textit{Reisenovellen}, would seem to support this assumption. Reflecting on the quintessential elements of Christianity Laube observed that "[d]ie Glocken sind die richtigste Erfindung des Christenthums, lebensfeindliche, erdenhassende, todeslechzende Instrumente---ich habe sie von Jugend auf gehasst. Ihr Gesumm ist die persönliche Christentums-Melancholie."\textsuperscript{489} Throughout his travel novel, Laube returned to the theme of the stultifying effect of contemporary Christianity. However, it is difficult to gauge Laube's own opinion from this semi-fictional novel. It was almost completely dependent on Heine's \textit{Reisebilder} for its structure and content, thus it is difficult to tell where Heine's religious beliefs ended and

\textsuperscript{487}Ibid., II, 141-142.

\textsuperscript{488}Ibid., II, 142.

\textsuperscript{489}Heinrich Laube, \textit{Reisenovellen I} (Leipzig: Otto Wigand, 1834), 444-445.
Laube's began. This similarity does, however, serve to underscore the degree to which Laube's religious philosophy had been heavily influenced by Heine's own philosophy.

Given the difficulties inherent in analyzing the *Reisenovellen*, one is essentially left to glean Laube's personal religious philosophy from the comments made in his earliest writings and the religious speculation outlined in *Die Poeten*. Clearly Saint-Simonianism was appealing to Laube in that it had begun a fundamental reworking of Christian theology and introduced a vital element of freedom into the social order. However, as a revolutionary doctrine Saint-Simonianism failed Laube, due to Enfantin's ill-timed attempts to introduce the world to the rehabilitation of the flesh and the increasingly hierarchical structure which Enfantin had created for the sect. What Laube wanted was a religious system which would be tolerant of everyone and open to a myriad of different interpretations. Every man would write his own religious faith, just as he himself had done, and everyone would be open to the rights of other faiths. This is completely consistent with the philosophy which Laube had first introduced to the reader in his reviews of the major works by Gutzkow and Heine. Everyone must step forward and write his own beliefs on the easel of change, then eventually a new order would emerge out of the chaos.

... darum müssen wir sie erinnern, eiligst aufzusitzen auf den Schreibesel, damit sie vor Abschluß der großen Weltrechnungen ankommen in Publicum... [W]enn alle einzeln aufgegangen sind, da ist der Baum grün, wenn alle Schriftsteller zusammengekommen sind, dann haben wir eine Versammlung, und so wie der grüne Baum Früchte zeitigen wird, so wird unsere Versammlung Gesetze beschließen...

In the interim it was clear that Laube was completely opposed to the gloomy asceticism of contemporary Christianity and that he believed that this had to be eradicated, whether by the Protestant Rationalists or by the Saint-Simonians.

5.

In matters of religion, perhaps more than any other issue, the Young Germans represented a broad range of opinions, though at times they touched upon similar themes. Ludolf Wienbarg attacked all traditional religions—those faiths which believed in an aloof, uninvolved God who stood by dispassionately while the vagaries of the material world turned life into a fleeting and tortured existence. Instead, like Friedrich Schleiermacher, he argued for an individualistic relationship with a God who was immersed in the activities and manifestations of this world, a God who experienced suffering as the material world suffered and who experienced joy as the material world rejoiced. For Wienbarg the problem was not the basic tenets of Christianity:

Es ist uns gepredigt worden von einem Gott, der aus seinem Himmel herabstieg und Fleisch wurde und in Palästina wandelte und auf Golgatha den Kreuzestod litt. Das ist ein Bild und Gleichnis von dem Gott, der im Fleisch durch die ganze Welt wandelt und dessen Kreuz sich erhebt aus dem Abgrund der Wesen und über Sonnen, Sterne und Milchstraßen hinausragt --- dessen Evangelium die Zukunft predigen wird.⁴⁹¹

The problem lay in the way that the Christian God had been interpreted over successive years by the Church hierarchy. Much as Mundt believed that Christianity had already reconciled spirit and matter, Wienbarg seemed to believe that his God was the God of the New Testament. However, His activities on the earth, especially his compassion for mankind, had been lost over

the years. However, it is essential to note that the degree of pantheism evident in Wienbarg’s writings would have set him apart from the vast majority of Christian reformers. Furthermore, Wienbarg never attempted to generalize from his own personal philosophy to a new world religion.

It is considerably easier to place Theodor Mundt among those who sought only to reform Christianity. He believed that the accounts found in the New Testament were accurate, he accepted Christianity as a religion of revelation, and he appreciated the necessity of a strong and flourishing Christianity in the modern world. His only objection was to the contemporary interpretation of the meaning of Christ’s sacrifice. As far as Mundt was concerned the reconciliation of spirit and matter had already taken place, though the task remained to raise people’s awareness of this reconciliation. Given the true meaning of Christianity, it was entirely wrong to deny people the pleasures of the world of matter. To celebrate the pleasures of this world was to acknowledge the supreme sacrifice that had been made to redeem humanity from its sins. Though Mundt celebrated sensualism, he did so to celebrate Christianity and not to advocate a more pantheistic philosophy. To the reformers of his time, however, it must have appeared that Mundt wanted a Christian God without the ethical code which was such a vital part of both Protestantism and Catholicism.

On the other hand, Karl Gutzkow evidently wanted the Christian code of ethics, but was somewhat indifferent to the rest of the Christian faith. Christianity was, after all, just the external appearance of a universal truth that could never be known. As a disciple of Kant, Gutzkow sought a natural religion which would need no prophesy or miracles to support it and whose only compulsion to its followers would be to act with moral responsibility. If they failed
in this task, as he demonstrated in the case of Wally, the results could be disastrous. On one issue Gutzkow was in complete agreement with Mundt and Wienbarg, all three deplored the direction which contemporary Christianity had taken and the spiritual damage which it had inflicted on its followers.

On the latter point, Heinrich Laube would have found himself in agreement with Gutzkow and the others. It is doubtful, however, whether he would have found much else in the writings of Wienbarg, Mundt and Gutzkow with which to agree. Laube's concept of religious change was perhaps the most radical of all of the Young Germans. His call for complete religious freedom clearly placed him on much more dangerous ground than either Gutzkow's advocacy of a natural religion or Wienbarg's pantheism, both of which were essentially individual choices which would not necessarily affect the masses. Laube's support for full toleration, based upon the right of every man to create his own religious philosophy, went far beyond the solutions offered by the other Young German writers. Given this distinction, it was not surprising that Laube was singled out for prosecution before the others.

On the final issue of Saint-Simonianism, it is evident that Wienbarg, Mundt and Gutzkow were not adherents of the faith, though there remains no doubt that they were aware of both its doctrines and its practitioners, and felt some sympathy for the aims of the sect. Heinrich Laube comes closest to approximating the beliefs of the Saint-Simonians. He was enthused by the implications of the rehabilitation of the flesh, convinced that artists would pave the way to a new social order, and, as the previous chapter demonstrated, captivated by Enfantin's ideas about the place of women in the new society. Nonetheless his conception of religious change was ultimately more radical than that of the Saint-Simonians and he himself
acknowledged that the philosophy of the Saint-Simonians would be unable to effect the transformation of Christianity that he had in mind. Thus even Laube cannot be considered to be an unqualified supporter of the movement.
CHAPTER FIVE:

The Problem of Political Emancipation in the Works of the ‘Young Germans’

It is difficult to gauge the political beliefs of the so-called Young Germans despite their voluminous writings. Any articles or novels which might have challenged the existing political system overtly would have immediately caught the attention of the censors who would have prohibited their publication. Thus the majority of the political writings of Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg were veiled in cryptic language and obscure references designed to outwit the censor, while at the same time remaining accessible to their audience. The paucity of overtly political works has not, however, prevented many commentators from counting the Young Germans, in particular Karl Gutzkow, among the most politically radical men of the Vormärz. In 1836 Georg Büchner observed that Gutzkow’s greatest contribution to his era was his commitment to political freedom. Büchner believed that “Gutzkow hat in seiner Sphäre

492 I have avoided the term “ideology” in describing the political views of the ‘Young Germans’ given the historical specificity of the term. Until the end of the 1830s it was generally accepted that abstract philosophical thinking could reveal universal and timeless truths. In the 1840s this gradually gave way to the theory of “ideology” which denied the validity of autonomous and authoritative concepts and instead proposed that philosophy was nothing more than the expression of particular social and political interests. On this topic see George Lichtheim, The Concept of Ideology and Other Essays (New York: Random House, 1967), 3-46 and Harold Mah, The End of Philosophy, the Origin of “Ideology.” Karl Marx and the Crisis of the Young Hegelians (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987), 1-42.

493 “Political writings” will be broadly defined so as to include all of those writings which advocated changes to the existing power structure.
muthig für die Freiheit gekämpft." Writing in the early 1920s, Ludwig Maenner emphasized the liberal-democratic orientation of Gutzkow's political thought. For Maenner Gutzkow represented "der feurige Demokrat, den sein Liberalismus, als eine Sache der Religion entflammte." More recently, Hagen Schulze has continued the argument put forward by Maenner, claiming that Gutzkow should be considered one of the leaders of the German liberal democrats. According to Schulze, these were men who took French liberal traditions as their inspiration and "for whom Germany's domestic political freedom came before national unity." Schulze further argued that men such as Gutzkow and Georg Herwegh broke with the German nationalist movement in the 1840s when it became overtly anti-French.

Unlike Maenner and Schulze who focussed primarily on the political beliefs of Karl Gutzkow, E.M. Butler's work considered all of the Young Germans. In general, Butler saw Gutzkow, Laube and Mundt as enthusiastic liberals, but she believed that Wienbarg was more devoted to art and beauty than any particular political belief. Leonard Krieger groups all of the so-called Young Germans together in his book on the German conception of freedom. Krieger believes that the Young Germans were a purely intellectual movement who were...
peripheral to the seven groups which he identifies as the core of the liberal movement of the 1830s. The Young Germans and Young Hegelians “embodied the powerful drive of the age for the application of ideals to practical activity, and... illustrated its tendency to merge individual theories into scholastic doctrines.”

Krieger goes on to note that the ‘Young Germans’ had been converted to radical politics by the July Revolution and thereby gained literary predominance among educated circles. However, Krieger concludes that the overall importance of the intellectual liberals was minimal since they had no contact with the mass movements which were committed to liberal principles.

Walter Dietze also believes that the July Revolution was the most important impetus in the formation of Young Germany. He argues that the whole political and literary platform of Young Germany was consciously modelled on the goals of the Parisian revolutionaries.

Following this line of reasoning one

---


500 Ibid., 280. Krieger argues that all of the liberal groups were severely disadvantaged by their pursuit of very diverse ends. This prevented the emergence of a solidly liberal bloc. Further, the persistent belief that the state would provide its citizens with an acceptable degree of personal freedom also weakened the liberal cause. While the ‘Young Germans’ did not subscribe to the latter view, they were influenced by their tendency to view political participation in spiritual terms. James Sheehan has identified this belief as a distinctive and important feature of German liberalism. In the minds of many liberals politics was closely identified with enlightenment and moral improvement (*Bildung*) and not with a specific institutional commitment. As Sheehan argues “[l]iberals believed that they represented not simply the common good but also the forces of history which would ensure the gradual triumph of enlightenment and freedom.... Liberals’ emphasis on the spiritual character of their movement was often accompanied by a certain distrust for practical implications of political organization and action.” James Sheehan, *German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 16-17. This distrust of concrete political organization and action is clearly evident in the activities of the so-called Young Germans.

would expect the Young Germans to express anti-monarchical sentiments and to advocate liberal socio-political goals.

In 1966 Jost Hermand returned to the concept of ‘freedom’ first introduced by Georg Büchner. Hermand contended that Young Germany was a movement which on the whole aimed for “politischer, religiöser, und moralischer Freiheit.” In 1980 Eda Sagarra introduced a new term into the debate. She argued that each of the Young Germans expressed republican sentiments. Sagarra also contended that the political platform of Young Germany was heavily indebted to the German Jacobins, in particular their belief in the brotherhood of all men. In general, Sagarra categorized the Young Germans as one of several groups which “attempted to foster critical awareness among their fellow countrymen of the repressive character of the political system.” More recently Takanori Teraoka concluded that the Young Germans were bearers of liberal emancipatory ideals which unfortunately ran headlong into the reactionary state, resulting in dire consequences. Helmut Koopmann, however, disagrees with all of the preceding assessments, and indeed with any historian or literary analyst
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who would argue that Young Germany was above all a political movement. Koopmann argues that the Young Germans were first and foremost a literary group. For Koopmann "[d]ie Jungdeutschen wollten in erster Linie nicht eine neue Politik, sondern eine neue Literatur schaffen."\(^{507}\)

Once again one faces a number of conflicting opinions. The Young Germans were variously democrats, freedom-fighters, intellectual liberals, liberal-democrats, republicans, revolutionaries, Jacobins and, at the same time, apolitical purveyors of a new literary style. However, the resolution of this conflict is relatively straightforward. Most importantly, it is incorrect to consider the Young Germans as representatives of a single political viewpoint. Their 'political' writings reveal a variety of different ideas, some of which appear to fit readily into the broader political movements of the era, and at least one of which is quite unique. As to Koopmann's point, that political concerns were secondary to the greater goal of creating a new literature, this is undoubtedly true at least insofar as Gutzkow, Laube and Wienbarg were concerned. Koopmann's argument, however, misses a vitally important point; the new literature, as envisioned by Ludolf Wienbarg, was consciously intended to create a new society. Thus political change would be a natural corollary of any literary effort.

Despite the repressive Metternichian system, the Young Germans lived in an age of enormous political questioning. As was noted previously, the defining political event of the 1830s was the July Revolution in France. Helmut Koopmann has argued that the July

Revolution signaled a decisive turning point for the youth of Germany. The memories of the revolution of 1789 were suddenly reawakened and became a very real part of their lives. Gutzkow's comment that the July Revolution made him realize that "[d]ie Wissenschaft lag hinter, die Geschichte vor mir," provides some indication of the momentous importance of the events in France for some German youths. However, as discussed in Chapter One, reactions to the revolution in the German states were mixed largely due to their earlier experiences under Napoleonic occupation. The Vormärz thus saw a considerable number of sometimes complementary and sometimes conflicting political ideas. The writings of Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg naturally reflected this diversity.

1.

To a greater or lesser extent all of the so-called Young Germans emphasized the revolutionary nature of literary production in their monographic and journalistic efforts and viewed literature from a utilitarian perspective. That is, literature could become a tool with which to effect a fundamental transformation of the socio-political status quo. During his tenure as editor of the Zeitung für die elegante Welt, Laube returned constantly to the theme of the transformative nature of literary production. During his first two weeks as editor, Laube devoted two full issues to his thoughts on the function of literature in society. Laube

\[508\] Ibid., 18.


\[510\] Heinrich Laube, "Literatur," Zeitung für die elegante Welt, Nr. 3 (4.01.1833), 9-12 and Nr. 7 (10.01.1833), 25-28. This quote is also indicative of the degree to which several of the 'Young Germans continued to look to the ancient world for guidance.
believed that literature was shaped by the most important conjecture of the time and had very often served as a harbinger of future historical change. "[E]he die griechischen Staaten aus einander fielen, wie morsche Kleider, zerfuhr ihre Literatur in dialektische Spitzfindigkeit, in wesenloses Geschwätz; als Rom der Auflösung entgegen ging, stand es im Zeitalter seiner bleiernen Literatur." 511 With respect to the present situation in Germany, Laube observed that it was clear from contemporary writing that the struggle for change had begun. In particular, he sensed that the battle against aristocratic principles had been joined since the new literature seemed to represent the heights of democracy. 512 In the coming struggle literary criticism in particular would be invaluable because he believed that the natural corollary of criticism was revolution. 513

Laube believed that the most highly developed example of the transformative power of literature could be found in the works of Heinrich Heine, in whose works all of the elements of the new revolutionary literary style could be found. "[D]ie neue Schreibart ist plötzlich wie ein voller, ausgewachsener Frühling da, man weiß nicht, wie es geschehen. Hat das große Genie der Weltdordnung das Alles so geordnet, waren es die Genies unserer großen Mitbürger --- wir wissen es nicht." 514 However, in Laube’s early writings it remained somewhat unclear whether

511 Ibid., Nr. 3 (4.01.1833), 10.

512 Ibid.

513 Ibid.

514 Laube, "Literatur," Zeitung für die elegante Welt, Nr. 32 (14.02.1833), 127. Laube’s use of the metaphors of spring and awakening once again reveal his proximity to the early Romantic writers.
he considered literature to be the force which drove historical change or whether literature was itself driven by this change. In subsequent articles, Laube developed his conception of the relationship between literary production and the forthcoming socio-political era more fully.

At no point was this philosophy more clearly developed than in Laube's review of Gutzkow's *Briefe eines Narren an eine Närrin*. Laube began by emphasizing that it was natural for each person to endorse his own viewpoint enthusiastically in a time of great upheaval and turmoil:

> Es ist dies etwas Natürliches: in einer Zeit des Sturmes, der Prüfung, des Werdens, da rettet Jeder zuerst seine Person, er macht sich selbst tüchtig, um zu bestehen, er regt alle Glieder, um bei der neuen Schöpfung mit zu wachsen, mit neu zu werden. Millionen Einer bilden eine Million; in einer zersetzenden, kritischen Zeit erfährt man das; darum rüsten sich in ihr die Einer, um eine starke Million zu bilden. 515

Ultimately, however, the multiplicity of individual opinions would come together to form something greater. Furthermore, it was essential that every different view be expressed before the time for change ended: “darum müssen wir sie erinnern, eiligst aufzusitzen auf den Schreibbesel, damit sie vor Abschluß der großen Weltrechnungen ankommen im Publicum.” 516 Only after the majority of these opinions had been heard would it be possible for the new age to reach maturity. Laube then emphasized the fact that it would be Germany’s writers and their literary creations which would carry through this transition to a new socio-political order. In support of this point, Laube reminded his audience of his words on Heine’s *Französische Zustände*: “wie sie einander ansehen, da sie sich auf schmalem Wege plötzlich begegnen. So


516 Ibid.
bildet sich die neue Gesellschaft, so finden sich die Geister, und Jeder hat seinen Kreis, und jeder Kreis hat Berührungspuncte mit einem andern, und so wird eine neue Welt.”517 Thus it becomes apparent that Laube conceived of a new world which would be created through the interaction of the various literary circles. Laube further emphasized that only the young were capable of injecting the requisite life into the new literature because “[w]enn man jung ist, gilt die Person, daher die Persönlichkeit unserer Literatur.”518

Laube returned once again to this theme in his review of Ludolf Wienbarg’s travel novella *Holland in den Jahren 1831 und 1832*. After examining Wienbarg’s work, Laube announced that he believed that Germany was approaching the point when all of the divergent viewpoints would come together. “Es ist mir manchmal vorgekommen, als waren wir dem Standpunkte schon recht nahe, wo alle die einzelnen Leidenschaften, Rasereien, Neigungen, Bevorzugungen, Liebhabereien einer bestimmten Epoche sich geläutert zu einem erfreulichen Kreise vereinten, um eine strahlende Sonne der Cultur zu bilden.”519 The emergence of the new socio-political era thus appeared to be imminent. But in subsequent articles in 1833 he failed to indicate whether or not the transformative point had in fact been reached.

Given Laube’s commitment to the transformative power of literature, a power which could only be realized through the free expression of differing opinions, it is not surprising that Laube viewed censorship in any form as an intolerable restriction upon the rights of the

517Ibid., 168; the review of Heine’s work to which Laube referred had appeared in two parts in Numbers 32 (14.02.1833) and 37 (21.02.1833) of the *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*.


individual. In the early months of 1833 Laube advocated that Germany’s young writers adopt a more aggressive orientation toward the censors. “Warum finden unsere jungen Schriftsteller, welche die Fortschritte der Gesellschaft lehren wollen, diesen Weg nicht auf? Statt neue Lehren zu predigen, welche die Censur streicht, sollen sie Gestalten aus neuem Odem, sollen sie neue Menschen schaffen und auf neue Weise in den Romanen handeln lassen. Solche Contrebande-Atome entgehen dem scharfsinnigsten Mauthbeamten.”

Laube’s provocative advice was not, however, repeated due to increasing police scrutiny of his work. By December 1833 Laube could only lament that the censorship system had become so stringent that the only aspect of Börne’s Briefe aus Paris he could comfortably critique was the style in which the book was written:

[I]ch referire nur, daß er noch niemals so blutig, unumwunden und offen seinen Haß gegen das Fürstenthum ausgesprochen als hier, daß er noch nirgends so ohne Rückhalt Revolution gepredigt als in diesem fünften und sechsten Bande. Wollt’ ich auch mehr sagen, so würde die Censur nicht dulden. Nur mit dem humoristischen, dem satyrischen Autor darf ich mir zu schaffen machen, nur seine Art zu schreiben, nicht das, was er schreibt, darf ich beurtheilen.

Nonetheless it was clear that Laube was an early proponent of a free press, one of the key goals of German liberals.

Prior to the intervention of the authorities Laube’s early works tended to be more overtly sympathetic to particular political causes than were the works of Gutzkow, Mundt and Wienbarg. Polen, written in 1833, was a sympathetic account of the plight of the Polish people

---

520 Heinrich Laube, “Literatur,” Zeitung für die elegante Welt, Nr. 100 (23.05.1833), 398.

and an ardent plea for their freedom. However, as Butler argued, Polen was “a badly written and ill-conceived production, in which the note of extravagant sympathy with the Polish nation is unconvincing and often irritating. Laube was simulating a personal enthusiasm which he was in reality far from feeling.” The book does, however, provide an early indication of Laube’s sympathy for revolutionary causes. Politische Briefe, published in the same year, confirmed this affinity. Written in the style of Ludwig Börne’s Briefe aus Paris, Politische Briefe was an impassioned call to writers everywhere to take up the cause of freedom which had been liberated by the July Revolution. Throughout the book Laube emphasized his hatred and mistrust of the nobility and urged liberals everywhere to take advantage of the opportunities which the era offered. The motto at the front of the book aptly summarized Laube’s personal philosophy: “Freiheit Dich bet’ ich an.”

Laube’s most fully-developed political statement can be found in the first volume of the three-part Das junge Europa: Die Poeten, which was published late in 1833. This novel marked the last time that Laube would enthusiastically depict revolutionary political causes. The two subsequent volumes of Das junge Europa were both published after the authorities
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522 Heinrich Laube, Polen (Leipzig: Furth, 1833).
524 Heinrich Laube, Politische Briefe (Leipzig: Furth, 1833).
525 Ibid., 134.
526 Ibid., 1.
began to take action against him for his involvement with the Burschenschaften.\footnote{On this subject see Eda Sagarra, *Tradition and Revolution: German Literature and Society 1830 to 1890* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 148.} Indeed the final volume of the trilogy was not published until 1837, following Laube’s eighteen month confinement in the protective custody of Pückler-Muskau. Sagarra concluded that the latter two volumes represented the work of a man who was completely disillusioned with politics.\footnote{Ibid., 149.} Likewise Hartmut Steinecke argued that Laube’s revolutionary spirit was in large part broken by 1837.\footnote{Hartmut Steinecke, *Literaturkritik des jungen Deutschlands* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1982), 179.}

Die Poeten, however, was published before Laube experienced any official censure and during the period of time in which he still spoke enthusiastically of the transformative possibilities inherent in the new literature. Thus it provides an excellent overview of Laube’s attitude towards a variety of political causes.

Chronologically *Die Poeten* spans the period March 20, 1830 to March 1831, encompassing the July Revolution in France as well as the Polish uprising. Both of these events are prominent in the narrative, as are more general discussions of the nature of political freedom and democracy. Early in the novel the character of Valerius was established as a defender of freedom and an advocate of democracy. A series of dialogues among characters holding differing political views allow Laube to develop Valerius’ own ideas and in the process ridicule the ideas of the other characters. In an early letter to the monarchist William, Valerius remarked, “ich bin ein Mann der Freiheit, und sitze zur Seite ihres holden Töchterleins mit den
lieben, klaren Augen, der Toleranz.” Following this assertion, Valerius engaged in a lengthy dialogue regarding the merits of political freedom, in particular, the efficacy of a republican style of government versus a monarchy. The incentive for this aside was William’s belief that individual freedom contradicted the notion of the general will—a assumption which Valerius vehemently denied. Most importantly, the goal of any political movement should be the development of a form of government which respected the individuality of all of its subjects: “Dein Schluß muß eine starre Monarchie sein, der meine ist die fröhlichste, ungebundenste Allherrschaft, wo jede Individualität gilt, weil jede in sich gesetzmäßig ist und ihrer Veredlung das neben ihr wandelnde Gesetz nicht stört.”

Though Valerius spoke of democracy and included vague references to Rousseau’s notion of the general will, the overall tone of his discussion actually amounted to a strident defence of classical liberalism. At all points Valerius emphasized the importance of the rights of the individual, rights which he believed should be restrained only by the rights of other individuals. Valerius’ dialogue berated William for turning humanity into an irresolute mass under the influence of an autocratic monarch instead of emphasizing the power of the individual. The greatest difference between the two men was their fundamentally opposed definition of the state. As Valerius aptly summarized: “[m]ir ist der Staat des Einzelnen wegen

---


531 Ibid., I, 37.
da, Dir [William] der Einzelne des Staats wegen." Once again this is a fundamentally liberal view of the state.

Valerius was not the only character whom Laube imbued with strong political beliefs. The character of Constantin also expressed overtly political opinions which were strongly informed by the beliefs of the French Revolution. In a letter to Valerius Constantin argued that all previous historical study had been rendered useless by the French Revolution; thereafter schoolboys should only study the revolution for it would establish the pattern for the coming years. It would be especially important for Germans to study these lessons because they had not yet fully grasped what was necessary to make a revolution. Constantin’s preoccupation with the revolution ultimately led him to Paris in July 1830. His first letter to Valerius from Paris was dated July 29, 1830 and expressed his exuberance upon finally having reached the centre of the revolutionary activities:

Sattle Dein Roß und fliege her, wir machen Freiheit hier. Vorgestern ist er losgegangen in den Straßen von Paris, der hochrothe blutige Kampf eines Volkes um sein Recht, die dunkeln Schatten der Jacobiner schreiten vor der neuen Jugend einher, die alten Freiheitslieder flattern wie Sturmvögel über den Plätzen, mein Herz ist fast zersprungen vor Freude, so zur rechten Zeit gekommen zu sein, und meinen grimmigen Haß gegen alles weltgeschichtliche Unrecht ausbaden zu können in schlechtem Söldnerblute.  

532 Ibid., I, 38.

533 Ibid., I, 92. This and similar passages underscore the degree to which the July Revolution appeared to the ‘Young Germans’ as a crucial watershed in the progress of historical development.

534 Ibid., I, 171.
Constantin was convinced that he was witnessing a genuine revolution in Paris, one which would sweep the moribund Bourbons from the throne and lead to the establishment of a Republic of the type advocated by Lafayette. The first book of Die Poeten closed with Constantin’s vow that “hätt’ ich tausend Leben, ich stirbe tausendmal für die Freiheit.”

Upon receipt of Constantin’s letter Valerius lamented Germany’s reluctance to embrace the revolutionary changes taking place in Paris. Calling Germans philistines who had once again failed to recognize the portents of a new age, Valerius begged Constantin for more details of the struggle for freedom in Paris. Several weeks passed without word from Constantin, until finally he responded in late August. However, by that time his revolutionary fervour appeared to be fading as he observed that constant exposure to revolutionary upheaval was not constructive for him. Indeed, Constantin wondered whether he was not at heart more representative of the reaction than the revolution. Constantin’s last letter from Paris concluded that he would soon return to Germany where he truly belonged. Valerius rejected Constantin’s conclusions arguing that every man was a reactionary at heart. This was not because of any defect in his character, but rather because every man wished good will to his fellow men and did not accept revolutionary upheaval gladly. But Valerius believed that this was a revolutionary age and, whether or not people found it palatable, the hand-to-hand combat had begun, combat which would involve all instincts and ideas, as well as the sciences.

---
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and the arts. Finally, Valerius concluded that despite the noble cries for peace, the order of the day was war. "Kämpfe --- der Kampf ist zur Kriegszeit der nächste Weg zur Ordnung." 537

Laube's novel concluded with a final letter from Valerius to Constantin in which he reflected upon the relative merits of freedom versus the constraints of the bureaucratic monarchical states. Valerius remarked that a free society did not guarantee that man would not make mistakes but it did ensure that he would be given an opportunity to correct those mistakes. This right was denied in an inflexible monarchy. The quest for freedom must therefore continue. 538 To this end Valerius announced that he was going to Poland to fight for the freedom of the Polish people. Though he felt no particular affection for the people themselves, he felt that he must fight for the love of the cause. Valerius noted that even the Polish aristocracy was a democratic one; thus he was bound to go to their assistance. He did observe parenthetically that he would have preferred an aristocratic democracy to a democratic aristocracy but nonetheless he was entranced by the overwhelmingly poetic nature of their love of country: "dieses Käthchen von Heilbronn in einem ganzen Volke, ist zauberhaft, ihr Kampf ist der reinste und edelste, der gefechten werden kann. Drum will ich hin, morgen schon, aus Folgendem." 539 Valerius' struggle for Polish freedom was, however, short-lived. The final page

537 Ibid., II, 99.

538 Ibid., II, 185.

539 Ibid., II, 187. Laube's comments regarding his personal distaste for the Polish people echo remarks he made in Polen. The romantic image of Polish freedom-fighters is taken almost verbatim from the earlier work.
of the novel consists of a brief note from Poland dated March 1831 which announced that Valerius was presumed to have died on the battlefield.\textsuperscript{540}

Laube's aim in all of his writings was to put forward new ideas that would educate the public and offer alternatives to the existing socio-political system. In this way the public would gain an awareness of the need for change and would be better prepared to affect those changes. The views expressed by Valerius can thus be seen as one alternative to the socio-political status quo.\textsuperscript{541} Above all, the characterization of Valerius provided a ringing endorsement of the power of the individual. The rights of the individual should be restrained only by the rights of other individuals. Thus the bureaucratic, monarchical states represented an intolerable development, given that they repressed individual rights and served merely to turn mankind into an unthinking mass of followers. Moreover, the time for change was clearly at hand, though there would necessarily be a period of struggle before the new order emerged. Despite opposition, the quest for individual freedom must continue, hence the need to support such causes as the July Revolution in France\textsuperscript{542} and the Polish Uprising of 1830. The shape of the new socio-political order would be derived from the new literature. However, its actualization would require a physical struggle against the institutions of the old order: "der Kampf ist zur

\textsuperscript{540}\textit{Ibid.}, II, 192.

\textsuperscript{541}E.M. Butler argued that the character of Valerius represented an idealized self-portrait of Laube himself. Butler, \textit{The Saint-Simonian Religion}, 203-215.

\textsuperscript{542}France was always the symbol of freedom to Laube. In the February 14, 1833 edition of the \textit{elegante Welt} Laube observed that France was "das Mutterland der Civilisation und der Freiheit." Heinrich Laube, "Französische Zustände, von H. Heine," \textit{Zeitung für die elegante Welt}, Nr. 32 (14.03.1833), 128.
Kriegszeit der nächste Weg zur Ordnung." The political beliefs which Laube put forward in *Die Poeten* thus represented a revolutionary challenge to the socio-political status quo.

2.

Like Heinrich Laube, Karl Gutzkow wrote frequently about the transformative potential inherent in literature. In his first appearance as editor of the literature supplement to *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland* Gutzkow addressed the crucial role of literature in the contemporary era. "Die Stunde der Emancipation von dem Ruhm und der Unbedeutendheit hatte geschlagen: sie ging vor sich mit etwas Schaam, aber lachend und keck; denn damals war viel Sonnenschein, Hoffnung, und poetische Thatsache in Deutschland." For Gutzkow literary criticism would be one of the most important vehicles of this revolution: "Alles was in den zu Grabe getragenen Zeiten Geist hatte, flüchtete sich in die Kritik. Sie übernahm einen ununterbrochenen Feldzug gegen die Herrschaft des Ruhms und die Prahlerei des Elends." Gutzkow further observed that since the time of Lessing criticism had been the nemesis of the old school. It was the vehicle of the hopes of youth, "denn Vaterland, Freiheit, Vorliebe für einige Größen, welche den angetasteten das Gleichgewicht halten mußten, die ganze Zukunft flüchtete sich unter den Schutz der Kritik." Following a lengthy discussion of the various
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types of criticism Gutzkow cautioned that criticism had frequently been misunderstood and had therefore assumed a somewhat destructive tone. Criticism should not merely destroy. Rather, it should have a surgical effect; it must heal, restore and make whole a literature which had been systematically destroyed by misguided critics, by the police and by an irresolute public. As to the role of the critic, Gutzkow likened his position to that of the high priest of a cult, who, in response to the wishes of his followers, would make the requisite sacrifices to appease the gods of change. Gutzkow thus acknowledged that some of the past literary tradition would have to be sacrificed in order for the present to free itself from the stranglehold of custom and move forward. These ideas, as yet tentative, were given additional clarity in a series of articles published in 1835.

Gutzkow's comments in his July 1835 article “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit” were particularly instructive about his concept of political change. Here he provided an overview of the German literary establishment and assessed its contribution to the struggle for socio-political change. He also explored the most promising sources of future progress. Unlike Laube, Gutzkow argued that mere production alone was insufficient to guarantee that the change which took place would be beneficial. Asking every author to contribute to the process of change would be counter-productive since Gutzkow believed that the vast majority of contemporary literary production served only to gratify the ego of its author. This was a tendency which had originally been confined to English writers but lately had begun to make an

---


appearance in Germany much to the detriment of German literature as a whole. Increasingly, German authors sought to inflate their own egos by faithfully reproducing the comfortable bourgeois existence with which they were most familiar.\textsuperscript{549}

However, Gutzkow perceived two other types of literature, one which still accomplished little and another which promised much for the future of German literature. On the one hand there was what Gutzkow termed the 'literature of plausibility,' literature which offered a picture somewhat different from reality but which still refused to challenge the reader too greatly. The alternate conceptions of reality remained well within the scope of plausibility and, moreover, left the basic institutions of society intact. There was, however, another type of literature, one which Gutzkow believed offered a genuine possibility of effecting social and political change. This he termed the 'literature of poetic truth,' a type of literature which could be produced only by a few geniuses. They alone would be able to see the emergence of an embryonic new world and translate that idea into literature. Gutzkow observed that such works would not be well-received. "Die Welt, wie sie ist, wird ihren Gebilden nicht entsprechen; diese werden dem nüchternen Vorwurfe der Unwahrheit und Unwahrscheinlichkeit ausgesetzt sein. Aber noch immer ging das Genie seinem Jahrhunderte voraus."\textsuperscript{550} Nonetheless such literary creations would be the key to introducing new ideas and generating eventual acceptance of possible future paths. Gutzkow believed that a clear example of this process could be found in

\textsuperscript{549}Ibid., 694.

\textsuperscript{550}Ibid.
the female characters who predominated in the novels of the 1830s. Such characters contradicted traditional mores and appeared in entirely original situations, thus they were of tremendous significance for the future. According to Gutzkow these women were representative of real unreality, that is, characters which would ultimately find an existence in reality though they were presently only an unreal figment of the author’s imagination. The authors who created such characters were thereby breaking down traditional assumptions and challenging the belief that only that which was comfortable and familiar was possible. In this task, the geniuses would face opposition, but they must not back down:

Wir fürchten uns den Zeitgenossen etwas zu entziehen, wovon wir uns einbilden, daß es zu ihrem Leben nöthig ist. Wir glauben an die Institutionen in Sitte, Meinung und politischer Einrichtung, wie an die unerläßlichen Lebensbedingungen der Jahrhunderte, als wenn die Menschheit keine innern Quellen hätte!

The crucial role of the literature of poetic truth would be to familiarize people with ideas which were beyond their present experiences and perhaps even beyond the grasp of their imaginations. Only from such literary challenges would an entirely new socio-political order eventually emerge. The remainder of the contemporary literature would contribute nothing.
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551 Gutzkow did not include any specific authors or characters in this reference. However, since “Wahrheit & Wirklichkeit” was appended to Gutzkow’s Wally as ‘an explanation,’ one can assume that Wally would be counted among the characterizations to which he referred. Thus Gutzkow was also implicitly counting himself among the geniuses who were capable of recognizing the future and translating it into the new literature.
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Gutzkow had broached similar ideas, though less thoroughly developed prior to the publication of "Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit." In particular, his 1833 *Briefe eines Narren an eine Närrin* had advanced a similar argument. There Gutzkow had drawn attention to the unwillingness of Germans to advocate political freedom because it was beyond the scope of their familiar existence. "Wir Deutschen würden mehr Vertheidiger der politischen Freiheit aufweisen können, wenn sie mit unserer Kunst, Wissenschaft, und Literatur inniger zusammenhinge. --- Es gibt in Preußen Leute, die sich schämen, das Wort Constitution in den Mund zu nehmen."\(^{554}\) In order to achieve the goal of effecting socio-political change, the author had to establish the crucial connection between art, science, literature, and the ideas of political freedom.\(^{555}\)

Beginning from the premise that only a select few writers were capable of producing the 'literature of poetic truth,' Gutzkow was forced to reject Laube's more democratic interpretation of the transformative nature of literary production. Whereas Laube had invited all writers to contribute their opinions on the new world order and believed that out of the mass of conflicting viewpoints and styles a new synthesis would eventually emerge,\(^{556}\) Gutzkow consciously rejected the vast majority of contemporary literary production since the

\(^{554}\)Gutzkow quoted in Heinrich Laube, "Literatur," *Zeitung für die elegante Welt*, Nr. 42 (28.2.1833), 168.

\(^{555}\)Gutzkow's belief that literature and art could play a crucial role in the preparation of the German people to accept political freedom would seem to place him very close to the political ideas of the early Romantics such as Friedrich Schlegel and Friedrich Schleiermacher. However, at the time Gutzkow rejected the Romantics, since he interpreted their works as a withdrawal from the world of politics into the world of art for its own sake.

\(^{556}\)Laube, "Literatur," Nr. 42 (28.2.1833), 165.
inclusion of the literature of reality and the literature of plausibility merely encouraged the reader to cling to the comfortable, traditional world which was faithfully replicated in both of these types of literature.

The ongoing rebukes which Gutzkow directed towards Theodor Mundt further underscored his commitment to the serious role which literature, and in particular literary criticism, would play in the process of socio-political transformation. Gutzkow's opposition to Mundt rested not primarily on the content of Mundt's work, but rather on the nonchalant approach with which Mundt addressed his topics. He believed that Mundt frequently put noise before substance. Mundt was guilty of using the new literature to gain attention; yet once he got the reader's attention there was no substance that might impart a lasting impression. "[D]ies plötzliche Johlen, Beinausschlagen, und Überschnappen zuerst einen wehmütigen Eindruck macht.... Trarara! Trara! Trara? Bei Gott.... Soll dieses unartikulirte Wort die Devise der neuen Berlinischen Bewegungsliteratur werden?" According to Gutzkow such tendencies had left an entirely incorrect impression of the new literature among the public. Mundt, and others like him, had created the perception that the new literature was an entirely negative phenomenon. In reality, Gutzkow argued, the new literature was as positive a genre as there had ever been. In combination with constructive literary criticism, Gutzkow believed that

---
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the new literature could redeem the world, serving as the vehicle by which the past and the present would be corrected.\textsuperscript{559}

Like Laube, Gutzkow believed that a free press was essential to the realization of the potential inherent in the new literature. Very early in his literary career Karl Gutzkow had argued in favour of a free press. In an unpublished article entitled "Pressezwang"\textsuperscript{560} Gutzkow argued that for him the issue of freedom of the press was a matter of honour. Paraphrasing Voltaire, Gutzkow observed that while it was a great shame to write poorly, it was an even greater sin to be prohibited from writing poorly.\textsuperscript{561} More importantly, Gutzkow believed that because of the negative impact of censorship authors in the German states had been forced to write for two separate groups: "für das Publikum und den Censor... es findet sich wohl, daß man unter dem Erlaubten auch einiges Verbotene hinüberschmuggelt. Natürlich gehört zu diesem Gaunerleben eine ganz eigene Disposition, und da diese nicht allen gegeben ist, so erklärt sich auch daher die unglaubliche Nüchternheit mancher liberalen Autoren."\textsuperscript{562} In a published article for the \textit{Forum der Journal-Literatur} Gutzkow reflected in a somewhat cryptic way upon what he perceived to be the dangers of the system of censorship currently in place in the German states:

\textsuperscript{559}\textit{Ibid.}, 310.

\textsuperscript{560}In Alfred Estermann's 1973 reprint of \textit{Forum der Journal-Literatur} and its literature supplement "Pressezwang" was included at the end of the \textit{Literaturblatt}. It contains no page references and has several comments, hand-written by Gutzkow, appended in the margins. Estermann concluded that the piece was never published due to its highly controversial nature; nonetheless it serves as a clear indication of Gutzkow's thoughts on freedom of the press.
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With this cautiously worded analogy Gutzkow seemed to be pointing out that censorship would not be so dangerous if it were confined, as it was in China, to editing the occasional awkward phrase and correcting stylistic inconsistencies. In Germany, however, the only control that the censors had left to the writers was over phrasing and style. Content was entirely at the whim of the official censorship apparatus.

Late in 1835 as the threat of official censure became a very real possibility Gutzkow remarked that he was beginning to see himself as a “...Doppelgänger auf einem schwindelnden Abgründe, von dem ich herunter muß. Entweder stürz’ich, so daß mich die Nacht der Vergessenheit Auffängt, oder ich stürze, und irgend ein deutsches Gefängniß streckt seine milden Arme nach mir aus, um mich zu retten!”564 Several years later Gutzkow wrote to the Frankfurt Senate reflecting back on the problems which the censors had created for him.

Sie [die Zensor] denkt a priori und der Autor, der in seinem Element ist, denkt a posteriori.... Er [der Zensor] bedenkt nicht, wie schwierig es ist, Buchstabe für Buchstabe zu setzen und wie lange es dauert, ehe eine Zeile fertig ist, die er im Nu durchstreicht.... Die Mühe des Druckers wird nicht geachtet, das Geld des Eigenthümers... ist Nebensache und das erst Prinzip der Censur: debetur

563Karl Gutzkow, “Offene Correspondenz. Guter Mond,” Forum der Journal-Literatur, Nr. 3 (18.7.1831), 10. Such analogies were a popular ‘Young German’ device for smuggling controversial ideas to the public. Whereas Gutzkow could not comment directly on the German censorship system, he could discuss the situation in China. It was left to the educated reader to make the necessary connections.

564Gutzkow to Varnhagen von Ense, 7.10.1835. BdfG, 204.
reverentia autoriibus! vollends aus dem Sinn geschlagen.... Sie hat die Sucht des Streichens und verwechselt Censiren mit Recensiren.  

Finally, in his autobiographical *Rückblicke auf mein Leben* Gutzkow returned once more to the issue of press freedom. "Und darin lag das Traurige: alle Niederlagen des revolutionären Geistes dienten für Deutschland nur dazu, die Einhelligkeit am Bundestage zur Unterdrückung der erhofften Preßfreiheit und der Erweiterung ständischer Befugnisse zu befördern. Metternich hielt über jeden der kleinen Staaten, selbst über Preußen, die eiserne Hand." Support for press freedom was thus one issue to which Gutzkow remained committed even after the events of 1835 dulled his enthusiasm for many other socio-political causes.

Since Gutzkow believed that his entire body of work was contributing to socio-political change, he seldom wrote on specifically political topics in the period prior to the federal ban. However, as Gutzkow turned his attention to the publication of the *Deutsche Revue*, the range of topics which he normally addressed broadened significantly. The keynote article of the new journal was to have been a lengthy discussion of the political situation in Sweden. This...

---

565 Gutzkow to the Frankfurt Senate; Frankfurt am Main 10.7.1837. *BdfG*, 150.


567 Karl Gutzkow, "Bernadotte," *Deutsche Revue*, Nr. 1 (unpublished), 7-23. The Prussian edict of suppression against Young Germany prevented the publication of the *Deutsche Revue* in its entirety and the journal remained largely unknown until 1904 when an edited version was published in Berlin. Subsequently Heinrich Houben published an abbreviated version in his *Zeitschriften des jungen Deutschlands*, Bd. 1 (Berlin: Behr, 1906) and the manuscript was reprinted in its entirety by Athenäum in 1971. The article "Bernadotte" did, however, reach the German public although in a highly censored version, through several sources including the *Allgemeine Zeitung, außerordentliche Beilage*, Nrs. 501-508 (7.12.1835-10.12.1835). The article also appeared without Gutzkow’s name in *Diaskalia: Blätter für Geist, Gemuth, und Publizität*, Nrs. 341-346 (11.12.1835-16.12.1835); Alfred...
article served the two-fold purpose of attacking the abuses endemic in Sweden while at the
same time serving as a general critique of out-moded political institutions. This critique was
equally applicable in the German states. In the process the article provided a reasonably
complete blueprint for future socio-political development.

The focus of Gutzkow's article was Jean Baptiste Jules Bernadotte, King of Sweden. 568
According to Gutzkow, Bernadotte was a Basque whose political career had encompassed the
French Revolution and the subsequent twenty years. During that time Bernadotte had been
transformed from an ardent supporter of the Revolution to his contemporary role as the
anointed King of Sweden. 569 Bernadotte's revolutionary pedigree was a strong one. Gutzkow
observed that Montesquieu and the spirits of the Girondins had been his compatriots.
Overwhelmed by the lust for war during the American revolution, he had fought alongside
Lafayette and Rochambeau until imprisoned by the English. After returning to France he had
fought with distinction under Napoleon at Rivoli thereby earning a political appointment as
envoy to the Viennese court. Just prior to Napoleon’s Egyptian campaign, Bernadotte had

Estermann, Hrsg., Deutsche Revue (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1971), 67-68. The page
references which follow refer to Estermann’s annotated edition of the original journal.

568 Jean Baptiste Jules Bernadotte (1764-1844) was the Prince of Ponte-Corvo,
Governor of Hanover, the Hanseatic States and Denmark. He was crowned Charles XIV in
1818. Bernadotte had been appointed heir to the Swedish throne by Napoleon in 1810. In
1812, however, he split with Napoleon over the latter’s support of Denmark. Bernadotte was
anxious to add Norway, then under Danish influence, to Sweden, but Napoleon’s support of
Denmark made Bernadotte’s goal unrealizable. Thus, Bernadotte had allied Sweden with
Russia under Alexander I against Napoleon’s Grand Armée. Bernadotte was a Gascon not a
Basque as Gutzkow indicated and his age at the time of the American Revolution (twelve)
casts substantial doubt upon Gutzkow’s claim that he had fought in the Revolutionary Wars.

married a sister-in-law of Josephine Bonaparte, a woman who was subsequently designated the heiress to the throne of Sweden by Napoleon. Gutzkow observed that the French upbringing of Bernadotte’s wife had offended Swedish pride and eventually she fled back to Paris. Nonetheless, a group of Swedish noblemen who believed Bernadotte to be a confidant of Napoleon invited him to take the throne instead of his wife. Napoleon, delighted to gain Sweden without war, obliged by anointing Bernadotte as the legitimate heir to the throne of Sweden. However, in the subsequent years Bernadotte had changed, abandoning his revolutionary principles and instead replacing them with a deep-rooted fear of the masses. Gutzkow’s account of Bernadotte closed with a letter supposedly written by the King in Hamburg, a letter which emphasized the degree to which power had corrupted Bernadotte’s republican values:

So oft die Massen sich erheben und von ihrer Kraft Gebrauch machen, hört jedermanns Sicherheit auf. Dann muß die Autorität der beschützenden Gewalt sich in ihrer ganzen Energie zeigen und den Gewalttätigkeiten durch ihre Dazwischenkunft ein Ende machen. Der alte römische Senat, der doch sonst so mißgunstig und eifersüchtig auf seine Prärogativen war, übergab in Zeiten der Verwirrung das schreckliche Recht über Leben und Tod an einen Diktator, der nach keinem andern Gesetze verfuhr, als dem seines Willens und des Liktoreneils. Die gewöhnlichen Gesetze begannen nich eher wieder, bis nicht das Volk zu seiner Pflicht zurückkehrte.571

Though Gutzkow largely refrained from passing comment on Bernadotte throughout the majority of the narrative, the final section of the article included a lengthy analysis of the consequences of Bernadotte’s ineffectual rule. Here Gutzkow laid out an ideal type of political

570 Gutzkow’s narrative implies that Bernadotte’s wife actually assumed the Swedish throne. However, this is also incorrect.

and economic development, while simultaneously attacking the abuses and suffering which had taken place in Sweden during Bernadotte’s reign. While Bernadotte had preoccupied himself with the trivial duties of officialdom, duties which were made ever more onerous by a bureaucracy which delighted in involving the King in every minor matter which came to their attention, the industrial, agricultural and commercial situation had deteriorated. Though Sweden was blessed with great natural resources, the cultivation of those resources did not work to the advantage of the country. Poor management of the forest industry had led the government to ban the export of wood despite acres of untapped forests. Sweden’s plentiful deposits of iron, which it currently sold raw to Britain, should have been processed in Sweden and turned to ship-building, an area in which Sweden had the potential to surpass even American production levels.

Gutzkow’s greatest concern, however, was directed toward Sweden’s political situation. In one of the most radical statements to be found in the entire piece, Gutzkow argued that “von den Zerwürfnissen des Mutterlandes selbst, welche mir kaum anders als durch eine Revolution heilbar erscheinen.” In terms of specific problems, Gutzkow noted that the taxation system had failed completely. Taxation was too high and was poorly regulated. Further, the land registers were erroneous and illusory, with the income reported too low, while the poor were being assessed at exceptionally high levels. The abuses of the monarchy and nobility were many. In particular, the nobility was exempted from the many feudal taxes which kept the small estates in poverty. Sweden did have a commendable constitution, but

\[572\textit{Ibid.}, 21. This sentence was deleted from the version of the article which appeared in the Allgemeine Zeitung.\]
even in this area there were difficulties. Gutzkow observed that Bernadotte frequently acted unconstitutionally, intervening in areas that were reserved to the parliament and creating conflict within that institution. Moreover, because the constitution had been constructed with equal input from the representatives of Sweden’s four estates, it could hardly be considered representative of the interests of the majority. The fourth estate had had only one quarter of the input in a country where it represented a far greater percentage of the population. Here Gutzkow remarked that he longed for the day when a true accounting of the relative power of the estates would take place, just as Emanuel Sieyès had done in France with his pamphlet, “What is the Third Estate?”573

Gutzkow’s analysis of the Swedish situation concluded with an examination of the moral failings of the Swedish people, failings which he believed were a direct result of the country’s impoverishment and which had serious implications for the future. In particular, Gutzkow singled out the tendency to abuse alcohol to the extent that “um Skandinavien zieht sich eine blaue, narkotische Dunstwolke.”574 The consequences of alcohol abuse were immense. Some seventy-five percent of the country’s crime was related to alcoholism and one third of those conscripted annually for military service were unfit to fight for their country.575

573Ibid., 20-21. Also omitted from the Allgemeine Zeitung version. The Abbé Emanuel Joseph Sieyès (1748-1836) published What is the Third Estate in 1788, demanding the participation of the representatives of the nation in the Estates-General. Sieyès further argued that the third estate had been deprived of its rightful influence due to the unfair formula which apportioned representatives to the various estates. Sieyès was also influential during the coup of 18 Brumaire.

574Ibid., 22.

575Ibid.
Meanwhile, faced with growing socio-economic problems, an embittered Bernadotte was increasingly invisible, speaking only about French literature and the Parisian theatre, and jealously studying all of the memoirs which appeared about the French revolution in order to see how his role was depicted. Gutzkow concluded that the people of Sweden had only two goals at the time. The first, the acquisition of Finland, was impossible to achieve. The second, the resignation of the King and his replacement by a more sympathetic Swedish monarch might yet be achieved.  

Taken at face value the article was most obviously an attack on the abuses perpetrated on the European continent in the wake of the Napoleonic armies. The article condemned the Bonapartist monarchies which understood nothing of the culture and traditions of the peoples whom they controlled. Gutzkow’s concluding remarks left the impression that even without a revolutionary overthrow of the institution of the monarchy, Sweden’s situation would be immensely improved by the succession of a monarch who could at least speak the language of his subjects. Such remarks echoed the sentiments of the early German nationalists, men such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte and Ernst Moritz Arndt, who, during the years of the Napoleonic occupation, had first raised the cry for German freedom from their French occupiers. In particular, Fichte’s *Lectures to the German Nation* (1807-1808) spoke of the dangers, both long-term and short-term, of military and cultural subjugation by the French nation.  

---


577 On Fichte’s role during the winter of 1807-8 see Schulze, *The Course of German Nationalism*, 50. Fichte’s *Lectures to the German Nation* were singled out by the Mainz Commission as particularly dangerous to the stability of the German Confederation. See
At a more fundamental level, however, Gutzkow’s comments underscored his own commitment to a particular type of socio-political order. Above all, Gutzkow expressed a commitment to a constitution which fairly represented the estates. The reference to the revolutionary work of Emanuel Sieyès was indicative of a strong commitment to equal representation. Given Gutzkow’s ordinarily elitist comments about the masses, however, it would be presumptuous on this evidence alone to interpret this as an endorsement of democracy. Presumably, Gutzkow’s enthusiastic recognition of Sieyès included an acceptance of the latter’s belief in a leading role for the intellectuals within the Third Estate.

Gutzkow clearly opposed unfair taxation practices, in particular, the over-taxation of those groups which were already locked into a cycle of endemic poverty, and the granting of exemptions from taxation for the nobility. Likewise, economic mismanagement appeared to him to be a significant problem, especially when it prevented the development of industrialization and the growth of the national economy. The dangers of excessive bureaucratization were also underscored in Gutzkow’s work. In fact his portrayal of Bernadotte as a hostage of petty bureaucratic tasks marks one of the few occasions when he allowed the reader to develop a degree of sympathy for the aging monarch. Finally, Gutzkow’s comments on Sweden’s political situation included the explicit endorsement of revolution if conditions deteriorated to such a point that no other solution appeared feasible.

These comments, in combination with Gutzkow’s earlier works, are largely responsible for the contradictory contemporary assessments of his political stance. In his endorsement of

Sieyès and revolution one can see some of the “feurige Demokrat” identified by Ludwig Maenner. Gutzkow’s denunciation of the Swedish monarchy and his acceptance of a representative constitution and a reformed system of taxation seem to validate at least part of Sagarra’s claim that the Young Germans were committed to raising awareness of repressive political institutions. Schulze’s assertion that Gutzkow should be counted among the men who put political freedom ahead of national unity, appears to be true; however, Gutzkow’s comments on the importance of eliminating French influence in Sweden indicate that he gave some thought to national issues. Clearly, however, securing a degree of freedom from traditional restraints was the key issue for Gutzkow, a goal which can be traced back to some of his earliest works. Support for religious, political and social emancipation can be found throughout the body of work which Gutzkow produced prior to the Prussian ban.

Nonetheless at a fundamental level, Helmut Koopmann was correct when he claimed that political concerns always took second place in Gutzkow’s work to the creation of a new literature. What Koopmann did not do, however, was to pursue his argument to its logical end. For Gutzkow at least, the creation of a new literature was an integral step in the creation of a new socio-political order. By creating alternate realities and bringing them to the attention of his readers, Gutzkow believed that he was consciously preparing people to accept ideas

578Maenner, Karl Gutzkow und der demokratische Gedanke, 53.

579Sagarra, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Germany, 50.

580Schulze, The Course of German Nationalism, 66.

581Koopmann, Das junge Deutschland, 24.
which challenged their preconceived notions of what the social order should look like. In creating these differing interpretations, Gutzkow could appear variously to be a democrat, a revolutionary, a liberal, a republican and an apolitical observer, all in the interest of raising awareness of these new ideologies.

3.

The clearest statement of Ludolf Wienbarg’s political beliefs can be found in several of the essays published in *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis*, in particular “Das goldene Kalb,” “Das Unvermögen der Zeit zu glauben und zu handeln” and “Die schlafende Freiheit.” Here Wienbarg revealed himself to be a far more radical political thinker than many of his contemporaries. He also distinguished himself firmly from Gutzkow, Laube and Mundt, notably in his interpretation of the significance of the French revolution and in his conception of the ideal socio-political order. Here again one can see the influence of Schleiermacher and the early Romantic writers on Wienbarg’s beliefs. Though Friedrich Engels dismissed the Young Germans as “woolly-headed phrase-makers,” it might even be possible to distinguish something of a proto-communistic orientation in Wienbarg’s political writings. In any case, Wienbarg’s beliefs were diametrically opposed to the views expressed by the majority of young writers at the time.

582 “Das goldene Kalb” appeared under the sign of Taurus, the Bull; “Das Unvermögen der Zeit zu glauben und zu handeln” under the sign of Cancer, the Crab; and, “Die schlafende Freiheit” under the sign of Leo, the Lion. The lion in the latter story becomes a symbol of German freedom.

“Die schlafende Freiheit” was an attempt to capture the events surrounding the last few years of Napoleon’s reign, in particular the years 1813 to 1815, and to demonstrate how the German people had been manipulated during those years both by Metternich (1773-1859) and by Karl August von Hardenberg (1750-1822).\textsuperscript{584} Wienbarg argued that Metternich had made a conscious decision to loose German freedom because he knew that there was no other way to defeat Napoleon once and for all. Likening German freedom to a slumbering lion, Wienbarg argued that the German princes had rallied to the cause of freedom and had thus effected the final defeat of the French. “Und der alte Löwe erhob seinen Schweif, wie Ziska\textsuperscript{585} seinen mit eisernem Morgenstern gegrühten Dreschflegel, und sprang brüllend über den frohlockenden Rhein und schlug dem korsischen Adler beide Flügel ab.”\textsuperscript{586} Once the Napoleonic threat was defeated, however, Metternich had gathered the princes around him and told them that the lion must be contained, otherwise it would constantly remind them of the promises they had made to the German people during the crisis. He thus offered to pass a series of expedient measures which would allow German freedom to sleep once more. Since that time, the forces of freedom had made a couple of tentative gestures, but these were easily contained by a laughing Metternich:

Metternich lächelt, der moderne, zierlich diplomatische Jupiter Ost-Europa’s


\textsuperscript{585}Jan Ziska (1360-1424) was one of the leaders of the Hussite army who, along with Andreas Proscop (1380-1434) successfully repulsed numerous attempts by the armies of Sigismund (r.1410-1437) to restore order during the Hussite Wars.

\textsuperscript{586}Wienbarg, “Die schlafende Freiheit,” 126.
lächelt, er der den habsburgischen Adler mit gewundenen Donnerkeilen sich zu Füßen ruhen sieht, der seinen erhabenen Vorgänger, den kriegerischen Jupiter Europa’s verrathen, gestürzt, zerschmettert hat, der sich der listigen Verhüllungen des alten Olympiers bedient, um die Länderschönheiten an sein System zu fesseln, der in der Lombardei die Gestalt eines ungarischen Stieres annimmt und auf den sonniggrünen Wiesen des Po weidet, der als Schwan seinen weißen gebogenen österreichischen Hals in die Palästespiegelnden Kanäle von Genua taucht --- Metternich lächelt, denn die deutsche Freiheit schläft wieder.\textsuperscript{587}

Wienbarg then examined the situation in the rest of Europe, where he argued that freedom also slept. These passages reveal for the first time Wienbarg’s conception of freedom. He claimed that the freedom which the majority of Europeans so callously disregarded had originally been a Germanic bequest. The Germanic challenge to the Roman world had led to the emergence of modern Europe in the first place.

Er ist noch derselbe, der den römischen Erdkreis angstvoll erzittern machte, als seine Stimme zuerst aus Germaniens Urwäldern erscholl.... Derselbe, der seinen Heldensamen in Spanien, Frankreich, England so verschwenderisch ausstreute und dem alle diese Völker verdanken, was Großmütiges, Kriegerisches, Freiheitathmendes in ihren Jahrbüchern lebt.\textsuperscript{588}

Moreover, this Germanic bequest was the factor which had made it possible for Martin Luther to challenge the tyranny of Rome for the second time, in the process planting the banner of religious freedom and allowing it to flourish throughout Europe. Had Germanic freedom been able to remain unfettered in the early nineteenth century then it would have taken the lead in directing world history onto a fundamentally new track. This freedom, however, had been repressed and thus the world mistakenly looked to the French revolution for its inspiration.

\textsuperscript{587}Ibid., 127-128. This quote also illustrates the degree to which Wienbarg remained fascinated with the ancient world in his later writings.

\textsuperscript{588}Ibid., 128-129.
Wienbarg believed that the French Revolution was not a viable model for European freedom because it had failed to elevate freedom to the throne of France. Instead, "[e]ure Revolution, Franzosen, hat die sieben Siegel der geheimnißvollen Pforte noch nicht aufgebrochen... wer hinderte euch die Freiheit auf das Polster zu heben, das sie erwartete?" Because the French had failed to accord freedom its rightful place, their revolution must simply be seen as a continuation of the violent wars of religion. It had served the important function of destroying the priesthood and weakening the nobility, but alone this was not enough. England, meanwhile, remained unable to effect even this basic change, enraptured as it was with the Episcopalian system of church government which had convinced them that no further revolution was necessary.

The article closed with Wienbarg questioning how much longer German freedom would sleep before awakening and ushering in the next phase of historical development. In this article, the depth of Wienbarg's dislike for the French conception of revolution remained unclear. Subsequent comments in another article clarified this issue. "Das Unvermögen der Zeit zu glauben und zu handeln" was primarily concerned with religious themes, but in the final pages Wienbarg returned to the general theme of freedom. He argued that the Germans, along with the majority of Europeans, tended to view freedom on a scale with France at one end, the extreme of freedom, and Russia at the other end, the extreme of tyranny. However, this polarity was entirely false. Taken individually and personally the Russians were capable of

\[\text{Ibid.}, 130.\]

\[\text{Ludolf Wienbarg, "Das Unvermögen der Zeit zu glauben und zu handeln," Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835), 105-122.}\]
freedom and the French individually and collectively were capable of autocratic actions as had been evident during the reign of Napoleon. In order to progress Europe must abandon this false conception of freedom and acknowledge that the Germanic states represented the real hope for the future. Germany was the eternal centre, imbued with neither the spirit of the French nor the spirit of the Russians, but rather with a natural conception of freedom. Thus the new European movement would come from the centre and in the process, the perceived east-west polarity would disappear.

Already in these preliminary comments it is possible to discern a very different conception of political development at work in the writings of Ludolf Wienbarg. Unlike Heinrich Laube and Karl Gutzkow who saw great promise in the revolutionary movements of their age, Wienbarg seemed to hearken back to an earlier conception of freedom, one that was rooted in the Germanic past. In this way Wienbarg seemed to stand closer to the literary tradition established in the 1820s by men such as Heinrich Luden and Friedrich von Raumer than to the other so-called Young Germans. Both Luden and von Raumer emphasized the centrality of the German role in the medieval period and, in particular, the superiority of Germanic culture. One can also find evidence of the philosophy of Schleiermacher in these

---

591 Ibid., 119-120.

592 Wienbarg included the entire Scandinavian peninsula in his conception of the Germanic world.

593 Wienbarg’s fascination with Germanic culture can also be seen in Holland in den Jahren 1831 und 1832 (Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe, 1833). The book was essentially a travel novella in which Wienbarg focussed on the beauty of the northern countries and their peoples. Despite the timing of the novella, the turbulent political upheavals which had shattered the Netherlands in 1830 were not discussed. In its celebration of the north, however, the book
passages. He also interpreted the victory of 1789 as a detriment to German freedom and German character. Schleiermacher’s conception of freedom called for the liberation of the organic community of the Volk united by language and cultural traditions, not the arbitrary imposition of French social and political forms.\footnote{John E. Toews, *Hegelianism: The Path Toward Dialectical Humanism, 1805-1841* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 54-64. Hegel criticized Schleiermacher’s emphasis on the liberation of the organic community arguing that it could lead to a resurrection of pre-modern forms of socio-political organization. Instead Hegel welcomed Napoleon’s victories as the triumph of a rational administrative structure over the irrational and obsolete forms which existed in the German states.} However, even though there were certain similarities which connected the thought of Raumer, Luden, Schleiermacher and Wienbarg, he was not in complete agreement with these interpretations. In many ways Wienbarg’s political thought was truly unique. Nowhere was this more evident than in the longest piece in *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis*, “Das goldene Kalb.”\footnote{“Das goldene Kalb” was excerpted in the literature supplement to *Phönix* during Gutzkow’s tenure as editor.}

“Das goldene Kalb” is a short story which relates the ill-fated relationship between two free-thinking Norwegians, identified only as Karl B. and Mathilde F.\footnote{Ludolf Wienbarg, “Das goldene Kalb,” *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1835), 29-72.} Though fictional, the story contains narrative excerpts through which Wienbarg spoke directly to the reader; in addition, Wienbarg claimed that the characterization of Mathilde F. was based on a real, if
extraordinary acquaintance. The key elements of the story were introduced by the two fictional characters, both of whom lamented the materialism evident in the contemporary world. Karl, a deckhand on a Norwegian freighter, was motivated by his travels to comment upon the contemporary situation in Europe. His reflections began with an overview of the situation in Norway which he found somewhat encouraging. Though the country's commerce no longer rested on religious and republican grounds, and had thus fallen victim to swindlers and avaricious characters, he saw some hope in the common people. They were characterized as solid, coarse and robust, though not without wit. It was their coarseness which Karl found most refreshing, the coarseness being a defence mechanism against the arrogance and insolence of the refined, the educated and the rich. Most importantly the Norwegian farmer “fählt sich geachtet, frei, glücklich, er bildet die Nation; diese Nation ist die einzige in Europa, die weder eine Aristokrasie des Reichthums noch eine Aristokrasie der Geburt in ihrem Schoße leidet.”

Despite the idyllic portrait of the Norwegian countryside, Karl had found himself drawn to the salons of London, Paris and Berlin in search of nineteenth century society, the product of a half-century long struggle for progress. However, the true nature of European ‘civilization’ which he had discovered in these salons showed few signs of progress. Europe appeared to Karl as an unfortunate and deluded place where the old aristocracy of birth remained and an even worse blight had appeared: the aristocracy of wealth. This was characterized as

597 Ibid., 43.

598 Ibid., 37-38.
"fluchwürdige Civilisation, welche die ehrloseste und verderblichste aller Aristokrasien, die des Reichthums, zu der Aristokrasie der Geburt hinzugefügt und ein halbgeschundenes Emporkriechergesindel zu Herren der Nation gemacht hatte."

Likening the aristocracy of wealth to ‘chubby leeches,’ Karl noted that the net result of society’s ‘evolution’ was the misery of the people. Europe, and in particular France, had been deceived into thinking that their struggles had actually accomplished something positive. In reality, both morally and politically, the curse of wealth had afflicted their development. Moreover, the liberal institutions of which they so proudly boasted, served only to perpetuate the lie of progress. 

"Lügenhafte liberale Institutionen dienten nur dazu, die Ausschweifungen des Königthums und des Reichstums unter ihre scheinheilige Aegide zu nehmen."

For a very brief period the French revolution had exorcised the demon of wealth, but it returned a short time later with seven other spirits which were infinitely more destructive. The end result of the revolutionary process was misery spreading out all over the world instead of being confined to France.

Once again, Wienbarg painted a depressing picture of the achievements of the French Revolution and for the first time indicated that the root of all of the evils afflicting European society was the quest for wealth. This was confirmed in another part of the story as Mathilde F. wrote to her friend Laura. Mathilde condemned the materialistic dreams of her father, a banker who had recently entered the service of the monarchy. Mathilde observed that her father

\[599\text{Ibid., 41.}\]

\[600\text{Ibid., 42.}\]

\[601\text{Ibid., 31.}\]
spent lavish sums of money on ornaments, yet could not even afford to put oil in one of the ostentatious lamps which he had purchased. Meanwhile the king devoted all of his time to writing meaningless prayers which did nothing to help the masses of people who languished in poverty in his kingdom. Fundamentally, Mathilde could not understand how the poor were left to suffer endlessly amidst displays of the most conspicuous consumption on the part of the wealthy.\footnote{Ibid., 60-64.}

In one of Wienbarg’s narrative asides, he developed these themes more fully by comparing the actions of Napoleon with the actions of the restored Bourbon monarchy. Increasingly the world was ruled by gold rather than by genius. To illustrate this point he drew the reader’s attention to the fate of the Jewish population under Napoleon and under the Bourbons. Napoleon had never bestowed baronial titles on any Jews, but rather he had granted full civic rights to all of the Jewish peoples in his Empire, for he understood that the Jews were an integral part of humanity deserving of the same rights and privileges as all others.\footnote{Ibid., 49-50.} In contrast, the Bourbon king raised a few Jews to the rank of knight and noble simply because they were rich and he wanted to gain access to that wealth. Thus, “[d]ie Geldmacht… überflügelt sie alle.”\footnote{Ibid., 50.} Due to the new-found adulation of wealth the more fundamental values of the people were being shunted aside. Values such as a sense of nationality and history were giving way to the universal worship of money and the inevitable egotism which accompanied

\addcontentsline{toc}{section}{Footnotes}
wealth. Even the republican North America was already half in the clutches of what Wienbarg called the kingdom of wealth.

In “Das goldene Kalb” Wienbarg offered no solution to this turn of events. The story ends tragically with the death of Karl B. in a storm at sea and Mathilde’s subsequent resignation to a life of bourgeois banality. However, the ideas developed in “Die schlafende Freiheit,” “Das Unvermögen der Zeit zu glauben und zu handeln” and “Das goldene Kalb,” provide a rough sketch of the new world which Wienbarg envisioned. Clearly he saw nothing but evil in the emergence of capitalism, which he believed was synonymous with greed and a concomitant lack of concern for the masses. Just as in matters of religion Wienbarg could not comprehend a vengeful god who showed no concern for the trials and tribulations of his creations, neither could he conceive of a political system which left the vast majority of people in poverty while an avaricious few enjoyed all of the benefits of wealth. At the same time, Wienbarg rejected the aristocracy of birth, characterizing this as the most ruinous and dishonourable of all aristocracies. Thus the present situation, especially in its Metternichian incarnation, was intolerable since once again the majority of people were being deceived into forfeiting their ancient freedoms.

Evidently only complete freedom would suffice for Wienbarg. This he defined in terms of a medieval concept of freedom that had been attained first by the Germanic tribes. All that remained was to find some way to awaken that freedom, as had happened during the

---

Ibid., 41. Wienbarg’s condemnation of bourgeois property relations stands in sharp contrast to Schleiermacher’s support of free market relationships and the inviolability of private property. Toews, Hegelianism, 64.
Reformation, in order that the Germans could once again assume their customary position at the head of world-historical socio-political change. There was thus absolutely no agreement among Wienbarg and the other so-called Young Germans on the issue of political change. There was no room for Laube's classical liberalism which exalted the power of the individual. Nor was there a place in Wienbarg's conception of change for Gutzkow's ideal political system, in which the intellectuals would reorder society along the lines laid down in Sieyès pamphlet "What is the Third Estate?" Though Gutzkow opposed excessive and unfair taxation of the masses and argued that the nobility should not be exempted from taxes, he made no attempt to condemn the entire capitalist system. Indeed in his advocacy of a more efficient industrial policy for Sweden he appeared to be an enthusiastic adherent of capitalist practices.

Wienbarg agreed with the other so-called Young Germans on only one subject, the ability of literature to effect the necessary changes to society. Wienbarg's Ästhetische Feldzüge was an enthusiastic call to Germany's young writers to take up the cause of the fatherland in their literature. More clearly than Laube, Mundt or Gutzkow, Wienbarg celebrated the utilitarian character of the new literature. He believed that the old literature had been characterized by the separation of its authors from the experiences of the real world. In contrast the new generation of writers were active participants in the activities of the world. There was no separation between life and literature:

Die neueren Schriftsteller sind von dieser sichern Höhe herabgestiegen, sie machen einen Teil des Publikums aus, sie stoßen sich mit der Menge herum, sie

---

606 Ludolf Wienbarg, Ästhetische Feldzüge (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1834); (Berlin: Aufbau, 1964).

249
ereifern sich, freuen sich, lieben und zürnen wie jeder andere, sie schwimmen mitten im Strom der Welt...  

Because of the commitment of the new generation of writers to live in the world about which they wrote, literature was no longer mere fantasy, no more a pleasant distraction from the here and now; rather, the new literature was in fact a representation of the spirit of the age. The author no longer served only the muses of literature, he also served his fatherland and was deeply intertwined in all of the great struggles of his era.  

For the first time in history truth and reality were the forces guiding the author. He could no longer forget nature in favour of art, nor could he be as tender and ethereal as his predecessors. The presence of reality must be the force which dominated all of the author’s work: “das ist ihre Schicksalsaufgabe, mit dieser muß ihre Kraft so lange ringen, bis das Wirkliche nicht mehr das Gemeine, das dem Ideellen feindlich Entgegengesetzte ist.”

Wienbarg argued that the effective use of wit would be the tool which would allow the author to devote himself to the service of his country. This was because wit was the most

---

607 Ibid., 188.
608 Ibid.
609 This discussion of ‘Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit’ was likely the inspiration for Gutzkow’s 1835 article of the same name.
610 Wienbarg, Ästhetische Feldzüge, 188.
611 Wienbarg’s comments on wit demonstrate his proximity to the early romantic writers, since his argument regarding the power of wit seems to have been drawn almost entirely from Friedrich Schlegel. Schlegel argued that wit is the power that connects and transforms imaginatively. Wit demonstrates the freedom of the mind operating within a multiplicity of thoughts. Both wit and irony are thus functions of the free play of the mind. On
powerful demonstration of freedom: 

"[z]u neuen Zeiten gehören durchaus freie; zu diesen wieder gleiche; und nur der Witz gibt uns Freiheit, indem er Gleichgewicht vorhergibt. Er ist für den Geist, was für die Scheidekunst Feuer und Wasser ist."  

612 By exercising their wit freely, Wienbarg believed that the new writers were providing an essential lesson in freedom to a populace which was largely unfamiliar with the concept. Thus Wienbarg argued that "Freiheit gibt Witz, und Witz gibt Freiheit,"  

meaning that the exercise of freedom, in the form of wit, would lead others to realize their own freedom. Thus the true Germanic freedom which had been repressed by Metternich might once again be awakened.

On the ability of literature to lead by example and to effect genuine socio-political change, Gutzkow, Laube and Wienbarg were thus in general agreement. Once again, however, there were small discrepancies. Wienbarg's *Ästhetische Feldzüge* appeared to draw its inspiration from Laube's more democratic notion of the transformative power of literature.  

614 Gutzkow's differentiation of literature into three types, where one type was more valuable than the others, does not appear in Wienbarg's work. In fact, the literature of reality which this topic see Eric A. Blackall, *The Novels of the German Romantics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), 30-32.
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612 Wienbarg, *Ästhetische Feldzüge*, 190; italics in original text. Wienbarg's emphasis on wit as the key to freedom was also featured in "Das goldene Kalb," in particular when the character of Karl underscored the importance of the Norwegian farmers retaining not only their natural coarseness, but also their wit. Wienbarg, "Das goldene Kalb," 37-38.


614 *Ästhetische Feldzüge* was published in 1834, the majority of Heinrich Laube's writings on the power of literature to build a new society were published in early 1833. Presumably, therefore, Wienbarg was aware of Laube's views when he wrote *Ästhetische Feldzüge*.
Wienbarg emphasized would seem to fall into Gutzkow’s least valuable category. Moreover, though the utilitarian character of literary production can be found throughout the works of Laube, Wienbarg, and Gutzkow, one cannot overlook the fundamental divergence of opinion regarding the outcome of the transformation of society which each envisioned. Wienbarg’s vision seemed to be an almost utopian conception of a world rooted in the Germanic past which would be free from greed and avarice and where every person would have complete freedom. Finally, there would be neither an aristocracy of birth nor an aristocracy of wealth. Every man would be equal.

4.

Theodor Mundt wrote very little on specifically political topics, nor did he expand in any detail upon the issue of literature as a transformative tool. There are, however, a few hints about the world of the future and the role which literature would play in bringing about that world in *Madonna*. The postscript to *Madonna* attempted to explain Mundt’s motivation in producing the work, much as “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit” purported to provide an explanation for Gutzkow’s *Wally*. Mundt acknowledged, however, that the postscript was at best a poor attempt to provide such an explanation. Nonetheless it does offer some insights into Mundt’s feelings regarding the role and function of literature in society. Referring to himself in the third person throughout the postscript, Mundt noted that the author’s intention had not been to produce a book, but rather to capture for the audience a slice of life. This was not a book

---

which replicated the aesthetics of the *ancien régime*, but rather it was a book of movement. Mundt believed that all of the literature being produced at the time was literature of movement, since this was fundamentally a time of movement and change. "Die Zeit befindet sich auf Reisen, sie hat große Wanderungen vor, und holt aus, als wollte sie noch unermessliche Berge überschreiten, ehe sie wieder Hütten bauen wird in der Ruhe eines glücklichen Thals." The outcome of this movement was as yet unclear, but Mundt felt that a definite direction would presently emerge.

The postscript contained only one direct reference to political change, as Mundt pondered the inevitable outcome of all of this movement. Mundt observed that he had always been of the opinion that political change achieved its greatest successes when it became entrenched in the hearts of the people, rather than in their minds. Anyone could think about political change, but it must find a place in the individual heart before it could become a worldwide movement: "Denn wenn die Politik nothgedrungen in die Gesinnung zurücktritt, wird die Gesinnung, nachdem sie ihre innere Umgestaltung aus sich vollbracht hat, allmählich wieder in die

---

616 *Ibid.*, 433. Mundt used the term *ancien régime* in the original text. The Berlin censor interpreted this statement to be an indication that this was a book of the movement, namely Saint-Simonianism, and thus he singled out this section for specific condemnation. See Appendix B(ii).

617 *Ibid.*, 434. The early Romantic fascination with travel as the means by which the individual could realize his true potential is a prominent theme in Mundt’s *Madonna*.

618 Comments such as these reveal the degree to which Mundt’s early fascination with Hegelian thought continued to influence his work. In the early years of the nineteenth century Hegel had argued that the alienation and division of the present era were historically and spiritually necessary. The task of philosophy was to recognize the necessity of the existing world and to demonstrate how it already contained the conditions for freedom and harmony. Mah, *The End of Philosophy*, 12.
Thus the sentiments of the people would ultimately generate such a great force for change that it could not be denied. In the meantime the function of literature was to provide a picture of these sentiments in order to raise awareness of the developing issues. Mundt thus conceived of *Madonna* as a picture of the ethical mood of his era, an ethical mood which was rapidly becoming part of a worldwide ethical spirit: "wer empfindet nicht das Ziehen und Zucken einer ethischen und gesellschaftlichen Umgestaltung eben so scharf und eben so gewaltig in seinem einzelnen Menschenherzen, als es das ganze Weltherz jetzt durchbebt?" 620

Despite the parallels between Mundt’s conception of the transformative role of literature and that of Heinrich Laube, the actual content of *Madonna* provides little evidence that Mundt took seriously the role of the writer in effecting these changes. This was clear in the opening chapter entitled “Posthorn Symphonie.” This chapter surveyed conditions in the German states and suggested what must be done to remedy the negative aspects of the German situation. 621 Above all, the German peoples were entirely too constrained in their behaviour. They were afraid to celebrate the joys of life, a full appreciation of which could only be

---


620 Ibid.

621 Theodor Mundt, “Posthorn Symphonie,” *Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen* (Leipzig: Gebrüder Reichenbach, 1835), 1-32. This chapter was excerpted in its entirety in Mundt’s *Literarischer Zodiacus* (February 1835), 97-112.
obtained through travel. Travelling freed one from the constraints of family, home and work and thus it became possible to experience all that life had to offer.622

More than ever before it was essential to experience the world because theirs was a vital time in human history. There had always been unrest, evident in the vast number of wars over the years, but for the first time this unrest would consign everything to history and a new, higher stage of development would emerge. However, the German people were unable to appreciate fully these changes because they were trapped in an idyllic vision of the past. Mundt argued that men such as Goethe were guilty of perpetuating an image of the past which was entirely without roots in reality; this image had encouraged the German people to focus on the subjective, rather than the objective realities of their everyday lives. Mundt observed that “die Deutschen waren nie unglücklicher, nie innerlich zerrissener, als zur Zeit ihrer Natursentimentalität und Landschaftsempfindsamkeit im Leben und Dichten.”623 Hope lay in the fact that modern Germans were no longer trapped in the idyllic world of nature and were able to focus on what was really important, the activities of man: “Ich rufe: Menschen! Menschen! und noch einmal Menschen! Ein Königreich für Menschen!”624 Germans must abandon nature for mankind. They must speak with other people, laugh, love and sing with them; above all, they must experience life. “Posthorn Symphonie” concluded with an apt summation of Mundt’s view of politics and other such mundane activities. He urged people not
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622 Mundt, Madonna, 1-2.

623 Ibid., 25.

624 Ibid.
to concern themselves with trifling matters and give themselves over entirely to the world of experience. "Ich werde mir um die spanische Politik nicht noch graue Haare wachsen lassen, da sie mir schon der deutschen wegen auszugehen anfangen." Mundt thus rejected any commitment to particular causes, in favour of his belief that experience alone would bring about the requisite changes.

The views which Mundt expressed in "Posthorn Symphonie" are fully consistent with the philosophy which John Toews has labeled moderate, liberal Hegelianism. Toews notes that the moderate Hegelians viewed the present political situation... as a transitional stage in which the actualization of freedom and Reason was still "abstract," that is, limited.... Future political progress was perceived as the transformation of the abstract form of the modern state into the concrete ethical community of a genuinely representational, liberal constitutional monarchy.

For Mundt literature was the means by which this actualization would be completed. Literature would illustrate the positive aspects of the new era so that they could fully penetrate the world of the present.

Mundt’s attitude towards politics was thus fully consistent with his religious views. Christianity was fully capable of effecting the fundamental changes which would make it
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625 *Ibid.*, 32. These concluding comments were followed by the call which had left Gutzkow so aghast, “Trarara! Trara! Trara!”---a call for a noisy celebration of life. See Gutzkow’s comments on this statement in Karl Gutzkow, “Theodor Mundt, Willibald Alexis und die Pommersche Dichterschule, oder über einige literar-historische Symptome,” *Phönix: Frühlingszeitung für Deutschland*, Literaturblatt Nr. 13 (1.4.35), 309-311.


relevant in the modern era. All the contemporary Christian should do was to raise awareness of the original intent of the scriptures, namely the advocacy of spiritualism, and live according to those scriptures. For Mundt it was pointless to support every new cause which came along because change was not related to any specific event, but rather to the cumulative effect of all of those events. Hence he celebrated experience and publicized the underlying currents of the age. Since Mundt did not believe that it was possible to discern the shape of the new world, he contented himself with providing small pieces of life for his readers to ponder while they awaited the eventual emergence of the new order. Mundt’s political views were thus far less activist than those of Wienbarg, Laube and Gutzkow, all of whom acknowledged that change would have to be brought about through careful preparation and potentially through direct action.

5.

There was no single political programme which could be categorized as Young German. These were men with broadly divergent political beliefs, as should be expected in a time of great political uncertainty. Only two issues are common to the writings of all of the so-called Young German writers. They were acutely aware that they were living in a time of considerable change and they also believed that literature should function as an important tool in the actualization of that change. Beyond these basic issues, however, there was little if any agreement.

Heinrich Laube was deeply influenced by the Revolutions of 1830. His works thus sought to raise public awareness of the importance of freedom and individualism. His essays and the characters he created in his novels demonstrated a firm commitment to the rights of the
individual, rights that should never be constrained except by the rights of other individuals. The inflexible monarchies of the day were thus an intolerable institution, since they denied the rights of the individual and encouraged people to follow the centralized dictates of the state. Life must therefore be devoted to the struggle against the institutions of the autocratic states, such as the censors, which repressed the rights of the individual. Thus Laube was an enthusiastic supporter of the July revolution in France and the Polish uprising of 1830 and wrote frequently in defence of such issues as press freedom.628

In contrast Karl Gutzkow was somewhat less ardent in his support of the French revolutionary cause, mindful as he was of the dangers of military and cultural subjugation of the Germanic states by the French nation. Nonetheless, Gutzkow was committed to socio-political change along the lines established by Emanuel Sieyès. Gutzkow thus argued in favour of constitutional government in which the majority of the people were fairly represented. He also opposed unfair taxation practices, in particular, the exemption of the nobility from taxation. The excessive bureaucratization which seemed to characterize the contemporary monarchies was unacceptable to Gutzkow, as was the neglect of economic development which accompanied weak government, and the denial of such basic rights as press freedom. Finally, should the socio-political situation degenerate to an intolerable level, Gutzkow explicitly endorsed the use of revolution to change that situation. There was no question, however, that Gutzkow believed that literature should function as the most important revolutionary tool.

---

628 This commitment to revolutionary causes also serves to explain the active role which Laube played during the Revolutions of 1848.
Literature could challenge preconceived notions of the ‘correct’ social order and could thus pave the way to an acceptance of radical change.

Ludolf Wienbarg’s conception of the new socio-political order was the farthest removed from that of the other so-called Young Germans. Whereas Laube, Gutzkow and, to a degree, Mundt looked to the French revolutions for their inspiration, Wienbarg looked to the Germanic past. He believed that the Germanic states already possessed an adequate conception of freedom, a legacy of the ancient Germanic tribes. This Germanic freedom had twice proven itself capable of bringing about genuine socio-political change, once when it effected the fall of Rome and once during the Reformation. The key to change in his time would be to reawaken that sense of freedom. In this endeavour it would be necessary to abandon the false belief that the French revolutions were the key to the future and to accept the leading role that the German states must play. Wienbarg also condemned the aristocracy of wealth which was developing throughout the Western world, and argued instead in favour of a society where there was neither an aristocracy of birth nor an aristocracy of wealth. Instead, in Wienbarg’s new world, all men would be free and equal and no-one would be forced to languish in poverty while an undeserving few reaped the benefits of wealth.

Finally, Theodor Mundt wrote little in the period prior to the ban which would furnish an indication of his political views. He did, however, provide some indication that he considered it unnecessary to involve oneself in specific political causes. Rather, Mundt argued that his contemporaries should not worry about every trivial matter which came along and should devote themselves wholeheartedly to the pleasures of the world. Germans should experience all that life had to offer while they awaited the eventual emergence of the new world.
order. Despite his insistence that he had distanced himself from Hegel's philosophy, Mundt's writings demonstrate his continued acceptance of the Hegelian belief that the key elements of that new order were already present in the world. One needed only to demonstrate that the world already contained the essential elements of freedom and harmony, in order to actualize a new world order.

As was true in the preceding examinations of social and religious emancipation, a single Young German political position did not exist. There were simply too many differences of opinion among Karl Gutzkow, Heinrich Laube, Theodor Mundt, and Ludolf Wienbarg for a common stance to emerge. It is thus incorrect to speak of the Young Germans as typical Vormärz liberals, democrats, republicans or romantics. Each man maintained a distinct set of political beliefs and the so-called Young Germans were typical only in the way that they mirrored the enormous diversity of the Vormärz period.
CONCLUSION

Each of the 'Young German' authors took as his starting point the assumptions about literature which had been outlined in Ludolf Wienbarg's *Ästhetische Feldzüge*. The Romantic separation of literature from the real world must end. Literature was no longer mere fantasy, no more a pleasant distraction from the here and now; rather, the new literature was a representation of the spirit of the age. Thus the author no longer served only the muses of literature, he also served particular causes. Beyond this common influence, however, there were few issues upon which Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg agreed. Moreover, even on Wienbarg's basic assumption that writers and their works must serve specific causes, there was considerable disagreement regarding the implementation of this ideal.

Heinrich Laube was without question the most democratic of the so-called Young Germans in his conception of the literary production. He believed deeply that literature was the vehicle which would transform the world and argued that the entire body of literature, no matter how contradictory its message, must be welcomed by those who wished to contribute to the new order. Only once all of the conflicting opinions had been heard would a new order gradually emerge from the chaos. Because Laube invited all writers to contribute their ideas, he did not reject the opinions of women writers outright. He did, however, call for a literature which would combine both male and female tendencies.

The democratic way in which Laube interpreted literary production was symptomatic of his entire personal philosophy. Laube viewed his life as a continuous struggle against those forces in society which sought to limit free expression. The bureaucratic, monarchical states were thus the most intolerable political institution since their very nature encouraged passive
compliance on the part of their subjects. Further, the inflexible monarchies made no allowance for the basic rights of the individual, rights which Laube valued more highly than anything else. Having been greatly influenced by the ideals of the July Revolution in France and the Polish uprising of 1830, Laube campaigned strenuously for classical liberal principles. The rights of the individual were sacrosanct and should be limited only by the rights of other individuals. This fierce defence of individualism carried over into Laube's views on religion. Laube rejected contemporary Christianity and called for complete religious freedom and toleration. Even the doctrines of Saint-Simon were rejected on the grounds that Enfantin was promoting a hierarchical order which would be incapable of granting the requisite religious freedom.

Only in his writings on women did Laube seem to stray from his commitment to individual freedom. On the topic of female emancipation Laube appeared to be trapped by the general assumptions of his era. His female characters were poorly defined and were depicted as incapable of understanding the limitations of their own situation or contributing to its amelioration. Laube's advocacy of the Saint-Simonian ideal of free love liberated from the constraints of bourgeois marriage was somewhat one-sided. Whereas his male characters were shown as willing and enthusiastic participants in the new social order, his female characters were at best reluctant adherents of the new philosophy. Overall, however, Laube's was perhaps the most consistent philosophy. All of the issues which concerned him were related to his overriding preoccupation with securing individual rights and freedoms.

If Heinrich Laube's was the most democratic conception of literary production, Karl Gutzkow's was the least. Gutzkow believed that only the best of the new literature, the literature that was produced by a select few geniuses, could contribute to the new world order.
Literature must be seriously conceived and artfully constructed to enable it to complete its mission. As Gutzkow saw it, the task of literature was to challenge preconceived notions of the 'correct' social order and to pave the way for public acceptance of radical change. This process would not take place overnight and it could be hampered by the noisy outpourings of writers who failed to take their mission seriously. Gutzkow believed that the time for the undisciplined destruction of the old order had passed. The elite writers must now devote themselves to the serious task of building a new order. Though Gutzkow rejected the great bulk of contemporary literature as an exercise in ego-gratification, he did not automatically exclude the work of female writers from the category of 'great literature.' Gutzkow openly acknowledged that women were capable of producing literary masterpieces.

Since Gutzkow believed that literature must challenge all of the preconceived notions about state, society, religion and politics, he frequently wrote about issues to which he was not particularly committed. These issues were nonetheless important to the overall goal of preparing the public to accept more radical changes. Certain themes, however, recurred constantly in Gutzkow's writings, an indication of his own commitment to these issues. In matters of religion, he deplored the pietistic direction which contemporary Christianity had taken. Personally, Gutzkow advocated a natural religion along the lines envisioned by Immanuel Kant, but he emphasized (as Kant had done) that many people would find this religion unsatisfactory. Gutzkow's natural religion would need no prophesy or miracles, but would simply enjoin its followers to act with moral responsibility. Failure to do so could have disastrous consequences as he convincingly demonstrated in Wally, die Zweißlerin. Gutzkow was also concerned by the destructive psychological repercussions of the expectations which
Biedermeier society placed upon women. By making his audience aware of these consequences, Gutzkow was implicitly endorsing the need to change the prevailing assumptions about women. Since Gutzkow believed that this change would be effected primarily through literature, he was the only one of the 'Young German' writers to hold out the possibility that women could contribute to their own emancipation.

In the realm of politics Gutzkow was less enthusiastic than Laube about the French revolutions because of a deep-rooted fear of cultural subjugation to the French nation. Nonetheless he did demonstrate a commitment to change along the lines envisioned by Emanuel Sieyès. Gutzkow's ideal government would be a constitutional system in which the rights of the people were fairly represented. This was not, however, an advocacy of democracy. Gutzkow's own elitism led him to reject outright the possibility of such a government. Rather, this would be a system in which men such as himself took a leading role in representing the interests of the masses. Not surprisingly, given the era in which he lived, Gutzkow deplored excessive bureaucratization, seeing this as the worst manifestation of the contemporary states. He also explicitly endorsed revolution should the political situation in a state become absolutely intolerable.

Summarizing Gutzkow's beliefs is a difficult task. He wrote on a plethora of subjects, many of which were entirely unrelated to his personal views. However, in the final analysis his primary commitment was evident in everything he wrote. Gutzkow was dedicated to literature. In particular, Gutzkow wanted to create a literature that would be capable of transforming the world through the depth of its insights. This was the role which he took more seriously than any other writer who was associated with the so-called Young Germans, hence his frequent
clashes with those contemporaries who failed to treat literature with the seriousness Gutzkow deemed necessary.

If Gutzkow was dedicated to literature, Theodor Mundt was dedicated to experience. Everything he wrote emphasized the importance of experience over mundane commitments to particular causes. Mundt's focus on experience as the key to achieving a new order led him to adopt a relatively conservative position on the specific issues which troubled the other so-called Young Germans. Mundt accepted the basic Hegelian belief that the fundamental elements of a new world order were already present in the modern world. The role of the writer was to raise awareness of these positive elements and thereby actualize them. This view was evident in all of Mundt's writings. He did not question the fundamental teachings of the Christian faith since he believed that they already contained the reconciliation of spirit and matter which many of his contemporaries sought in Saint-Simonianism and elsewhere. Thus he urged his readers merely to celebrate the original intent of the scriptures rather than seek to establish a new faith.

Mundt rejected Gutzkow's belief that women could play an active role in their own emancipation. Further, though he was clearly aware of the restrictions which Biedermeier society placed upon women, Mundt refused to advocate a revolutionary change in the status of women. In fact, Mundt seemed uncertain as to the best way to ameliorate the condition of women. In Madonna he argued that emancipation would be achieved by men such as Hippel and the Saint-Simonians, but elsewhere he indicated that women could never be satisfied by the kind of society which the Saint-Simonians envisioned. Thus the only concrete solution he was able to offer was a very traditional one: a retreat into religion until a new social order appeared.
Similarly Mundt displayed a very cautious attitude towards the transformative potential inherent in the new literature. Though Mundt enthusiastically called for Germany’s young writers to contribute to the new literature, he warned that literature should not be structured in such a way that it might bring undue criticism upon itself. Literary characterizations should not venture too far beyond the realm of plausibility, women must remain feminine, and the social situations depicted should remain as close to reality as possible. Mundt was therefore the least radical of the so-called Young Germans despite the censor’s perceptions that Madonna was among the most dangerous of the new literary creations. Far from wanting to challenge the contemporary socio-political order, Mundt believed that this order already contained the basic elements of a new world. He thus devoted his writing to raising awareness of the most positive developments within the existing order.

Ludolf Wienbarg has often been seen as the founder of the Young German movement. In fact, his dedication of Ästhetische Feldzüge to ‘das junge Deutschland’ was intended simply as a reminder to all of Germany’s young writers that they must devote themselves to the production of a more functional literature. Wienbarg’s aesthetic campaign was a struggle against what he perceived to be the Romantic retreat from reality which continued to dominate much of Germany’s literary community in the early part of the nineteenth century. This was not conceived as a campaign for a socio-political revolution.

Despite his admiration for Gutzkow’s writing, Wienbarg’s personal philosophy was diametrically opposed to that of Gutzkow. Whereas Gutzkow saw salvation in a modern, constitutional state inspired by the revolutionary principles of Sieyès, Wienbarg looked to the past for his inspiration---to the glories of the medieval Germanic world. There Wienbarg saw a
basic conception of freedom which had been responsible for all of the major transformations of human society to date. Both the fall of Rome and the Reformation were visible demonstrations of the power of the Germanic concept of freedom. Mankind would be emancipated when that freedom once again broke free of the chains imposed upon it by the Metternichian system. Since Wienbarg looked to the Germanic past as the only true manifestation of freedom, he naturally rejected the French Revolution as a false model which could only lead Europe along an incorrect path. Rather than a constitutional state which guaranteed fair representation to the various social groups, Wienbarg envisioned a new kind of state where all people, men and women alike, would be free and equal. Because Wienbarg anticipated that the coming era would be characterized by complete human emancipation, he paid little attention to causes such as female emancipation. Though he was keenly aware of the repressive nature of Biedermeier femininity and depicted this oppression in his writings, he nonetheless believed that women would have to wait for emancipation. Only when human society had been reorganized along truly egalitarian lines would women attain complete freedom. In this respect Wienbarg was unique among the so-called Young German writers.

Wienbarg’s conception of religious change also represented a radical departure from the arguments of the other ‘Young Germans.’ Like Friedrich Schleiermacher, Wienbarg argued in favour of an individualistic relationship with God. Unlike the Christian God of the present, however, Wienbarg’s god suffered when his creations suffered and experienced pleasure when they experienced pleasure. This was a god which would rejoice in the pleasures of the senses, rather than condemning them as the current Christian God did. The extreme pantheism evident
in Wienbarg's writings set him apart from most of his contemporaries, not only from Gutzkow, Laube and Mundt.

By 1836 any common ground which might have existed among the 'Young Germans' had been irrevocably destroyed. However, this study has argued that the whole idea of common ground is something of a myth. The mutual denunciations which followed in the wake of the Federal ban were in fact a reflection of the deep-rooted differences which had always existed among the so-called Young Germans in the years leading up to the ban. When Mundt and Laube claimed in 1836 that they had nothing in common with the others whose works had been proscribed, they were essentially correct. Among the core members of 'Young Germany' there were few shared interests. Though they touched on similar topics, their response to those topics mirrored the diversity of the Vormärz era itself. It is true that each of the core members was committed to the creation of a new type of literature, but this alone should have been insufficient grounds to merit Federal proscription. However, the combative tone evident in much of their writing virtually guaranteed an eventual showdown with the institutions of order. In addition, given that the stated goal of the new literature was the creation of a new socio-political order, its proponents were an indirect threat to the stability of the Metternichian system. Metternich was thus essentially correct when he argued that the banning of Young Germany was essential to the maintenance of order in the German Confederation.
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APPENDIX A:

Documents Relating to Young Germany

i. Text of the Prussian Ban against Young Germany; dated 14.11.35


1) sämtliche Verlags- und Commissions-Artikel der Löwenthal'schen Buchhandlung in Mannheim werden verboten.


2) Zu den Hauptforderern der Eingangs gedachten Richtung gehören namentlich die Schriftsteller Carl Gutzkow, Ludolf Wienbarg, Heinrich Laube und Theodor Mundt.


Nach Vorstehendem ersuche ich das Königliche Ober-Präsidium, überall das Nöthige zu verfügen und die Censoren anzuweisen:

dass sie keiner Ankündigung oder Kritik oder sonstigen Erwähnung der vorerwähnten Drucksschriften und keiner neuen Schrift jener Schriftsteller das Imprimatur ertheilen.


In Vertretung des Herrn Geheimen Staats-Ministers v. Rochow.
Vermöge Allerhöchsten Auftrags. Der Justiz-Minister. (gez.) Mühler.\(^{629}\)

---

As the Baden Bundestag debated the ban against Young Germany, the following addition to the Reichstag decree was recorded:

Es hat sich unter dem Namen 'Junge Literatur' ein Verein mehrerer Schriftsteller gebildet, deren Absicht dahin zu gehen scheint, durch Erschütterung aller bisherigen Begriffe über Christentum, Obrigheit, Eigenthum, Ehe etc. in allen sozialen Verhältnissen eine Anarchie zu verbreiten und eine allgemeine Umwälzung vorzubereiten. An der Spitze dieses Autorenvereins stehen Ludoph Wienbarg und Dr. Gutzkow; auch Börne und Heine sollen Mitarbeiter desselben seyn. [630]

By the time the ban reached the legislature of the Free State of Hamburg it now appeared as follows. This was the final edict which was signed into law on December 10, 1835.

Beschluss

Nachdem sich in Deutschland in neuerer Zeit, und zuletzt unter der Benennung 'das junge Deutschland' oder 'die junge Literatur', eine literarische Schule gebildet hat, deren Bemühungen unverhohlen dahin gehen, in bellettristischen, für alle Classen von Lesern zugänglichen Schriften die christliche Religion auf die frechste Weise anzugreifen, die bestehenden sozialen Verhältnisse herabzuwürdigen und alle Zucht und Sittlichkeit zu zerstören: so hat die deutsche Bundesversammlung --- in Erwägung, dass es dringend nothwendig sey, diesen verderblichen, die Grundpfeiler aller gesetzlichen Ordnung untergrabenden Bestrebungen durch Zusammenwirken aller Bundesregierungen sofort Einhalt zu thun, und unbeschadet weiterer, vom Bunde oder von den einzelnen Regierungen zur Erreichung des Zweckes nach Umständen zu ergreifenden maassregeln --- sich zu nachstehenden Bestimmungen vereiniget:

1) Sämtliche deutschen Regierungen übernehmen die Verpflichtung, gegen die Verfasser, Verleger, Drucker und Verbreiter der Schriften aus der unter der Bezeichnung 'das junge Deutschland' oder 'die junge Literatur' gekannten literarischen Schule, zu welcher namentlich Heinr. Heine, Carl Gutzkow, Heinr. Laube, Ludoph Wienbarg und Theodor Mundt gehörten[631], die Straf- und Polizei-Gesetze ihres Landes, so wie die gegen den Missbrauch der Presse bestehenden Vorschriften, nach ihrer vollen Strenge in Anwendung zu bringen, auch die Verbreitung dieser Schriften, sey es durch den Buchhandel, durch Leihbibliotheken oder auf sonstige Weise, mit allen ihnen gesetzlich zu Gebot stehenden Mitteln zu verhindern;

2) Die Regierung der freien Stadt Hamburg wird aufgefordert, in dieser Beziehung insbesondere der Hoffmann und Campe'schen Buchhandlung zu Hamburg, welche vorzugsweise Schriften obiger Art in Verlag und vertrieb hat, die geeignete Verwarnung zu gehen zu lassen....[632]

---

[630] Houben, Zeitschriften des Jungen Deutschlands, I, 435; emphasis added.

[631] Börne’s name was never added to the ban.

Karlsbad Resolutions:


§1. Solange als der gegenwärtige Beschluß in Kraft bleiben wird, dürfen Schriften, die in der Form täglicher Blätter oder heftweise erscheinen, desgleichen solche, die nicht über 20 Bogen im Druck stark sind, in keinem deutschen Bundesstaate ohne Vorwissen und vorgängige Genehmigung der Landesbehörden zum Druck befördert werden. Schriften, die nicht in eine der hier namhaft gemachten Classen gehören, werden fernerhin nach den in den einzelnen Bundesstaaten erlassenen oder noch zu erlassenden Gesetzen behandelt. Wenn dergleichen Schriften aber irgend einem Bundesstaate Anlaß zur Klage geben, so soll diese Klage im Namen der Regierung, an welche sie gerichtet ist, nach den in den einzelnen Bundesstaaten bestehenden Formen, gegen die Verfasser oder Verleger der dadurch betroffenen Schrift erledigt werden.

§2. Die zur Aufrechterhaltung dieses Beschlusses erforderlichen Mittel und Vorkehrungen bleiben der näheren Bestimmung der Regierungen anheimgestellt; sie müssen jedoch von der Art sein, daß dadurch dem Sinn und Zweck der Hauptbestimmung des §1 vollständig Genüge geleistet werde.

[.....]

§4. Jeder Bundesstaat ist für die unter seiner Oberaufsicht erscheinenden, mitthn für sämtliche unter der Hauptbestimmung des §1 begriffenen Druckschriften, in so fern dadurch die Würde oder Sicherheit anderer Bundesstaaten verletzt, die Verfassung oder Verwaltung derselben angegriffen wird, nicht nur den unmittelbaren Beleidigten, sondern auch der Gesammtheit des Bundes verantwortlich.

[.....]


§8. Sämtliche Bundesglieder verpflichten sich, in einem Zeitraum von zwei Monaten die Bundesversammlung von den Verfugungen und Vorschriften, durch welche sie dem §1 dieses Beschlusses Genüge zu leisten gedenken, in Kenntniß zu setzen.

§9. Alle in Deutschland erscheinenden Druckschriften, sie mögen unter den Bestimmungen dieses Beschlusses begriffen sein oder nicht, müssen mit dem Namen des Verlegers und, in so fern sie zur Classe der Zeitungen oder Zeitschriften gehören, auch mit dem Namen des Redacteurs versehen sein. Druckschriften, bei welchen diese Vorschrift nicht beobachtet ist, dürfen in keinem Bundesstaate in Umlauf gesetzt und müssen, wenn solches heimlicher Weise geschieht, gleich bei ihrer Erscheinung in Beschlag genommen, auch die Verbreiter derselben, nach Beschaffenheit der Umstände, zu angemessener Geld- oder Gefängnisstafe verurtheilt werden.\[633\]

iii. Provisions of the *Bundesakte* and *Wiener Schlußakte* Regarding a Uniform Press Law:

*Bundesakte*: Artikel 18d.

Die Bundesversammlung wird sich bei ihrer ersten Zusammenkunft mit Abfassung gleichförmiger Verfügungen über die Presßfreiheit und die Sicherstellung der Rechte der Schriftsteller und Verleger gegen den Nachdruck beschäftigen.

Amended as follows by the *Wiener Schlußakte*:

*Schlußakte*: Artikel 65

Die in den besonderen Bestimmungen der Bundesakte, Artikel 16, 18, 19, zur Beratung der Bundesversammlung gestellten Gegenstände bleiben derselben, um durch gemeinschaftliche Übereinkunft zu möglichst gleichförmigen Verfügungen darüber zu gelangen, zur fernern Bearbeitung vorbehalten.\(^{634}\)

---

APPENDIX B:
The Impact of Censorship on ‘Young Germany’

i. Self-Censorship in Gutzkow’s Work:

The following table compares Gutzkow’s March 1835 review of *Der Salon II* by Heinrich Heine which appeared in the *Phönix Literaturblatt* Nr. 10 to the 1836 version of the same review which was published in Gutzkow’s anthology *Beiträge zur Geschichte der neuesten Literatur*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11.3.1835</th>
<th>1836:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- ....aus schönstem satirizten Palmen-Velin sind sie nun übersetzt worden in gutes deutsches Druckpapier, in ehrliches Altenburgisches Bourgeois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ....er mag sich in französische Anschauungen filtriren so viel als er weniger will als muß; es ist sein gutes liebes packkleinnes Deutschland mit allen seinen Blättern für literarische Unterhaltung, mit seinem halben Liberalismus, mit seiner Ängstlichkeit in Religionssachen, mit seiner Lindenbäumen, Schlafmützen und Tabakspfeifen, mit Allem, wie es Heine braucht-[omitted] Denn Heine ist eine ganz deutsche... Figur.... ein Mann von heute, wenigstens mehr Mann der Vergangenheit, als der Zukunft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Heine spricht in diesem Buche viel über Christenthum, Nixenglauben, über den Pabst, Luther, Leibnitz, Spinoza, Rothschild, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, über Sein und Nichtsein, kurz über Illusionen und Irrthümer, von welchen man eine gute Meinung behält, je weniger man davon weiß.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [omitted] Im Allgemeinen kann ich mich nicht dem Ernst über Salon II aussprechen, welchen Heine wenigstens von der jungen Literatur dabei zu erwarten scheint. Heine hatte immer das Verdienst eines Tirailleurs, der plänkelnd im Vordertreffen steht und nur sich, keineswegs eine gewonnene oder verlorene Schlacht einsetzt. Heine arbeitete scherzend der Julirevolution vor: er arbeitet jetzt im Scherz dem großen Ernst vor,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- [condensed into the following] Man wolle doch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
welcher sich mit der Revision der Offenbarung, 
und mit allen sozialen Fragen des Jahrhunderts 
beschäftigen wird.

- Für den Kampf selbst im Großen ist Heine nicht 
geeignet. Er ist dazu nicht massiv und 
systematisch genug. Sollte man es glauben! Heine 
hat Vorurteile. Es gibt gewisse Dinge, für welche 
Heine, wenn auch nicht sterben, doch den 
Schnupfen haben könnte. Heine will die Hütter 
unserer morsch en Institutionen nur är gern. Es 
macht ihm Spaß, die Geheimnisse fremder 
Überzeugungen zu profanieren; doch thut ihm 
wieder leid, was er thut. Er spricht in diesem 
Buche viel von der Kirche; aber er will nur Angst 
einjagen, er will nur den Triumph genießen, in 
einer christlichen Gemeinde die Lorgnette 
gebrauchen zu dürfen. Einen Hund in den 
Gottesdienst mit hineinzunehmen, würde er schön 
wenig wagen; noch weniger aber, einen neuen 
Glauben zu predigen. Denn müßte dieser nicht 
positiv sein? Das ist es, Heine hat Furcht for dem, 
was noch nicht ist

- Wie ihm das Veil der Republik Schrecken 
einflöt, so eine Religion, welche am Ende neue 
symbolische Bücher erfindet, die möglicher Weise 
in einem nicht so guten Styl geschrieben sein 
könnten, als die Bibel. Heine befindet sich bei 
unsern Zuständen, wie sie sind, ganz wohl.

- Er will nur hinter dem Spiegel stecken, als 
Schreck, als Drohung, mit der Geberde dessen, 
wie er sein könnte, wenn er wollte. Styl und Witz 
gedeihen bei dieser Indifferenz vortrefflich. Heine 
kann ohne Deutschland nicht fertig werden; er 
sehen sich zurück nach unserem Dienstags- und 
Donnerstagsgerichten, nach unserer dummen aber 
feurigen Liebe, nach den Alsterpavillons und dem 
Bergedorfer Boten, und dieser Schmerz steht ihm 
schön. Dies ist ein Motiv, das sich bei einem so 
reichen Genius, wie Heine, zu Dantescher 
Erhabenheit steigern kann. Es wäre ein ganz 
neues Colorit seiner Poesie, die Sehnsucht nach 
Deutschland quand même! Und müßte eine 
Consequenz werden dieses wunderbaren

Karl Gutzkow, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der 
neuesten Literatur*, Bd.1 (Stuttgart: P.Balz'sche 
Buchhandlung, 1836), 79-89.
Menschen, die ihn den deutschen Herzen immer noch näher brächte.

ii. Prussian Ban Issued Against *Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen*

Dies Buch nimmt eine sehr bedeutende Stelle in einer Klasse von Schriften ein, die sich in den letzten Jahren so wie noch in keiner früheren Zeit der deutschen Literatur hervorgethan hat, und die in hohem Grade sittenverderblich und also mittelbar auch politisch gefährlich zu wirken droht. Es sind dies die Schriften, deren Grundgedanke auf Geltendmachung der zügellosesten sinnlichen Lust, --- nicht in der nackten Weise der französischen Materialisten und mancher deutschen Romanschreiber von gewöhnlichem Schlage --- sondern in engster Verbindung mit scheinbar tief geistigen, selbst religiösen Lehren und Gefühlen gerichtet ist, und dergleichen mehrere, namentlich von dem berühmten Heine, von Heinrich Laube, von Wienbrack [sic] bereits zu dringend motivierten Verboten Anlaß gegeben haben.


In dem vorliegenden Buch zeigt sich diese Tendenz in höchst konsequenter Weise und nicht ohne einer die Gefährlichkeit steigerndes angezeigtes Talent der Darstellung. Ohne auf eine vollständige Darlegung des Inhaltes einzugehen, wird es hinreichen die vorzuglich auffallenden Stellen auszuzeichnen.

Zuförderst möchte dahin schon die ausführliche verherrlichende Charakteristik des berühmteten Casanova gehören (: S. 79-87 :) der gewissermaßen als ein Heiliger dieser neuen Religion hingestellt wird, so wie die Heldin des Romans, ein in früher Jugend in die Tiefen des sittlichen Verderbens, in eine verzehrende Gluth geistig sinnlicher Lust eingeführtes und mit Bewußtseyn darin sich ergehendes Mädchen die Heilige ist, die der Titel nennt (: S. bes. S. 143. und 187 :) Hoch unzuchtig ist sodann, ohne daß dabei jene geistige Beziehung hervortritt, die Schilderung der Bühnenproduktion zweier Tänzerinnen S. 185 f.

Dies erscheint indes fast unbedeutet gegen die ausführliche Schilderung der Scenen nächtlicher Unzucht S. 225-240., die zum Theil als die nothwendige tadellose Frucht wahrer freier Liebe erscheint und vollends gegen die S. 240. 242. mitgetheilte Selbstschilderung des Gemüthszustandes der Hauptperson unmittelbar nachher (: mit lästerlichem Mißbrauch des Gebets :), ohne daß dies auch nur scheinbar durch irgend eine Mißbilligung oder sonst wie gemildert würde.


Endlich möchten noch die in dem nachwort S. 432 f. und S. 434 und 35. bemerkten Stellen einer besonderen Beachtung wert sein.


Berlin, den 30sten April 1835.

Das Königliche Ober-Censur-Collegium,

Wilken, v. Lancizolle

---

*Reprinted in Jan-Christoph Hauschild, *Verboten! Das Junge Deutschland 1835. Literatur und Zensur im Vormärz* (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1985), 64.*
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iii. The Impact of Censorship on Gutzkow's *Wally* and Mundt's *Madonna*:

The rulings of the Berlin censor and the Mannheim tribunal serve as an instructive case study of those aspects of the 'Young German' works which the state considered to be most dangerous. In reviewing the official ruling against Mundt's *Madonna* and the transcripts of the Mannheim tribunal which investigated Gutzkow's *Wally*, it becomes apparent that the state had carefully defined the limits of creative expression in such a way that certain issues would lead to immediate official sanction. The ruling of the Berlin censor on *Madonna* was issued on April 30, 1835. The state was most deeply concerned with the inappropriate displays of sexuality in the novel and with the challenge that it appeared to offer to the Christian religion.

The text of the ban against *Madonna* specifically cited Mundt's dangerous tendency to adopt a sensualist approach that was more typical of the French materialists, but which had overtaken German literature in the past few years.\(^{636}\) The censor went on to note that this tendency was especially common in Heine, Laube and "Wienbrack" (presumably Wienbarg). The censor found especially troubling Mundt's preoccupation with the Rehabilitation of the Flesh and his concomitant subversion of Christianity. From the outset it was clear that the censor objected to the fact that the novel's heroine was named Madonna. The ban cited several pages where these dangerous tendencies were most evident, in support of the conclusion that

\(^{636}\)Das Königliche Ober-Censur-Collegium, Wilken, von Lancizolle, "Theodor Mundt, *Madonna, Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen*," Berlin, April 30, 1835; see Appendix B(ii) for the complete text of the censor's ruling. Reprinted in Jan-Christoph Hauschild, *Verboten! Das Junge Deutschland 1835. Literatur und Zensur im Vormärz* (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1985), 64.
the circulation of this book in all libraries and reading-circles must be expressly prohibited.\textsuperscript{637}

The issue that was clearly foremost in the mind of the censor was the perception that Mundt's novel was promoting the doctrine of rehabilitation of the flesh. In this light, the characterization of one of the novel's central figures was particularly troubling. The censor believed that the character of Casanova was being portrayed as a holy man of a new faith, a faith that was very different from Christianity. Mundt's description of Casanova certainly seems to lend itself to such an interpretation:

\begin{quote}
Der Mann der Wirklichkeit war wieder zu klug und zu stark, um sich die Kabbala über den Kopf wachsen zu lassen, und das Stückchen Voltairescher Atheismus, mit dem sich sein Witz zuweilen Bewegung machte, und mit dem er es im Grunde nie ernstlich gemeint, vermochte ihn vollends nicht um seine Seeligkeit zu bringen, weil Casanova am Ende doch noch witziger war, als Voltaire. Aber wie Faust in die Tiefen des Weltgeistes hineingestrebt hatte, wie er liebesbrünstig nach Vereinigung und Einheit mit demselben gerungen, so kann man von Casanova sagen, daß er, gleich einem indischen Gott, der sich in tausendfache Formen der Weltmaterie verwandelt, so alle nur möglichen Gestaltungen und Wandlungen der äußeren Weltenformen an sich erlebt und mit denselben eins gewesen ist.\textsuperscript{638}
\end{quote}

Casanova was thus depicted as one with the material world, a manifestation of Mundt's own pantheism which greatly disturbed the censor. The censor likewise objected to the characterization of the central female character, Maria, believing that Mundt had imbued his heroine with 'sinful lust.' Two sections in particular were singled out for censure:

\begin{quote}
Mit mir tröste Dich! Wahrlich, wahrlich, ich sage Dir, Du kannst keine größere Heilige auf Erden sein, als wenn Du eine Weltliche bist! Schönes Mädchen, ich erwähle Dich zu meiner Heiligen, damit Du nicht zu sehr verzagst an Dir! Ich
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{637}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{638}Theodor Mundt, \textit{Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen} (Leipzig: Gebrüder Reichenbach, 1835), 82-83.

Similarly the censor objected to the following description:


The latter characterization was contained within a longer section of the narrative in which Mundt described in great detail a stage show featuring two dancers performing a 'rustic Pas de Deux,' which culminated in the two dancers removing their clothes to reveal their 'luminous spirit.' After the performance the narrator had concluded that the women had danced extraordinarily, they had demonstrated that the human form could become an enchanter, with all of their limbs representing the gods of love. The censor, however, did not appreciate the beauty of the show and branded the entire passage obscene.

Correspondingly Maria's confession of her worldly inclinations, which was contained within a lengthy and highly descriptive account of her life, was dismissed by the censor for its 'obscene description of nightly sex acts.' In this case it is difficult to disagree with the censor, as Mundt seems to have resorted to merely scandalizing his audience without regard for the

---

While the censor’s initial objections seemed to be related more to issues of basic morality than the doctrine of emancipation of the flesh, the subsequent sections which were singled out were clearly related to the latter concern.

Of particular interest to the censor was a section of the novel in which Mundt discussed the evolution of Christianity to its present condition, with particular attention to the perceived conflict between spirit and matter. Though Mundt attempted to conceal this discussion by refusing to use the term ‘emancipation of the flesh,’ instead referring to the ‘emancipation of the image,’ the censor believed that the entire account promoted the emancipation of the flesh. One passage in particular was emphasized by the censor:

O ihr Philosophen, was euch fehlt, ist das Bild! Tollkühner Studirstubengedanke eines Weisen, ein Diesseits zu construiren, das bloß der Geist ist, ein Diesseits, das Logik geworden, und eine Logik, die Diesseits geworden! Ihr Philosophen, setzet das Bild in seine Rechte ein, und dann erst wird die Wahrheit des Lebens in ihrer vollgereiften Blüte erscheinen! Wir sind Kinder dieser Welt! Der Geist verlangt nach dem Bilde, die Tiefe entbrennt in Sehnsucht nach der Gestalt! Ich kämpfe für die Wiedereinsetzung des Bildes!

Um der Schwachen willen werde ich künftig, wenn ich einmal öffentlich über diese hochwichtige Sache sprechen sollte, nie mehr von der Wiedereinsetzung des Fleisches reden! Das Fleisch, in das Bild erhoben, erweist sich auch darin schon als das veredelte und geklärte Element, und als die Durchleuchtung des Geistes, der im Bilde Fleisch geworden ist. Ueberdies ist,

\[643 \textit{Ibid.}, 227-228.\]

wenn ich nicht irre, Fasttag heut in der katholischen Christenheit, und so enthalte man sich, wie billig, endlich des Fleisches, von dem ich schon gar zu viel gesagt. Ich kämpfe für die Wiedereinsetzung des Bildes!645

Finally, the censor focused on the postscript which Mundt had provided to his novel. In these passages Mundt attempted to describe why the book was created and how it should be received by its audience:

...so nennt es ein Buch der Bewegung! Nicht bloß, weil es der vagabundirende Verfasser auf Reisen geschrieben hat, sondern weil wirklich alle Schriften, die unter der Atmosphäre dieser Zeit geboren werden, wie Reisebücher, Wanderbücher, Bewegungsbücher aussehen. Die neueste Aesthetik wird sich daher gewöhnen müssen, diesen Terminus ordentlich in Form Rechtens in ihre Theorien und Systeme aufzunehmen. Die Zeit befindet sich auf Reisen, sie hat große Wanderungen vor, und holt aus, als wollte sie noch unermeßliche Berge überschreiten, ehe sie wieder Hütten bauen wird in der Ruhe eines glücklichen Thals. Noch gar nicht absehen lassen sich die Schritte ihrer befriedigungslosen Bewegung, wohin sie dieselben endlich tragen wird, und wir Alle setzen unser Leben ein an ihre Bewegung, die von Zukunft trunken scheint. Und daher das Unvollendete dieser Bewegungsbücher, weil sie noch bloß von Zukunft trunken sind, und keiner Gegenwart voll!646

It remains unclear from the censor's wording whether he took this to be a cryptic reference to the Saint-Simonian movement or whether he interpreted 'die Bewegung' to be the Young German movement. In either case the censor deemed support of the movement unacceptable and singled out the passage for special condemnation.

Many months later the Mannheim tribunal would object to Gutzkow's Wally on very similar grounds. The Mannheim trial focussed exclusively on Wally, die Zweiflerin despite the fact that Gutzkow had published earlier works on similar themes including the 1833 novel,

645Ibid., 406-407.

646Ibid., 434.
Maha Guru. Geschichte eines Gottes. The prosecution, however, addressed only the anti-Christian aspects of Wally and the materialistic concerns of the novel's heroine.

In its original form Wally had been divided into three books, with the essay "Wahrheit and Wirklichkeit" appended after the third book as both an explanation of the novel's intent and a way to ensure that the book reached the desired length of twenty folio sheets. The prosecution at the Mannheim trial singled out several passages from the novel to prove the charges against Gutzkow. Taken together these passages reveal conclusively why Gutzkow's work was considered to be such a threat to the state.

Only one passage from Book One (some thirty-eight pages) was mentioned in the transcripts of the trial. The passage in question raised the issue of religion as both a positive and a negative force in society. While Cäsar, the novel's anti-hero, argued that religion was merely a product of despair and therefore could offer no comfort, a secondary character countered that genuine religions could be a positive healing force. Christianity, however, was too much of a mixture of different ingredients to serve as a positive force. This passage was cited as the first evidence of Gutzkow's anti-Christian tendencies.

Moving to Book Two the court turned its attention briefly to Gutzkow's portrayal of

---


649 Ibid.
sexuality and morality. Two issues in particular caught the attention of the court. The first was Gutzkow's depiction of marriage and in particular the assertion by his central male character that the state should never allow a civil marriage to take place until there was a child to prove the preciousness of the love. The second issue to which the court took offence was Gutzkow's account of a medieval poem Titurel and the reaction of his characters to that poem. Several passages from this section were singled out. The first retold the mythical tale of Schionatulander and Sigune:

“Nur jener Zug ist so meisterhaft schön, wo Tschionatulander, als er in die Welt hinaus muß und sein treues Windspiel klug zu den beiden Liebenden hinaufsieht, Sigunen anfleht, um eine Gunst ---” Cäsar stockte und sprach dann leise, mit fast verhaltenem Atem: “daß Sigune, um durch ihre Schönheit ihn gleichsam fest zu machen, wie der magische Ausdruck der alten Zeit ist, um ihm einen Anblick zu hinterlassen, der Wunder wirkte in seiner Tapferkeit und Ausdauer, --- daß Sigune --- in vollkommener Nacktheit zum vielleicht --- ewigen Abschiede sich ihm zeigen möge.”

The second passage detailed Wally's reaction to the poem:

Jetzt wußte sie, worin der ganze Zauber liegt. Sie fühlte, daß das wahrhaft Poetische unwiderstehlich ist, daß das Poetische höher steht als alle Gesetze der Moral und des Herkommens Sie fühlte auch, wie klein man ist, wenn man der Poesie sich widersetzt.... Sie kam sich verächtlich vor, seitdem sie fühlte, daß sie für die höhere Poesie kein Gegenstand war. So konnte es nicht mehr fehlen, daß sie sich bald selbst dazu macht. Wie oft war sie Cäsarn begegnet! Er blickte stolz! Er hatte eine Moral, die über der ihren war! Er konnte das Auge erheben, das Ideale hub es in ihm! Wally konnte nicht stolz sein. An ihr schien die Reihe der Scham zu sein. Sie fürchtete sich vor Cäsar. Ihre ganze Tugend war armselig, seitdem sie ihm

---

650 Ibid., 237.

651 The poem in question is by Albrecht von Scharfenberg, “Der jüngere Titurel” (1270). During his doctoral studies at Jena Gutzkow had copied this poem for Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen (1780-1856), Professor of Germanic Studies.

652 Gutzkow, Wally, die Zweiflerin, GWII, 237.
The resolution of Wally's dilemma caused the most difficulty for the court. Having decided that she must make herself a worthy object before Casar and the power of poetry, Wally re-enacted the scene from *Titurel*:

Sie steht da, hülflos, geblendet von der Torheit der Liebe, die sie um dies Geschenk bat, nicht mehr Willen, sondern zerflossen in Scham, Unschuld und Hingebung. Sie steht ganz nackt, die hehre Gestalt mit jungfräulich schwellenden Hüften, mit allen zarten Beugungen und Linien, welche von der Brust bis zur Zehe hinuntergleiten. Und zum Zeichen, daß eine fromme Weihe die ganze Uppigkeit dieser Situation heilige, blühen nirgends Rosen, sondern eine hohe Lilie sproßt dicht an dem Leibe Sigunens hervor und deckt symbolisch, als Blume der Keuschheit, an ihr die noch verschlossene Knospe der Weiblichkeit. Alles ist ein Hauch an dem Bilde, ein stummer Moment, selbst in dem klugen Augen des Hundes, der die Bewegungen verfolgt, welche der Blick seines Herrn macht. Das Ganze ist ein Frevel; aber ein Frevel der Unschuld.


Taken together these passages represented Gutzkow's most obvious attack on the morality of his era. Not only did his heroine accept that her concepts of virtue and morality were false (and by extension those of the class she represented), but she also appeared naked before a man who was not her husband on her wedding day, thus challenging both the principles of chastity and the sanctity of marriage. Added to the earlier passage which advocated the birth of a child prior to an official marriage ceremony, the court concluded that Gutzkow was systematically

---


attempting to undermine all that society held to be sacred.

The court transcripts indicate that the greatest attention was paid to Book Three. This book contained Wally's diary, a third person narrative entitled "Geständnisse über Religion und Christentum" and the peripheral article "Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit." The latter two pieces were ultimately the most damning for Gutzkow, since the court assumed that the first-person narrative "Geständnisse" was the author's way of speaking directly to the audience. The transcript of the hearing of November 30, 1835 described the following exchange between Gutzkow, acting in his own defence, and the questioner:

Q: The chapter on religion in Book Three begins with the sentence: 'I want to talk about the religious creeds of people' therefore the author himself is speaking.

G: At this point he [I] merely assembled all of Cäsar's views to prepare the scene for the catastrophe. Cäsar remains in these pages the same cold anatomist who in higher matters simply goes back to the chance origin of them and is not capable of leaping to the heights of Christianity as a world-historic event, but rather emphasizes at every point, much in the pattern of the old materialistic French philosophy, the chance elements and anecdotal nature of Christianity. He himself had [I myself have] formulated such different views of religion and Christianity in other writings that the utterances appearing here could only be viewed as even less personally related to him [me].

In sharp contrast to the relatively slight attention paid by the court to the rest of the novel, the Court found at least one lengthy passage on nearly every page of the sixteen-page "Geständnisse" objectionable. Among the most damning passages were the following:

Niemand war in diesen anthropomorphistischen Konsequenzen einer supernaturellen Offenbarung kecker als die Apostel Jesu; denn: alle Schrift von Gott eingegeben heißt: in der Lehre von der Inspiration Gott zum Mitschuldigen aller der Solozismen und inkorrekten Konstruktionen machen, welche sich im griechischen Texte des Neuen Testaments finden. Gewisse Kapitel gibt es in den

---
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dogmatischen Systemen unserer Theologen, die sich besser für Grimms Kindermärchen oder "Tausendundeine Nacht" schicken würden. Dazu gehören die kriminalisch strafbaren Dogmen von der Offenbarung und Inspiration.656

The tribunal also objected to a passage which claimed that:

Jesus war nicht der größte, aber der edelste Mensch, dessen Namen die Geschichte aufbewahrt hat.

Dies ist der historische Kern eines Ereignisses, aus welchem spätere Zeiten ein episches Gedicht machten mit Wundern und einer ganz fabelhaften Göttermaschinerie. Eine kleine Anekdote wurde welthistorisch. Die französische Revolution hinterließ eine Menge von politischen Wahrheiten, welche im Ansehen geblieben sind, selbst wenn jene weniger glücklich von statten gegangen wäre. So kam es auch, daß die verunglückte Revolution des Schwärmers Jesu etwas zurückließ, was zuletzt eine Religion wurde.657

Finally, the tribunal singled out what it perceived to be Gutzkow’s most vicious attack on the institutions of Christianity:


The Mannheim tribunal, whether correctly or not, read each of these passages as a direct challenge by Gutzkow to the Christian faith and its church. The central tenets of the
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Christian faith were being compared to fairy tales; the church hierarchy was viewed as a politically-motivated institution; and, most egregious of all given the sensitive political climate of the time the French Revolution was held up as an event of at least as much importance as the coming of Christianity.

Outside of the attention paid to the Confessions, the court singled out only one other passage in Book Three, a reference by Wally to the essence of her doubts regarding the existence of God:

Oder es darf mich niemand tadeln, wenn ich denke, die Existenz Gottes anzunehmen, war eine ganz äußerliche, politische und polizeiliche Übereinkunft der Völker. Denn warum haben wir halbe Vernunft, halbe Erkenntnis, halben Geist? Warum zu allem nur die Elemente? Und wir sind so vermessen und bauen auf diesen trüben Boden Systeme, welche den Schein der Vollendung tragen und uns mit Verpflichtungen willkürlich belasten!659 Gutzkow's final provocation was a passage from the essay “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit,” specifically the claim, this time unmistakably Gutzkow’s, that “[z]wei Garantien der unsichtbaren Welt sind die Religion und die Poesie. Jene schließt das Reich der Möglichkeit auf, um zu trösten; diese, weil sie die Wirklichkeit erklären will. Beide beruhen auf Täuschungen, nur ist die Poesie glücklicher, weil sie die Wahrscheinlichkeit für sich hat. Es ist leichter, an ein Gedicht als an den Himmel glauben.”660 This passage was particularly galling to the Mannheim tribunal. Not only did the passage encapsulate Gutzkow’s basic challenge to the Christian religion for those who might have missed the intent of “Geständnisse,” but the court
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also believed that the essay itself had been appended to evade the requirements of the Vorzensur and thus allow Wally to pass uncensored. Finally, even those members of the literate public who had been unable to acquire a copy of Wally, would have been exposed to the ideas in “Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit” since Gutzkow had published the essay independently in the July 25 issue of Phönix.

Overall, the ruling of the Prussian censor and the findings of the Mannheim tribunal were essentially the same. Both institutions were concerned with the appearance of immorality and inappropriate displays of sexuality which Wally: die Zweiflerin and Madonna: Unterhaltungen mit einer Heiligen seemed to promote. More important, however, was the perception that both books could inflict serious damage upon the institutions of Christianity. In the case of Wally it was the invocation of a natural religion and the concomitant condemnation of Christianity that inflamed the Mannheim tribunal. And in the case of Madonna it was the belief that the book was promoting the emancipation of the flesh and the subsequent impression that Christianity was being undermined, which led to a complete ban against the book in Prussia.