c.1

NESTROY TAKEN AT HIS WORD

A STUDY OF NESTROY'S LANGUAGE AS A KEY TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF HIS PLAYS

by

ALFRED NEUFELD
B.Ed., University of British Columbia, 1968
M.A., University of British Columbia, 1970

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

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
Department of Germanic Studies

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standards

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Spring, 1981

© Alfred Neufeld, 1981

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 GERMANIC STUDIES

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date 28/04/81

Table of Contents

Abstract iii

Introduction 1

Chapter I

A. Biographical Background and Critical Literature 5

B. Methodology of Approach. 28

Chapter II

Bäuerle and Nestroy, the Old Language and the New . . 46

Chapter III

Nestroy "Beim Wort genommen": Several Unique Features of Nestroy's Language 122

Chapter IV

Der Talisman: A Detailed Analysis of the Language of Titus Feuerfuchs

A. Titus Confronts a Prejudicial World (I) 180

B. Titus Overcomes a Prejudicial World (II). 245

C. Titus' "Glück und Ende" (III) 321

Chapter V: Conclusion. 360

Notes. 368

Bibliography 378

Abstract

It is the intent of this study to examine the work of the Austrian playwright Johann Nepomuk Nestroy (1801-1862) through a close analysis of his original and unique use of language. The introductory chapter presents a cursory biographical background of the author. This is followed by a brief discussion of some secondary literature which is of pertinence to this dissertation. The concluding part of the chapter consists of the methodology of approach employed in this thesis. Chapter II consists of a comparison between Nestroy and Adolf Bäuerle (1786-1859), a contemporary of Nestroy, equally popular in the "Wiener Volkstheater." The plays singled out for comparison are Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche and Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel by Nestroy, and Wien, Paris, London und Constantinopel and Die Bürger in Wien by Bäuerle. There are also numerous supportive references from other Nestroy plays. The comparison seeks to identify and examine primarily the fundamental differences as reflected and manifested in Nestroy's revolutionary use of language, which contrasts sharply not only with that of Bäuerle, but with the entire foregoing language tradition in the plays of the "Wiener Volkstheater." This difference provides an appropriate approach to Nestroy's work, as it suggests how several significant themes permeating his whole work are reflected in his use of language.

The focus on language continues to narrow in Chapter III, which includes firstly an analysis of the ironic use of words and expressions as understood by the audience, which I call "the boomerang effect." This is illustrated by an analysis of the language of Simplicius, the protagonist of Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel. The second part of this chapter deals with what I call "the thumbprinting quality" of language, by analyzing the playwright's ability to show how an individual's linguistic patterns tend to reflect his basic nature. An examination of a given character's language throughout a whole play reveals what Nestroy considers an important aspect of human nature, namely man's basic unchangeability. This is exemplified in the language of Peter and Puffmann in Der Unbedeutende. Chapter III develops the discussion of the boomerang aspect and thumbprinting quality of language, as well as the unchangeability of human nature. However, what becomes increasingly significant in an exegesis of Nestroy's language is the calculated use and abuse of language, as seen in the figure of Puffmann in Der Unbedeutende. For Puffmann, who uses language in a deceptive manner, the deception aimed at others becomes a web in which he is ultimately caught himself.

In the final chapter, there is an explication of the language used by Titus Feuerfuchs, who is the protagonist in Der Talisman, and one of the great masters of language manipulation in all of Nestroy's plays. This figure combines to a certain

extent the linguistic habits of both Peter and Puffmann. The discussion not only reiterates the dominant elements found in the previous chapters, but seeks to emphasize that language, when no longer used as an instrument of truthful communication, but molded opportunistically to achieve a certain impact, becomes destructive to its user. In order to elucidate this, a lengthy and detailed textual analysis has been undertaken. An analysis of Titus Feuerfuchs' rise and fall in the structured Viennese society which surrounds him, shows that his opportunistic use of language, which in its initial stages seemed to be justifiable as a defensive measure, ultimately leads directly to a development of destructive linguistic habits, which treat language as concealing and twisting, rather than discovering and communicating truth. Thus, screened behind sparkling and entertaining comedy, the playwright has constructed a modern analysis of the misuse of language, which contradicts its very purpose.

Introduction

> Words are magical in the way they affect the minds of those who use them. 'A mere matter of words', we say contemptuously, forgetting that words have power to mold men's thinking, to canalize their feelings, to direct their willing and acting. Conduct and character are largely determined by the nature of the words we currently use to discuss ourselves and the world around us.
>
> Aldous Huxley, Words and their Meanings.

I first became interested in the topic discussed in this dissertation upon reading Karl Kraus's essay "Nestroy und die Nachwelt." The sentence, "Nestroy ist der erste deutsche Satiriker, in dem sich die Sprache Gedanken macht über die Dinge" sparked this interest. The dissertation, in part, seeks to identify precisely what it is in Nestroy's language which makes it comment so astutely on things, that is, on those things the speaker seeks to convey through his particular choice of words. Although critics of Nestroy usually comment on the language, they do not approach it, as is the case in this study, strictly through the spoken word, namely in a detailed textual analysis of several major representative figures from Nestroy's plays, where the attempt is made to emphasize how a character expresses himself, rather than what it is that he expresses.

The title of this dissertation is taken from the writings of Karl Kraus, who, with Otto Rommel, is primarily responsible for the Nestroy Renaissance which began about fifty years after

his death. This particular quotation, as well as Huxley's quotation, were chosen because they suggest in typical Krausian hyperbolic form the conclusions this dissertation hopes to draw about Nestroy's writings, namely, that the way language is used in Nestroy is more important than the meaning the words purportedly impart. Karl Kraus and Aldous Huxley, among others, were of the conviction that a speaker's basic nature is reflected by his choice of words, and that through his language, the individual will inevitably communicate not only ideas, but himself.

The most penetrating of Nestroy's critics, such as K. Kraus, O. Rommel and F.H. Mautner, have always underscored that the crucial element in Nestroy's writings is his peculiar and revolutionary use of language.[1] The aim of this dissertation is to provide an analysis of individual words, phrases and sentences, of representative characters, and thereby attempt to show that this use of language is the identifying characteristic of Nestroy. However, before such an analysis is undertaken, we will take a brief look at the contemporary theatrical scene in Vienna for the young Nestroy. This will be followed by a detailed analysis of language in several Nestroy plays, which will then be compared to some of the work of Adolf Bäuerle, a major contemporary rival of his. This should help to launch the discussion of the newness of Nestroy's language. In Chapter III several significant components of Nestroy's language, specifically linguistic devices, are identified and critically examined in the language of

Simplicius, who is the protagonist in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel, and in the language of Puffmann and Peter, the two dominant figures in Der Unbedeutende.

The next main section examines, analyzes and interprets in detail the language of one of Nestroy's greatest characters, Titus Feuerfuchs, the flamboyant hero of Der Talisman (1840). This is a work of the mature Nestroy. It is an extended examination because only by means of an exegesis of Titus' language can Nestroy's unique use of language be analyzed. Chapter V will be a succinct summary of the conclusions reached in this dissertation. As length does not permit a demonstration of my theses in extenso, I offer an analysis of representative selections. It is my belief that this selection does not represent an exception in Nestroy's writing, but the norm, and that similar conclusions could be drawn on the basis of a large majority of his plays.

In the course of a century and a half, the works of Nestroy have enjoyed great popularity, and suffered great neglect. He started his career as a singer of classical music, but relatively soon also performed speaking roles, which dominated shortly thereafter. In 1827 he wrote his first play, and continued to write, as well as act in his plays, until his death in 1862. Although extremely popular with the large majority of the Viennese theater patrons, he had a running battle with the censor. His view of the censor perhaps, is best expressed in the following quote: "Ein Zensor ist ein Mensch gewordener Bleistifter oder ein

bleistiftgewordener Mensch, ein fleischgewordener Strich über die Erzeugnisse des Geistes, ein Krokodil, das an den Ufern des Ideenstromes lagert und den darin schwimmenden Literaten die Köpf' abbeisst" (V,152). The first fifty years after his death saw his work all but forgotten. One contributing factor seems to have been the belief that his plays could not successfully be performed without Nestroy starring in them. A second cause was probably the assumption that the plays could be presented favourably only in Vienna. This latter cause in particular severely hindered the performances of his plays in the German speaking areas outside Austria. Fifty years after Nestroy's death, Otto Rommel, and especially Karl Kraus, recognized the timeless and universal qualities of Nestroy's work, and espoused them with greater fervour. The appearance of O. Rommel's and F. Brukner's critical edition of Nestroy's plays in 1924 also contributed to this evergrowing interest in Nestroy's plays, which is indicated in part by the very length of the bibliography in the Appendix of this dissertation.

Chapter I

A. Biographical Background and Critical Literature

Johann Nepomuk Eduard Ambrosius Nestroy was born on December 7, 1801, in the Sternhof, Jordangasse, Vienna during the reign of Francis II. His family originated from a well-to do Viennese upper-middle-class family. The small Czech town of Komotau was the birthplace of his father, a respectable lawyer, who was able to study law in Troppau through the intervention of a relative. Nestroy's parents married in Vienna on October 23, 1799. There were eight children, Johann being the third oldest. His mother died when he was only thirteen. His father was unable to overcome the loss, became increasingly neglectful, and died poor and unhappy.

Nestroy's first school was "Sankt Anna," and it was followed by studies at the "Akademisches Gymnasium" and the "Schottengymnasium." Success at school was irregular. He showed talent, but was uninterested. His success at the university was moderate. He seemed restless and inattentive. It took him four years to complete three philosophy classes. In 1820, he transferred to the faculty of law, but after only two years, distracted by romance and love for music, terminated his studies and turned to singing. His strong interest in music, and his obvious talent, had shown at a relatively young age. When only thirteen, he had performed at a piano concert. When

seventeen, he sang a bass solo in Timotheus. On August 24, 1822, "nach bestandener Prüfung aus dem römischen Rechte" (XV,5), he premiered as Sarastro in Die Zauberflöte at the "Hoftheater" next to the "Kärntnertor." Significantly, Die Zauberflöte remains the one lasting operatic success from the "Wiener Volkstheater." Within the following year, he performed as a singer seventeen times in operettas, and thirty-nine times in operas.

On September 7, 1823, Nestroy married Maria Wilhelmine Phillippine Zwetterlinger. He was twenty-two, and his bride was nineteen. Two days later, the couple left for Amsterdam, where Nestroy sang in the German theater. He was very successful as a singer, but in August, 1825, the theater was closed. Brünn, Czechoslovakia was his next station. There were increasingly more speaking roles, and he began to extemporize, which resulted in a collision course with the censor, a problem which was to plague him for the rest of his life as a writer and actor. He left Brünn because he refused to submit to the authorities and stop extemporizing. The next stop was Graz, where he met Marie Weiler, who was to become the main woman in his life. She has been called his lover, mother, guardian and manager of his estate. The latter was rather significant, since he had numerous affairs and other passions which were costly. It was in Graz in 1827 that his wife Maria had an affair with a Graf Batthany. She left Nestroy and their three-year-old son, Gustav. Yet in 1841, when she was in financial need, he sup-

ported her. However, when she incurred debts in his name, he had a legal divorce in 1845. He paid alimony, but she had to agree to be placed under guardianship, which continued until her death in September, 1870.

By 1827, the speaking roles were in the majority, but even more important, from then until 1862, the year of his death, Nestroy wrote one or more plays every year. His first play, Friedrich, Prinz von Korsika, had been written in about 1822. The following year saw the start of the life-long partnership with Marie Weiler, with whom he had two children, a son, Karl Anton, born on October 3, 1831, and a daughter, Maria Cecilia, born on April 2, 1840. Both were legitimized in February, 1858. Weiler, née Lacher or Lauber, was born on September 13, 1809. Nestroy's relationship with her was, for all intents and purposes, a regular marriage. However, the Church's sanctions were out of the question. In their partnership she was undoubtedly the stronger partner, and, as O. Rommel notes, "Sie beherrschte ihren Gatten, dem das Neinsagen so schwer fiel und das Geld so locker sass . . ."(XV,37). In 1829, Nestroy gave his first guest performance in Vienna in the "Theater in der Josefstadt." The following year he performed again in Vienna, this time in the "Kärntnertor Theater." In 1831, he again returned, and this time signed a contract with Carl.

Although very successful and extremely active, Nestroy still took the time to perform in other German-speaking cultural centers: July 1841 and August 1847 in Hamburg; September

1844, August 1845, July 1847, July 1853 in Berlin; June 1843 in Breslau (Wrocław); September 1845 in Munich; August and September 1847 in Frankfurt, Mainz, Wiesbaden and other German cities (XV,204-05). When Carl died in August 1854, Nestroy leased the "Carl-Theater" and became its director. However, the real business force behind Nestroy was Marie Weiler, as she was in control of his finances. He did deal fairly with the actors, but he was not at all a forceful director. O. Rommel believes this to be due to his lack of will power and reluctance to make decisions (XV,323-24). It was his acting which was undoubtedly the strength which supported Nestroy as a director.

On April 29, 1862, Nestroy gave his last performance. He had retired in 1860, but still performed at times. On May 16, 1862, he did not feel well, but refused to take note. On the eighteenth, his speech began to slur. Five days later his right side was paralyzed, and on the twenty-fifth, at eleven in the morning, he passed away in Graz. The funeral was in Vienna on June 2, 1862. In his will, which was dated January 13, 1861, at Graz, Marie Weiler was the sole heir ("Universal-Erbin"). He was fully aware of the important role she had played in his life, as is noted in part of the will: "Zur Universal-Erbin ernenne ich Frl. Marie Weiler, die treue Freundin meiner Tage, welche durch aufopferndes Wirken das Meiste zur Erwerbung dieses Vermögens beygetragen hat, so zwar, dass ich nicht zu viel sage, wenn ich behaupte, sie hat gegründetere

Ansprüche darauf als ich selbst"(XV, 620-21).

Over a span of thirty-five years--from 1827 to 1862--Nestroy wrote eighty-three plays, the majority of which Rommel has divided into the following categories: fourteen "Zauberspiele," ten parodies, six political comedies, ten "Volksstücke," and thirty-five farces. In the parody Weder Lorbeerbaum noch Bettelstab (1835), Leicht, the hero, explains his goal with "G'fallen sollen meine Sachen, unterhalten, lachen sollen d'Leut, und mir soll die G'schicht' a Geld tragen, dass ich auch lach', das is der ganze Zweck"(III,355-56). This is undoubtedly also part of Nestroy's aim in writing. The fact that he is supposed to have played over eight hundred roles also indicates his devotion to the theater.

After 1850, there was a commercialization of the "Vorstadttheater," a change in the social structure of the audience, and again a stronger intervention by the censor, as well as a decline of the critical components in the "Volkstheater." Operettas were performed more and more, while the "Volkstheater" lost its spontaneity and its audience. After Nestroy's death, his plays seemed to be temporarily forgotten in Vienna. In addition, the "Burgtheater," which had not permitted any of his plays to be performed during his lifetime, did not attempt a performance until 1901, when it presented Lumpazivagabundus (1833). Even then, there were only three performances, after which the play disappeared from its repertoire. In 1913, this theater finally admitted Nestroy, and from that year until 1934,

there were one hundred eighty-five presentations of five comedies. Yet from 1934 to 1937, there was another nadir, with only four performances in the "Burgtheater," four in the "Volkstheater," and twenty-three in the "Akademietheater." During the Nazi period from 1938 to 1945, there was an upswing: the "Akademietheater" had eighty-seven performances, the "Volkstheater" one hundred seventeen, the "Burgtheater" two hundred twenty-one, and the "Bürgertheater" presented Nur keck (1855) three hundred fifty-six times. Ironically, the Nazis thought the Nestroy plays useful, because they might help mollify the Austrians. They also looked upon them as a part of German folk literature.

At the end of World War II, the Communists used Nestroy's plays as a medium for propaganda: "Whereas the Nazis had understressed Nestroy's satire to accomplish their aims, the communists overemphasized his biting wit to achieve their goals, and, as might be expected, all of these productions were heavily laden with communist propaganda."[1]

The years 1946 to 1951 saw again a decline in the performances of Nestroy's plays: the "Volkstheater" had ninety-one, the "Akademietheater" one hundred twenty-three, and the "Burgtheater" had only thirty-nine presentations. But 1952 was definitely a turning point. Since then, Nestroy's plays have experienced a very significant increase in popularity in Vienna and throughout the German-speaking world. Reichert posits that the immediate cause was the work of the gifted Munich director

Axel von Ambesser, who himself was a splendid actor and playwright. Ambesser had read the entire Fackel and thus been greatly influenced by Karl Kraus. Another important factor was of course Kraus himself, 1874-1936, who published the Fackel for thirty-six years, starting in 1899. Kraus's aim was ". . . to expose corruption wherever he found it."[2] For Kraus, Nestroy was one of the greatest satirists, one of world stature, and his own predecessor in Vienna. "But it must not be forgotten that Kraus himself was a gifted satirist, who shared with Nestroy not only his love of words and language, but also his disdain for the low moral standards of his time, his political conservatism, his philosophical pessimism and his satirical reaction to existing conditions."[3]

Kraus exerted greater effort to revive Nestroy, not only by writing about him, but also through his readings, and by modernizing two farces: Die beiden Nachtwandler (1920), and Der konfuse Zauberer (1925). Undoubtedly, Kraus's efforts were eventually successful. Indeed, the original impetus provided by Kraus is still gaining momentum.

Serious and scholarly study of Nestroy's work did not begin until the start of the twentieth century. At that time, the negative criticism outweighed the positive. During the first decade of this century, Nestroy was seen as little more than a precursor of Ludwig Anzengruber, 1839-1889, in the following works: Stefan Hock, Von Raimund bis Anzengruber, and Jacob Zeidler, Die Grundlage von Nestroys literarischer Eigen-

art und Weltanschauung. Furthermore, Nestroy's work was interpreted in reference to the critics' concept of satire, which, if seen as a destructive force, would result in a negative evaluation. An example was Walter Dohn, who in 1912 refers to Nestroy's skill as "Talent des Niederreissens," and calls his couplets "unorganische Einschiebsel."[4]

But also in 1912, fifty years after his death, Karl Kraus and Otto Rommel published their first writings on Nestroy, and both presented a much fuller picture than had been achieved so far: "Beide entwerfen über alle Einzelbeobachtungen hinaus ein Gesamtbild, das Geist und Stil der Komödien Nestroys zum erstenmal in gebührender und objektiver Weise zur Geltung bringt."[5] Karl Kraus, in his essay "Nestroy und die Nachwelt," sees Nestroy's satire originating out of his relationship to the language. Otto Rommel drew the following conclusions: firstly, Nestroy's satirical significance is not confined to the specific locale of Vienna, having instead world-wide applicability. Secondly, the comedy in Nestroy's farces has a "doppelten Boden." It has more than one level of meaning, and comments on much more than the stage situation. Otto Rommel also asserts that Nestroy's "Sprachkunst" had not received proper and worthy study. These examinations by Karl Kraus and Otto Rommel provided the basis for a "literaturwissenschaftliche Nestroyforschung,"[6] and the growing scholarly interest in Nestroy is reflected in the length of the bibliography of the secondary literature.

Of the numerous books written about Nestroy, I have chosen the following three for discussion, because they deal to a certain extent with the author's language. The books are: S. Brill, Die Komödie der Sprache (1967), H. Herles, Nestroys Komödie „Der Talisman" (1974) and J. Hein, Spiel und Satire in der Komödie Nestroys (1970). Brill defines his approach as follows: "Gegenstand meiner Untersuchung ist Nestroys Werk, das heisst: die uns überlieferten Stücke in ihrer Textgestalt."[7] More specifically, he states, "Dagegen soll meine Arbeit allein auf den Text gehen.. . ."[8] Herles seeks to present an analysis of Der Talisman, by showing its developmental stages from Dupeuty's Bonaventure and Nestroy's first drafts to the finished play. One of Herles' main concerns seems to be the author's "Werkstattbereich," because he believes that a full understanding of Nestroy's work can only be achieved if the critic recognizes, ". . . dass Nestroys Sprache in einem Prozess entstanden ist."[9] A result of this process is a change in the quality of the playwright's language. Herles explains:

> Die komödiantischen Elemente in der Sprache werden kräftiger herausgearbeitet, an verschiedenen Stellen wird rhythmisiert, in einigen Sätzen werden parodistische Bezüge eingebaut, in anderen Fällen werden Pausen eingelegt, und damit ist den Spielern mehr Raum für Mimik und Gestik geschaffen. Insgesamt werden die Entwürfe auf dem Weg zum fertigen Stück theatergerechter gemacht, auch rhetorischer und im Fall der Szene des Titus, in dem er dem reichen Onkel sein plötzliches Grauwerden erklärt, auch geschwätziger. Im allgemeinen gewinnen die

> Entwürfe jedoch dadurch, dass Nestroy bewusst seine Sprache Bedürfnissen des Theaters unterwirft."[10]

Herles, whose book appeared seven years later than Brill's, is critical of the latter for being concerned only with the final versions of Nestroy's plays, and, therefore, according to Herles, unaware of the growth of the language: "Die Qualitätsänderungen, die die Sprache Nestroys im Laufe ihrer Herausbildung erfährt, können sie nicht erkennen, da sie die Vorstufen nicht beobachtet haben. Sie gehen von endgültigen Gebilden aus, Brill noch dazu nur von 'Texten'."[11]

It would appear that Herles' assertion would be valid only if a particular critic specifically chose to introduce or base his argumentation on the plays' various stages of development. Brill clearly states that he works strictly with the texts, not with any intermediary phase of Nestroy's language, but exclusively with the final versions. This is also the aim of this thesis. It is, after all, the text as we know it today which Nestroy wanted to have performed. Furthermore, the importance the author attributed to any intermediary stage is unknown to us. Also, one might argue, those parts which have been deleted--whatever the reason might be--Nestroy thought not to be as suitable as the text which still stands. Therefore, they would seem to be insignificant. Thus, it would appear that Herles' argument does not concern a critic who professes to be dealing strictly with an analysis of the text as language.

Furthermore, adherence to Herles' position would inevitably result in an analysis which would gravitate towards an examination which deals with the study and comparison of the various drafts, and thus would deviate from an analysis of the text as such. The approach to, and goal of this thesis is not the study of the various developmental stages of the language. Instead, it tries to identify and analyze specific linguistic devices which, I believe, provide one valid key to the understanding of Nestroy's plays.

According to Brill, the fundamental nature of Nestroy's plays lies in their "Sprachkomik," in which the comedy is the result of the language itself. In the section entitled "Die Sprache Nestroys unter dem Einfluss der Sprachkomik," Brill sees Nestroy as using language as a "Gegenstand", "Sie [Sprache] wird konsequent als ein Gegenstand gebraucht.. . ."[12] Brill agrees with Otto Rommel, whom he quotes: "Sinnerfüllte Worte . . . haben für Nestroys Sprachgefühl offenbar etwas Gegenständliches. Er kann sich an ihnen freuen, kann sie wählerisch und wählend nebeneinanderlegen wie ein Augenkünstler farbige Stoffe"(XV,286). However, Brill believes to have gone beyond Rommel:

> Zwar ist es richtig, dass Nestroy die Sprache als einen Gegenstand handhabt; doch mit der zum Gegenstand gemachten Sprache verhält es sich prinzipiell anders als mit farbigen Stoffen, die ich ‚wählerisch und wählend' nebeneinanderlege. Die Vorstellung eines im Grunde kindlichnaiven Umganges mit Sprache, welcher in ihr schöne bunte Gegenstände sieht, die lustvolle Empfindungen zu wecken

> vermögen, ist kein angemessenes Analogen dessen, was in der Sprachkomik Nestroys wirklich vor sich geht. Die in ihr zum Gegenstand gemachte Sprache ist zugleich auch die Aufhebung ihrer Gegenständlichkeit. Diese Dialektik, die es im Bereich farbiger Stoffe nicht gibt, wohl aber im Bereich der Sprache, bleibt bei O. Rommel unerkannt."[13]

Herles takes exception to this position when he comments about Salome in Act I, Scene iii, and points out that Salome in her loneliness does not succumb to despair. Instead, she reflects on her situation. This, and her basic inner strength, help her come to terms with the problem of prejudice. Herles then continues:

> Das hat Konsequenzen für die Sprache. Salome spricht zwar nicht naiv, dennoch treffen Brills Thesen auf sie nicht zu. Bei ihr ist von verdinglichter Sprache nichts zu spüren. Sie wird, ähnlich wie bestimmte Frauen- und Jünglingsgestalten Schillers, in einer extremen Situation zu einer poetischen Sprache fähig."[14]

Herles, however, does not continue to illustrate his point with further analysis of the language. Instead, he turns to a comparison between Salome and Jeanne, her counterpart in <u>Bonaventure</u>.

Brill sees in Nestroy's language a dialectic. Because of this "Sprachdialektik," the author's plays are pregnant with meaning: "Die Stücke sind nämlich angefüllt mit Meinungen."[15] Certainly this is true. Yet it should also be underscored that the basic building blocks for this are--at least to a

large extent--the multi-levelled meaning of numerous key words and phrases, as will be shown later in this thesis. The meanings elicited by these key words and phrases provide the foundation for such broad topics as marriage and love, as well as fate and happiness.

As he pursues his line of reasoning in reference to the "Entgegenständlichung der Sprache,"[16] Brill makes the following statement:

> Tatsächlich bekämpfen sich die Figuren der Stücke mit Worten. Das Verhalten zueinander ist 'sprachlich-antagonistisch'. Gestalten wie Titus Feuerfuchs, Sebastian Faden, Lips, Ultra und andere sind 'Worthelden' (nicht im Sinne des Sykophanten), welche die Sprache als Waffe führen, um sich durchzusetzen - denen das Schlagwort ein Wort zum Schlagen ist. [17]

Brill's observation intimates that there is no physical violence in Nestroy's plays--instead, any hostility is verbalized. This I concur with, but I do believe a significant result of this "hostility," which is a basic aspect of Nestroy's use of language, must be noted at this point. Characters like Puffmann and Titus, and Dickkopf in <u>Heimliches Geld und heimliche Liebe</u> (1853), experience that language used by them as a weapon against others invariably acts as a boomerang, in that it turns on them. The audience soon realizes this. The language of the above mentioned figures, and that of others, develops into a linguistic web, in which the speakers themselves are trapped in the end. Thus, although Brill notes, "Nestroys Sprache spielt nicht nur mit dem einzelnen Wort;

wichtiger noch ist sein Spiel mit der Phrase,"[18] he does not analyze the result for the speaker. Ultimately, it must be noted, that those who seek to manipulate language, in order to manipulate those around them, are themselves manipulated by language. I believe this to be a crucial message inherent in Nestroy's language. F.H. Mautner, in his book entitled Nestroy, seems to imply this, at least in part, when he states, "Zweifach ist so die Haltung seiner Figuren zur Sprache; die im Leben Überlegenen spielen mit ihr - scherzend, angreifend, vernichtend -, und sie spielt mit den Kurzsichtigen, den Dummen und Schlechten, sie spielt ihnen mit."[19] Still, F.H. Mautner, too, does not make the definite point that all those, not merely the stupid, short-sighted and bad who play with language, become in the end the victims of their own linguistic habits. Cleverness or foolishness seem to be irrelevant. Neither Brill nor Mautner appear to point this out.

With regard to the dialectic of Nestroy's language, Brill makes the following statement, "Die Entgegenständlichung der Sprache ist es, die - im Sinne einer Kraus'schen Formulierung - den Gedanken abwirft."[20] This aspect of Nestroy's language, I believe, is indeed significant, and, as I will demonstrate later, may be seen concretely in various linguistic devices, which will be analyzed in Chapters III and IV.

Brill writes further, "Indem nämlich die Sprache über sich selbst aussagt, sagt sie, wenn sie sprachlich genommen wird, auch über das aus, was sie vermittelt, das Gemeinte."[21] This

seems to imply that "how" something is said is of crucial importance in analyzing "what" is said. It is this approach which I employ in my analysis. As a result, I have come to identify significant linguistic elements as the fundamental components which constitute the essence of the playwright's language. Whereas Brill relates all his arguments to what he defines as "Sprachkomik," I seek to gain a general understanding of Nestroy, specifically through the examination of the basic constituents of his language.

In reference to language, one of Brill's central arguments deals with what he calls the "Bewusstheit der Sprache."[22] He says, "Die Bewusstheit, das heisst: der selbstreflektierende Charakter der Nestroyschen Sprache, der jede Unmittelbarkeit zum Gemeinten tilgt, ist das entscheidende Ergebnis meiner Analyse."[23] Brill sees the consciousness of language and its self-reflection as inextricably tied to the comedy, which is inherent throughout Nestroy's works. This quality of the playwright's language has been underscored by Karl Kraus, whose statements also provided part of the impetus for this dissertation. Trying to go beyond Brill, I have attempted to provide specific linguistic examples which support Kraus's axiomatic statement, "Nestroy ist der erste deutsche Satiriker, in dem sich die Sprache Gedanken macht über die Dinge."[24] The seven linguistic devices--sometimes individually, sometimes in combination with others--result in language moving beyond the authority of the speaker. I have literally taken the author at his word.

At this time, Herles' most significant criticism of Brill should be noted, namely, his adamant stance that language itself does not create language, but rather, "Das Spiel der Figuren im Szenarium drängt den Autor zur Formulierung,"[25] and, "Dieser Text ist aus der Handlung erwachsen, die er zuvor im Szenarium inszeniert hatte."[26] Furthermore, Herles insists, "Denn über allen Arbeiten an der Sprache, allen Einfällen, genügt dem Autor die reine Sprache nicht."[27] This appears to be in direct contrast to Kraus's statement, "Denn aus dem Wort springt mir der junge Gedanke entgegen und formt rückwirkend die Sprache, die ihn schuf."[28] Herles is convinced that already, in the scenario and the drafts, the peculiarities of Nestroy's style are apparent. In his conclusion, Herles reiterates the importance of the staging, and refers specifically to Brill, "Diese Bedeutung der ‚Inszenierung' für Nestroys Werk ist bisher nicht gesehen worden, weder von Brill für die ‚Genesis' der Nestroyschen Sprache.. . ."[29] If a critic is concerned about the genesis of Nestroy's language, then Herles' position is valid. If, however, a critic is strictly concerned with a textual analysis of the definitive version, this version alone should be seen as entirely adequate. In fact, if one deals with all intermediary steps, one inevitably analyzes also those parts Nestroy himself ultimately rejected. This could well lead to speculation why certain parts were deleted, and others not, which could hardly contribute further revealing knowledge.

Although Herles' argumentation and findings have un-

doubtedly contributed to an increased understanding of Nestroy's plays, the implication the critic makes, that studies dealing with the language must consider all stages of development in order to be valid, is bound to raise doubts. The vitality of Nestroy's language, which continuously opens up further denotation and connotations beyond the immediate and concrete situation--as will be argued in this dissertation, does not depend on an exegesis of the different developmental stages, nor upon the original "Inszenierung." Instead, it must be argued that once Nestroy had formulated the final version, it seemed to possess a life of its own, which is manifested, at least in part, in its linguistic devices. Although my initial position is similar to that of Brill, I have gone beyond him in certain areas which I felt were significant.

In his book Spiel und Satire in der Komödie Johann Nestroys, Jürgen Hein seeks to undertake, "Die Untersuchung zur Struktur der Nestroyschen Komödien.. . ."[30] He also seeks to come to terms with the essence and structure of Nestroy's farces. The second section of Part Two (42-74), entitled "Die Sprache," contains several positions bearing some relevance to my dissertation. Hein's first point deals with dialect and "Hochdeutsch", "Die verschiedenen Möglichkeiten der Sprache zwischen Dialekt und Hochdeutsch werden für die Komödie und die Charakterisierung ihrer Figuren nutzbar gemacht."[31] It would seem that Hein is far too general here, particularly when several paragraphs later he notes, "Die Differenzierung in Sprachebenen vermag sowohl

'gesellschaftliche Schichtungen,' wie die Spielfähigkeit der Figuren sichtbar zu machen."[32]

"Sprachebenen" may certainly reflect such aspects as occupation and social position, but more important is the recognition that a character's basic nature may be mirrored by his language. By this I do not mean "Sprachebenen," but unique language habits and patterns which, I believe, act as a thumbprint, that is, indicate the speaker's fundamental character traits.

A different facet of the above consideration may be seen in the following comment by Hein:

> Die Redensarten geben einen Einblick in den Grad der Fehleinschätzung der Possenfiguren. In ihrem leitmotivischen Anklingen in der Komödie spiegeln sie zumeist die Unveränderlichkeit der Figuren in ihrer Haltung zu sich und der Welt. Diese 'Unverbesserlichkeit' ist ein Grundzug der Nestroyschen Komödie.[33]

I can endorse this up to a point, particularly in reference to "Unveränderlichkeit," however, the critic re-designates this as "Unverbesserlichkeit." Thus, he makes a change that covers only a part of what I consider to be a very significant theme in Nestroy's work. I refer to this as the unchangeability factor, which includes all of Nestroy's figures, be it Simplicius in <u>Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel</u>, or Puffmann in <u>Der Unbedeutende</u>, or Titus in <u>Der Talisman</u>. When Hein stresses "Unverbesserlichkeit," he seems to refer only to those characters who are in need of "Besserung." However, I believe that

a far more fundamental consideration in this area is the characters' unchangeability, to which all must necessarily succumb. Furthermore, and closely tied to this argument, is the thumbprinting nature of language. Just as a character's thumbprint remains fixed, so do his language habits. These in turn reflect the unchangeability of his basic self. I must also add that language habits, as I see them, are not merely "Redensarten" and "Sprichwörter"--terms that Hein uses--but include a character's total language use. This would seem to be in direct contrast to Hein, who states, "Die Sprache steht stets im Dienst komisierender Formung und Charakteristik, sie kann also keine ‚psychologisch getreue Abbildung innerer Vorgänge' der Figuren leisten."[34] In Chapter III of this dissertation, the argument is put forth that language indeed reflects the fundamental traits of Nestroy's characters.

There is one further view about language expressed by Hein which causes doubt, namely his claim, "Sie vermag mit der Sprache zu spielen, weil sie sie beherrscht, und sie kann daher auch mit denen spielen, die die Sprache nicht beherrschen."[35] This may be true of some "Zentralfiguren," but certainly not all--Titus is a notable exception. As shown in Chapter IV, Parts Two and Three, language ultimately plays with those who believe they control it, and therefore, can play with it. Playing with language really means manipulating it, usually for selfish reasons. This is also seen in the case of Puffmann, who, although not a main character, certainly is a master in

playing with language. He is one example of a figure who controls language, but in the end, finds himself caught in a linguistic web of his own making. It would seem that in Nestroy's plays, language--irrespective of who uses it--holds an element of danger for the speaker, because he does not really control it, even though he thinks he does. It would appear to me that Hein only touches upon this aspect of language, and does not provide a full analysis. Whereas Herles works with only one particular play, and whereas Brill states, "Beschränkung auf einige wenige Stücke ist unumgänglich,"[36] F.H. Mautner, in his book Nestroy, implies that a valid understanding of the playwright can come only from a study of all of his works. It is primarily the opening section, entitled "Das Werk," which has relevance to my dissertation, since it concentrates on the linguistic, as well as the theatrical elements of the plays.

A crucial statement in this part is Mautner's emphasis on the "Wortspiel": "Das Wortspiel ist die Schwelle, über die man in die Geistigkeit der Komödie Nestroys eintritt. . ."[37] One particular facet of the "Wortspiel" may be seen in the following comment by Mautner: "Nestroys typische Wortspiele sind ein Niederschlag von Nestroys immer wachem Bewusstsein vom vielfachen Sinn eines Wortes oder einer Wendung. . ."[38] Although the term "Wortspiel" can well be used regarding Nestroy's unique and revolutionary use of language, "Spiel" should not be seen as intimating merely playfulness or frivolity of

language. Instead, it reflects the ease and skill with which Nestroy uses language, as he elicits a spectrum of shades of meaning from individual words and phrases, because of their particular combinations, juxtapositions and context. It is this aspect which is stressed throughout my dissertation.

Mautner espouses the view that Nestroy has a special relationship to, and understanding of words, "Worte sind ihm nicht neutrale Begriffsträger, sondern als gedankenspiegelnde, gedankenträchtige, gedankenformende ‚Wörter' Quelle, Ursprung des Denkens."[39] This echoes Kraus's position, "Denn aus dem Wort springt mir der junge Gedanke entgegen und formt rückwirkend die Sprache, die ihn schuf."[40] In my analysis, I support Mautner's argumentation, in that I identify and analyze specific, concrete, individual linguistic devices. One of these devices is the boomerang effect of single words and phrases. Mautner appears to suspect this aspect of Nestroy's language, although he does not define it specifically, "Nestroy macht sich auch oft den Spass, aus den Reden der Einfaltspinsel, ihnen unbewusst, die Wirklichkeit hervorleuchten zu lassen."[41] He then quotes Spund, one of the figures in Der Talisman, " . . . aber, wie sie waren in unserer Familie, haben wir alle braune Haar' g'habt, lauter dunkle Köpf', kein lichter Kopf zu finden . . . und der Bub' untersteht sich und kommt rotschädlet auf d'Welt"(X,462). Here the significant aspect of the language is surely the fact that language betrays the foolishness of the speaker--that is, the words have a boomerang effect. The

speaker seeks to be critical of someone else, yet the audience immediately recognizes that these words revert back on him, and develop a critical attitude to him, in spite of the fact that he aimed his words at another character.

I would like to go back to the Mautner quotation, in which he uses the adjectives "gedankenspiegelnde," "gedankenträchtige" and "gedankenformende," because they lead to a further aspect of Nestroy's language, one that Mautner does not stress. I argue, through the identification and analysis of linguistic devices, that language evades the conscious control of the speaker, and operates in different ways from those intended by him. Thus, as it were, it takes on a life of its own, outside the controlling mind which conceived it. Consequently, the meaning of key expressions, as intended by the speaker, frequently does not coincide with the meaning conceived in the minds of the spectators.

Mautner also notes that Nestroy possesses such a sensitive and perceptive ear in reference to language that he invariably identifies and ridicules those language patterns which have lost their vitality, and have, in fact, become lifeless, "Nestroy hat die erstarrten Phrasen der gesellschaftlichen Konversation, der routinierten Literatur, des Militärismus, des konventionellen Ehrenkodex, der Bürokratie, des Nationalismus immer wieder mit harmlosem Gesicht dem Gelächter preisgegeben."[42] I have come to regard this as one of the basic areas where Nestroy departs radically from the other

writers of the Viennese Popular Theater. In my argument, I compare Nestroy's language to that of Adolf Bäuerle, a popular contemporary author of Nestroy. In this comparison, Nestroy's sharp deviation from the traditional use of language becomes obvious, and it may be seen as symbolic of his break with many traditionally accepted modes of thought.

Related to the ideas expressed in the previous paragraph is Mautner's following statement, "Nestroys Geist war satirisch gestimmt, sein Gefühl für sprachliche Leere und Trug als häufiger Ausdruck innerer Leere und Trugs äusserst empfindlich."[43] I argue that, irrespective of whether a figure is honest and upright, or false and deceptive, his language acts as a thumbprint, and once he has spoken, his language patterns tend to remain fixed.

There is one further linguistic aspect noted by Mautner, to which I want to address myself, "Die Vielfalt einander unterstützender sprachlicher Kunstgriffe auf engstem Raum macht immer wieder Nestroys Stil so dicht, geistig und ästhetisch so befriedigend."[44] Certainly this is true. However, another facet must be mentioned, not only because it is related to the one Mautner observes, but because I believe it to be very significant. This device I call the echo of words and phrases. Here, related expressions in the text support and buttress each other. These function not only "auf engstem Raum," but in different parts of the same scene, the same play, and even in different plays. Echo words constitute a sort of language gridiron,

which indirectly relates all of Nestroy's plays. In this gridiron, individual echo words are the connecting links. Generally, I concur with Mautner's position and findings. However, I shift the emphasis in the argument, and stress further aspects.

We now turn our attention to Nestroy's writing, and introduce it via the method of analysis used throughout the dissertation.

B. Methodology of Approach

> Ich bin der Kolumbus einer neuen Methode.
>
> Nestroy, "Aphorismus 169."

"Nestroy beim Wort genommen" is a suitable motto for the method of analysis to be employed in this dissertation. The meaning of this world view is to be derived through an examination of Nestroy's peculiar use of language. Therefore, the method of expression will serve as the primary basis of analysis, in the attempt to identify and elucidate some essential components of Nestroy's language. Some of the major linguistic developments this dissertation will attempt to distill are: a) the reversal of the given understanding of "Sprichwörter"; b) the shaky foundation of words; c) the ingeminating feature of particular words and phrases, and d) the tendency of language eventually to manipulate its manipulator. Ultimately, there is the realization of the potentiality of language drifting away from the speaker's apparent control.

Language, be it silent or oral, is the most important communicative form of thought, and, according to Kraus, language provides the impetus for thought, namely, initial thought. However, simultaneously, thought creates the language out of which it was born. Kraus posits, "Denn aus dem Wort springt mir der junge Gedanke entgegen und formt rückwirkend die Sprache, die ihn schuf."[45] It must be pointed out that the sphere of thought and language is an extremely complicated one, and that increasing attention has been given to it by linguists. However, in order not to go beyond the limits of this dissertation, specific references are made only to Kraus. Thus, language and thought are totally interdependent, or, to quote Kraus again, "Sprechen und Denken sind eins. . ."[46]

The following brief analysis consists of examples of some of the aforementioned essential linguistic components, and serves as an introduction to the method of analysis to be applied in detail throughout the remainder of this study. That is, it presents, as it were, a microcosm of what follows in the ensuing pages.

Nestroy's use of specific words evokes images which echo and buttress ideas brought out by other similar words. These ideas might represent themes, or deal with the nature of a certain character, or, in fact, do both. The following are two brief quotations from Die schlimmen Buben in der Schule (1847). Wampl, the teacher, is examining Willibald, the son of Frau Schnabel, who is at the school, and insists that her son be

given a prize, a demand which infuriates Wampl. One of the questions he asks is: "Was ist die Erde?"(XIII,224). Willibald answers, "Ein Himmelskörper, auf dem die Unglücklichen ein höllisches Leben haben"(XIII,224). On the one hand, it is quite apparent that this is not the kind of answer the teacher is expecting, since it is not a scientific one. On the other hand, even though it is an evaluative response, referring to the ambiguities and miseries of human existence, it is a far more pertinent comment, from a human point of view, than one consisting merely of scientific facts. In Willibald's reply, two words stand out, because they represent a sharp antithesis, namely, "Himmelskörper" and "höllisch." The term "Himmelskörper" can indeed be a synonym for "Erde," and if Willibald had only given it in answer, Wampl could not have faulted him, as he does now. However, the term "Himmel" inevitably evokes traditional thought patterns--that is, images of beauty and perfection in all areas the human mind can imagine, and, by association, some aspects of this beauty and perfection are seen as supposedly also existing on earth, because earth is a "Himmelskörper." Such thinking Willibald explodes with the adjective "höllisches," which forms a polarity with "Himmel." Thus, existence on earth is a hellish one.

The inhabitants of the "Himmelskörper" are referred to as "Unglückliche." Again, in traditional thinking, existence on a "Himmelskörper," because of the intimations projected by "Himmel," should be one marked by bliss and serenity. But such

thinking, too, is shown as false by the designation "Unglückliche." According to commonly accepted beliefs, there would only be "Unglückliche" in hell. It, however, is seen in a different realm than earth. But Willibald's answer posits that life on earth, for which "Himmelskörper" may well be a synonym, is really hell, and man is seen as "ein Unglücklicher." This emphasizes man's misery, and exposes the images of bliss and serenity as non-existent on the so-called "Himmelskörper," which constitutes man's home.

In the play Höllenangst (1849), some of Wendelin's words are a strong echo of Willibald's comments above. Wendelin is unemployed, and has no hope of finding work. He says to Eva, his mother, "Meiner Seel', ich halt' schon auf die andre Welt auch nix mehr"(V,329). But Eva admonishes him, "Frevel nit, Sohnerl, die andre Welt is ja die bess're Welt"(V,329). Wendelin, however, is adamant: "Mein Gott, sie kann zehnmal besser sein, und 's is erst noch nicht viel dran"(V,329). It seems that Eva and Wendelin are examples of the "Unglückliche" noted by Willibald. Wendelin's first comment above, although not referring directly to this life, nevertheless criticizes it severely, and thus echoes Willibald's "höllisches Leben." In the statement, " . . . ich halt' schon auf die andre Welt auch nix mehr," the phrase "auch nix mehr" clearly indicates the disdain for this world of "ein Unglücklicher." Eva conveys the traditional view, when she insists that the other world is the better one. Wendelin's retort, particularly the

words "sie kann zehnmal besser sein," reiterates his view of this world as being an extremely miserable place of existence for man. He thereby echoes again Willibald's statement. But especially damning of this world is a comment from his monologue, which precedes the dialogue with his mother. There, he laments, "Ich hätt' sollen gar nie in d' Wirklichkeit kommen . . ."(V,328). Here, the term "Wirklichkeit" deserves special attention, because it is synonymous, firstly, with "diese Welt," implied when he says "die andre Welt," and secondly, with "Himmelskörper" which, in turn, is closely related to "höllisches Leben." Thus, the negative images evoked by "höllisches Leben" also relate to "Wirklichkeit." They are echoed by the latter term, and ultimately, "Himmelskörper," "Unglücklichen," "höllisches Leben," "Wirklichkeit," as well as "diese Welt," which is implied, reverberate each other, thereby buttressing the thought projected by each of these terms. Consequently, these words are in a reciprocal relationship of ideas. Such created reciprocity, and the echo words which are responsible for it, are to be found throughout Nestroy's plays, and are one reason for the strong effect of his language. In this manner, the language, specifically key expressions and phrases, acts like a gridiron, with all components interconnected, where the intermediate spaces provide the appropriate areas in which the themes are developed. Because of such interrelations, images are evoked and resonated off different parts of this gridiron. Whenever this occurs, a particular theme is further elucidated.

Thus, Nestroy's language, as it were, supports itself without a conscious effort by the speaker. The audience soon recognizes these patterns. Frequently, Nestroy uses expressions--individual words or phrases--which project more than one meaning. Thus, they possess a plurisignation quality. Although the speaker may not be aware of the various connotations, the audience will soon come to anticipate, and to recognize them. The following is a brief interchange between Kern, Regine and Gabriel in Der alte Mann mit der jungen Frau (1849).[47] Regine, who had been absent when Kern arrived home, explains where she and Rehfeld had been, "Wir sind auf den Fichtenhügel gefahren"(V,471). Kern interrupts, "Auf'n Fichtenhügel? Aha -"(V,472). The "Aha" indicates a certain amount of suspicion. This is inevitably increased by Gabriel's, "Der Herr Baron wird g'wiss eine Überraschung g'macht haben mit einem Sonnenuntergang"(V,472). Gabriel's interrupting, and his choice of words insinuate that Regine has been unfaithful. The word "Überraschung" also relates to the fact that Regine went out with Rehfeld, came home late, and unexpectedly found Kern had returned. Furthermore, "Überraschung" was also what Kern experienced when he came home and found his wife had gone out. Thus, both spouses are "überrascht," and unpleasantly so. The term "überrascht" describes not only this particular moment for Kern and his wife, but is also a succinct description of the tenuous relationship between the two.

The thumbprinting quality of Nestroy's language has its

basis in the Krausian notion already mentioned, namely, that language and thought are one. Since language is thought in verbal form, a rigorous, critical examination of a person's language habits must inevitably lead to a thorough understanding of his basic nature. Such an approach to Nestroy's work is appropriate because the quiddity of his plays lies in their language rather than in the plot and action, which were usually borrowed, in any case. Thus, plot and action will be considered only secondarily. Of foremost concern will be the specific manner and choice of words used by the characters, namely, their peculiar language habits. We shall then attempt to show, " . . . the meaning of a linguistic expression as a function of the way in which it is used by the speaker."[48] By examining this manner, we hope to arrive at an explanation of Nestroy's unique quality. Such an explanation would seem to be more accurate than one arrived at through an investigation that would accept language only as a medium, and not as the nucleus of the meaning projected. There exists a very close and intricate relationship between thought and language and action. Consequently, a thought is not complete unless it has been molded into words, even though in this process, part of the original concept may be modified, perhaps entirely lost, "Denken und Sprechen hängen . . . miteinander notwendig zusammen. Die Existenz des einen setzt die des anderen voraus. Es gibt weder ein Sprechen ohne Denken, noch ein Denken ohne Sprache."[49] Therefore, a probing investigation into a par-

ticular character's language habits and patterns, its composition, constancy and variation, will help expose his basic nature, and, thereby, lead toward a meaningful understanding of them. Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin note this in their recent book on the foundation of L. Wittgenstein's linguistic philosophy, "Here, in the plays of Nestroy, one can understand the Krausian notion that the 'language' of the satirist attains the 'origin', as it lays bare the moral character of the person who speaks."[50]

The thumbprinting by language can also be referred to as the self-unmasking of a character, particularly if he is a pernicious one, as in the case with Gabriel, already mentioned above. Gabriel's first appearance is accompanied by the following stage direction, "in ärgerlicher Aufregung" (V,450). His opening commentary deals directly with the marriage of Kern and Regine, especially with the latter's extra-marital activities:

> Na ja, das wär's Wahre, Visiten machen bei der Frau, wenn der Mann verreist is. Ich bin a alter Diener, ich muss ja schau'n auf mein'n Herrn seine Frau. 's is ja gar aus der Weis'. Wenn eine einmal ein'n Mann hat, so is sie für die Männerwelt so viel als wie gar nicht auf der Welt. Aber das wollen sie nicht einsehn, die G'schwufen. (V,450-51)

Firstly, he is angry, which is his usual disposition; secondly, he clearly betrays his position toward Regine specifically, and wives in general. His first sentence introduces doubts and suspicions about Regine, and thereby unmasks him as a virulent member of this household. He sees himself as "ein alter Diener,"

whose responsibility it is to spy on the wife of his master, but more important is the intimation that because he is old, he has certain rights and privileges. The last two sentences are very significant, because the position he expresses here is totally in opposition to his later attitude and behaviour toward Theres. It may well be that wives are "für die Männerwelt so viel als wie gar nicht auf der Welt," but do other men, such as Gabriel, abide by this rule? As the play develops, Rehfeld, and Gabriel himself, ignore this position. Thus, Gabriel's first commentary shows him to be extremely critical toward a particular kind of behaviour in women.

In the following scene, he has a confrontation with Frau Strunk, who questions the amount of work he does. He immediately retorts:

> Was ich tu'? Erlauben Sie mir, ich bin ein alter Diener; in der Fruh' schau' ich auf alles, unter Tags tu' ich wieder auf alles schau'n und auf d'Nacht leg' ich mich nicht eher nieder, bis ich nicht auf alles g'schaut hab'. (V,452-53)

He reiterates that he is "ein alter Diener," implying that he should not be expected to do much. The work consists solely of "schau' ich auf alles." He is only watching, that is, just spying to satisfy his curiosity. His presence, therefore, is of no particular benefit. Instead, one might posit, it is detrimental. So far, Gabriel has unmasked himself as one who, because of his age and long years of service in the Kern household, believes to have special privileges, which are: spy on his young mistress; not do any work; and, say what he

pleases, even to Regine. An example of the latter is seen when he confronts her for not treating Theres, Anton's wife, as a friend. When Regine becomes angry and says, "Ich will nicht hoffen -," he breaks in, "Ich bin ein alter Diener, von mir darf Ihnen nix beleidigen"(V,454). Here, too, he hides behind his shield of "alter Diener."

But it is with Theres that Gabriel unmasks himself to an even greater extent. Theres notes about Kern in reference to Regine: "Er ist glücklich mit ihr, weil sie seine Lieb' mit kindlicher Verehrung lohnt"(V,457). But Gabriel is quick to point out:

> Larifari! Verehrung -! Er will Liebe. Lernen Sie mir die alten Herren kennen. Ich bin zwar nur ein alter Diener - aber die Gefühle bleiben sich gleich und werden im Alter noch heftiger, weil sie keine rechte Erwiderung finden! Das is grad als wie einer, der einen Hering isst und nix z'trinken kriegt. (V,457-58)

The concluding sentence marks his feeling very clearly--he feels very passionate, but no-one returns his feelings. His use of the words "Hering" and "nix z'trinken kriegt," underscore the sensual elements in man, which, as he notes before, "werden im Alter noch heftiger." Theres' objection "Sein Verstand muss ja aber doch-," he cuts off with, "Ich bitt Ihnen, reden Sie mir nichts von Verstand; Wein und Schnopftabak, das sind noch die einzigen Besänftigungsmittel für das ewig junge Herz"(V,458). Gabriel rejects outright the power of intervention by "Verstand." Instead, the drugs of alcohol and nicotine are used to calm what he calls the young heart, namely, the senses.

The words "das ewig junge Herz" reiterate his following statement: "Aber die Gefühle bleiben sich gleich und werden im Alter noch heftiger." Gabriel has, of course, been talking about Kern. However, this is not a proper description of the latter, rather a self-unmasking of the speaker, who projects his attitude onto Kern. More important, however, Gabriel's remarks must also be seen as a veiled pass at Theres. She quickly recognizes that Gabriel, pretending to talk about Kern, is himself like that. But the servant objects:

> Ja bei mir is das was anderes. Meinem Herrn liegt 's G'schäft am Herzen, Staatspapier' stecken ihm in Kopf, aber bei mir war nur Mädl immer das höchste. Aber allemal haben sich riesengrosse Hindernisse gezeigt. Erst heuer hat mich eine ang'schmiert, die vorig's Jahr noch meine Geliebte war. (V,458)

He sees Kern as having more important matters on his mind than his wife, whereas, for him, girls were always more important than all else. Still, there were "riesengrosse Hindernisse," despite the fact that "die Gefühle im Alter noch heftiger werden," and even though the heart was "ewig jung." Gabriel does not specify what the "riesengrosse Hindernisse" are, but they do seem to imply that his strong emotions and young heart were perhaps not quite as strong and young as he claimed them to be. His last lover deceived him, and chose one he describes as follows, "Und wenn Sie denjenigen säheten, wegen dem sie mich - ja, ich lüg' nicht, aber drei solche macht man aus mir - und dennoch-"(V,458). Clearly, his lover thought the other man better,

otherwise she would not have left Gabriel. Therefore, Gabriel's evaluation of the other is in all probability a lie, and by insisting, "ich lüg' nicht," he unmasks the fact that he is lying. Then the question arises as to whether he has told the truth before about Kern's behaviour. This does not seem likely. Furthermore, in the future, his veracity will always be in doubt whenever he comments on the nature and behaviour of others.

Theres feels sorry for Gabriel, and does not recognize his ulterior motive when he expresses his concern about the manner in which Regine treats her. She thanks him, saying, "Sie meinen es gut mit mir - reichen Sie mir die Hand"(V,459). His answer is, "Jetzt? - (Für sich) Er lebt ja noch"(V,459). He interprets her action as an advance, because this is what he is wishing for, and, thereby, he discloses himself again. As before, in his comment about Kern, Gabriel, here too, projects his attitude onto others, thereby unmasking himself repeatedly through his particular choice of words, simultaneously underlining the fact that he continues to be what he is.

Theres senses something strange in his reply, and asks, "Was haben S' denn?" to which Gabriel answers:

> Skrupeln...Ihr Mann is auf der Festung, folglich moralisch tot, also darf sie mich moralisch lieben. Nur heiraten, das geht nicht, da müssen wir doch warten, bis er ganz tot is. Es ist gewiss auch mein Wunsch - aber Ihr Mann -." (V,459)

Above, it was noted that Gabriel projected his attitude onto others, but in the opening of his quotation, the reverse occurs.

That is, he asserts that he has scruples, but his commentary about Regine, then about Kern, and now his attitude toward Theres, prove this to be incorrect. Theres, however, does have scruples--in fact, she is totally committed to her husband, even though she has no hope of seeing him for the next fifteen years. Thus, his claim to possess scruples only underscores that he does not have any at all. Gabriel then continues, as he notes to himself, "Ihr Mann ist auf der Festung, folglich moralisch tot." The conclusion that he draws about Anton has a definite boomerang effect, in that Gabriel's past remarks have been immoral--he is the one who is "moralisch tot." It was already noted that he lacks scruples, and now he unwittingly draws attention to the fact that he lacks morals.

Gabriel continues his bizarre reasoning, ". . . folglich ist er moralisch tot, also darf sie mich moralisch lieben." Because of his actions, Anton has been apprehended. Therefore, Gabriel claims, Anton has acted immorally, and is "moralisch tot." The morals that condemned Anton now permit Theres to love him. According to Gabriel, marriage is not possible "bis er ganz tot is." By saying this, he betrays his impatience in the matter, and unmasks his own shortcomings even more. He immediately reiterates this by concluding, "Es ist gewiss auch mein Wunsch - aber Ihr Mann -." The expression "mein Wunsch" refers directly back to "bis er ganz tot is." At this point, Gabriel's basic nature has been unveiled to a large extent through his various comments, in a way that has shown a definite

increase in the degree of his shortcomings.

One further quotation by Gabriel, this one from Act IV, will not only reiterate his past attitude and behaviour, but also underscore his unchangeability. Several factors have combined in contributing toward his hostility directed at Kern. He then comes upon Regine, Frau Strunk, Spitz, Schreyer and Agathe, who are in the process of discussing Regine's divorce from Kern. Gabriel believes to have damaging information about Kern when he asserts, "Ich bin ein erbärmlicher Liebhaber, die Theres is a falsche Katz' und der Herr von Kern is ein heimlicher Sünderer"(V,503). In the first statement, the words "erbärmlicher Liebhaber" are noteworthy, because they are intended to explain himself, but instead unmask him. The adjective "erbärmlicher" shows him to be a contemptible lover, but simultaneously, it also conveys the meaning of him asking for pity and sympathy. He might receive the latter, not because his love is unreciprocated, but because it is contemptible of him to pursue a woman, who is not only much younger, but also married. Because this opening has portrayed him in a bad light, the rest of the commentary will be examined critically by the spectator.

Theres he calls a "falsche Katz'," but the modifier "falsche" turns back on the speaker, in that it does not describe Theres, but Gabriel. He is "falsch," that is, incorrect in believing that she reciprocated his feelings toward him, even though he boasted, ". . . ich hab' da wirklich einen schönen

Triumph gefeiert"(V,459). This incorrect interpretation of the attitude of the others is one of his dominant traits, and it is apparent throughout the play. But he is also "falsch," in the sense of perfidious, of which his present activity, particularly his comment about Kern, is an example. Shortly after believing he had celebrated "einen Triumph," he saw Theres embracing Anton, whom he mistook to be a "Landkutscher." Again, he was incorrect.

In the concluding statement, he calls Kern "einen heimlichen Sünderer." Here, too, are several levels of meaning. Firstly, it provides another example of self-unmasking, because Gabriel is a "heimlicher Sünderer," since he tries to win the love of Theres, even though she is married, and loves her husband dearly. The word "heimlicher" is noteworthy, as Gabriel's endeavour is indeed a secret, especially to Theres, who is totally oblivious to the fact that she is the target of his affection. Secondly, in reference to Kern, this description is incorrect, at least in as far as Gabriel implies it, namely, that Kern is having an affair with Therese. Yet there is also an element of truth as it relates to Kern, because of his treatment of Regine, upon whom he pretends to lavish tenderness and love when in public, but treats harshly in private. Gabriel is, of course, unaware of this latter aspect, even though indirectly hinting at it. This is an example of language acting independently of the speaker. Each of the three statements in Gabriel's quotation above contribute toward a further unmasking

of himself, reiterating his past attitude and behaviour, and underlining that these remain constant.

Karl Kraus, in his essay "Nestroy und die Nachwelt," posits, "Nestroy ist der erste deutsche Satiriker, in dem sich die Sprache Gedanken macht über die Dinge."[51] This quotation aims at the very nucleus of Nestroy's skill with language and insight into the workings and psychology of his characters. The author seems to have been aware of his revolutionary use of language, as in "Aphorismus 169" he states, "Ich bin der Kolumbus einer neuen Methode"(XV,695). It is this new method which is partly responsible for Kraus's comment above. It appears that Nestroy's language frequently eludes the speaker's control in terms of the meaning(s) it projects--that is, the meaning becomes multi-layered. Nestroy's skillful control of the language imbues certain words with a life of their own. Consequently, they absorb and reflect meanings within their particular context, as they pulsate with allusions and connotations. Kraus underlines this position in the following, "Ich beherrsche die Sprache nicht; aber die Sprache beherrscht mich vollkommen. Sie ist mir nicht die Dienerin meiner Gedanken. Ich bleibe in einer Verbindung mit ihr, aus der ich meine Gedanken empfange, und sie kann mit mir machen, was sie will. Ich pariere ihr aufs Wort."[52]

One quotation from the play Die Papiere des Teufels (1842) will help to elucidate the above statement. Shortly before his death, Stoppel discovers, due to the vindictiveness of Eva, that

Federle is in love with Sophie, his stepdaughter. Angrily, he retorts, "Liebe hinter meinem Rucken!", to which Eva sardonically replies, "Ja, das denkt sich so ein Rucken oft gar nicht, was all's vorgeht hinter seiner"(XI,258). She does not refer to Federle, Sophie, or Stopperl, nor to Stoppel's "Rukken" specifically, but just to the word "Rucken," and imbues it with consciousness and will. There has been no actual love--all that has happened so far has only been a figment of Federle's imagination, of which Sophie is completely unaware. Furthermore, this statement seems to separate Stoppel, his self, from his "Rucken," alienating him from himself. This underlines his helplessness in reference to certain areas that he wants to control, but cannot. There is no contextual reason why Eva should seek to convey these meanings. Still, the words she chose bring them out, in spite of the speaker. Stoppel has used the idiom "hinter meinem Rucken" in its usual meaning, but Eva, his cook, in her determination to punish Federle for spurning her, takes the word "Rucken," and uses it as in an extension to the above mentioned idiom. As soon as she has spoken it, she no longer has control over it, even though only through her saying it, "Rucken" was given life. But once this initial impetus has happened, the word achieves autonomy, and is thereby able to project more than just one level of meaning. This, however, will be dependent upon the word's particular context and the various associations it will evoke in the reader or spectator. The word

"Rucken," that is, the sign is important, not the referent, namely, that which it stands for in the physical or abstract world, in this case, Stoppel's back. To reiterate: because the word itself is important, and because it is not tied to the physical thing it stands for, it is seemingly able to come alive and convey a meaning that is beyond the intentions of the speaker. Thus, it contributes to the conversation. One might say, paraphrasing Kraus, language becomes its own philosopher.

Chapter II

> Nein, was ich die Sprichwörter nicht ausstehen kann! - Mich hat einmal ein Sprichwort abscheulich ang'setzt, nämlich das „Jung gefreit, hat niemand bereut", das wird schier, wenn man alle Sprichwörter nach der Dummheit klassifiziert, 's erste Prämium kriegen. Und dem Sprichwort zum Trotz geh' ich jetzt als Alter wieder auf Freiersfüssen und ich werd's g'wiss nicht bereuen. Wart' nur, Sprichwort, dich bring' ich noch ganz um den Kredit. (XI, 130)

In this chapter, the language of Nestroy is compared to, and contrasted with, that of Adolf Bäuerle, because the latter is a popular representative contemporary playwright, who enjoyed a considerable, albeit temporary, measure of success. The purpose of this comparison is to underscore the fundamental difference in the use of language, which is symptomatic of further essential differences between Nestroy and other contemporary writers of the "Wiener Volkstheater."

Whereas Bäuerle stresses primarily the goodness of the Viennese, their nature and their general condition, living well and contentedly, Nestroy posits a pungent criticism of his fellow man. However, this is basically neither destructive, nor nocuous, as some of Nestroy's contemporary critics maintained. Karl Gutzkow (1811-1878) complained in his "Wiener Eindrücke" (1845):

> In Verbindung mit dieser Wut nach exzentrischen

> Vergnügungen kann sich auch die Bühne einen grossen Teil der Schuld beimessen, zur Verwilderung des Volkscharakters beigetragen zu haben. Die Zweideutigkeit und die Selbstironisierung haben besonders in den Nestroyschen Stücken einen Einfluss auf die untern Klassen ausgeübt, der ihnen zwei der kostbarsten Kleinode des Volkscharakters raubte: sittliche Grundanschauung der Dinge und gläubiges Vertrauen gegen Menschen.[1]

Gutzkow is accusing Nestroy of contributing toward, and causing, a decline in morals, because he fails to recognize that Nestroy is, in fact, battling it by exposing it, and hoping that the destructive attitude and behaviour will be forced to retreat. The Viennese lacked to a large extent "sittliche Grundanschauung der Dinge und gläubiges Vertrauen gegen Menschen," and, by portraying facets of such behaviour, Nestroy sought its destruction. Nestroy initiates a healing process, as his criticism ruthlessly unmasks the selfish motives of man's actions in the sphere of human relationships, where the individual is always the point of origin and nucleus of the commentary. Both Nestroy and Bäuerle wrote numerous "Besserungsstücke," but, as will be argued later, the characters in these plays do not undergo an organically motivated "Besserung." Through his characters, Nestroy seeks to bring about an improvement in the audience, and, therefore, attempts to involve the spectator seriously, whereas Bäuerle, through his figures, sought primarily, as we have seen, to electrify his audience.[2]

Aside from the fundamental differences in their attitude toward the nature of man, the two authors also show a dissimilarity in their view toward, and use of, language as a

whole, and that of key terms and expressions in particular, e.g., sayings and proverbs. Bäuerle's use of proverbs endorses their traditional meaning, and accepts them at face value. In Die Bürger in Wien (1813), Redlich, described in the stage directions as "bürgerlicher Bindermeister," states, ". . . nur gute Menschen können singen -."[3] He refers to himself and his friends, who all believe themselves to be "redliche Wiener Bürger," and he reiterates this assertion throughout the play. Moreover, the plot of the play confirms this self-assurance. It is a self-praising attitude which Bäuerle's characters seemingly need in order to assure themselves.

Damian, in contrast, "ein zugrunde gegangener Tandler" in Nestroy's Zu ebener Erde und erster Stock (1835), states in his introductory song:

> Am allerlängsten ehrlich währt,
> Das Sprichwort hab' ich oft schon g'hört,
> Das Sprichwort passt für alle Leut',
> In jedem Stand, zu jeder Zeit,
> Das will ich glaub'n, doch sei's, wie's sei,
> Ein Tandler geht zugrund' dabei. (VI,12)

His fortunes so far prove this proverb, which is almost a sacred cow, to be entirely incorrect. Later, the fortunes of his relatives improve drastically, which is of benefit to him, but still he remains "ein zugrunde gegangener Tandler." Although he claims to believe in the proverb, as the third and fourth lines of the first stanza indicate, the conclusions of the fifth and sixth lines, even though they do not deny it, still show the proverb to be wrong. Damian's choice of words

in the fifth line, in spite of the fact that they are not an open rebellion against this belief, nevertheless show his position clearly--that is, his knowledge of facts prove the belief to be wrong. Once the falsity of proverbs is established, many commonly practised and accepted modes of thought, and general views held by society, will also be open to sharp criticism. This is the goal of Nestroy's use of proverbs. In Bäuerle's language, the meaning is one-dimensional, as argued in the interpretation of the proverb. There is no deviation from the traditional understanding and exegesis. One might say, it is transparent, and, therefore, the medium is rather insignificant. In Nestroy, on the other hand, the medium of language must be seen as an integral component of the total meaning that is projected. Here, the particular choice and use of words must be analyzed and evaluated, because the context in which it is said might well be of greater import than the apparent ideas expressed by the words. If one subscribes to this tenet, there will be frequent discoveries of several levels of meaning--not only of statements, but also of individual words. The reader or viewer of Nestroy's works, instead of merely being confronted by one meaning, may uncover a multiplicity of penetrating insights into human nature.

On the other hand, Bäuerle's basic considerations appear to be the amusement of his audience, always within the framework of a given social and linguistic order. His writings merely confirm and sanction the official position. The in-

evitable result is, that the reader or viewer need not be, in fact, must not be, critical, not about himself, nor about those in his environment. The following are the concluding two lines from Bäuerle's Die Bürger in Wien (1813), "Es leben die gnädigen Gäste! / Es leben die Bürger von Wien!"[4] These words are typically representative of Bäuerle's praise and pleasantries, which he lavishes on his contemporaries. Clichés like the opening lines, particularly the non-ironic use of expressions like "es leben," and "gnädigen" are not only meaningless, but underscore the total absence of a critical attitude, which is the very lifeblood of Nestroy's writing. Such writing betrays a naive and simplistic view of the human condition--naive, because it obviously is reluctant to aim for a penetrating understanding, and simplistic, in that it presents it only in terms of black and white, ignoring all the other shades with which Nestroy colours his world. For Nestroy, the human condition consists of a variety of tones, and his writing, specifically his choice of language, may be seen as a prism, which separates and identifies its many components, showing that change toward the positive is imperative, although hardly possible. Because of the latter, Nestroy was inevitably in an almost constant state of hostility with the censor.

Nestroy is always concerned with relationships between people, specifically with the individual's nature, and how it shapes his own life, and influences that of others. Bäuerle, however, seems to deal almost exclusively with an individual's

relation to the state and to society as a whole, while aiming to perpetuate existing mores. Therefore, the latter illuminates human nature only from an external point. Toloysky, who is an upright Viennese citizen in Die Bürger in Wien, pressed into service as a jailor, solemnly underlines this, when he counters a prisoner's personal attempt at bribery with "Ein Wiener Bürger verkauft seine Pflicht um keinen Preis," and "Glauben Sie, ein Wiener Bürger missbraucht das Vertrauen, das Staat und Menschen in ihn setzten. . . ."[5] In the first quotation, the emphasis is on "Pflicht," the correct attitude and behaviour toward society as a whole. The second quotation reiterates this, but is more specific, by naming "Staat und Menschen," towards whom he must fulfill his duty. Staberl was just a little tempted. However, Toloysky's immediate intervention helped Staberl remain loyal to his duty.

Clearly, the Nestroyan illumination aims at the ultimate source and mainspring of human action, while Bäuerle seems to consider only the results of human action as they affect the good name of Vienna in particular, and Austria in general. He never fails to remind his audience to be "brave, redliche Wiener." This is one main reason why such writings are indeed "Lokalpossen," while those of Nestroy are universal, because their quiddity is the exposition of some of the basic components that comprise human nature, and these attributes are independent of time and location.

Inevitably, in Nestroy, negative and outright destructive

character traits come to the fore. Therefore, the resulting relationships between people are at best tenuous, and at worst virulent, particularly those between husband and wife, and between parents and children. As always, it is in the language used by individuals that the problematic relationships become apparent. Bäuerle, on the other hand, focuses primarily on the interconnection between the subject and the state, especially on how this is of significance to the image of the latter, while the difficulties experienced by a particular individual, and how these in turn affect those in his immediate environment, remain of peripheral importance. Thus, connections between individuals are not explored, or only in a very superficial way--more in the manner of gossip--while empirical-supportive arguments are studiously evaded.

Bäuerle continues to endorse and reiterate the traditional trend of the Viennese "Volkstheater," whereas Nestroy, who recognizes the significance of individual human nature, its motives, attitudes and action, embarks on a different and original approach, unmasking and impugning human behaviour, as reflected through an individual's use of language. It is specifically through Nestroy's ingenious use of language, that he not only differentiates himself from contemporaries like Bäuerle, but also brings traditional popular Viennese comedy to its peak and conclusion.[6]

These positions are best elucidated in a comparison between a Nestroy and Bäuerle play of close proximity, as is the case

with Bäuerle's Wien, Paris, London und Constantinopel (1823) and Nestroy's Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche (1828), with references to Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel (1838), and several other plays. The Bäuerle play portrays three individuals, who have divorced themselves from the accepted social order. A supernatural being and magic are employed, to have the three errants realize the errors of their ways, and, therefore, recognize and submit to the existing order. Thus, the play is entirely consonant with the tradition of the "Zauberstück." Nestroy, on the other hand, is still using this genre as a mold, but most definitely not in order to show the continuance of existing blindness toward human shortcomings. Instead, he employs it as a vehicle to expose the misuse of language, which inevitably reflects flaws in the speaker, and in turn, contributes toward a general human condition that is highly unsatisfactory, not only for the individual, but specifically in reference to relations between people. For Bäuerle, "Besserung" is a foregone conclusion, while for Nestroy, it is an extremely ambiguous and problematic process, which does not lead to a resolution. This is especially the case in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel. It is most significant that a mere five years separate Die Verbannung from Wien, Paris, London und Constantinopel, while the other Nestroy play was only written fifteen years after Bäuerle's, yet the difference between Nestroy and Bäuerle is crucial.

Wien, Paris, London und Constantinopel opens with a common-

place reiteration of an old, traditional dogma:

> Arbeit macht das Leben froh,
> Lasst uns rüstig wirken,
> Zieht hinaus ins finstere Holz,
> Fällt die alten Birken.
> Baut für böse Winterzeit
> Gegen Sturm und Wettern
> Euch ein nettes Häuschen auf
> Aus den festen Brettern.[7]

Here is the banal affirmation that work will bring happiness and serenity, and that preparations for the future are tantamount to overcoming difficulties. Arilla, the "Schutzgeist," who guides and controls the experiences of Muff, Wimpel and Kitt, the three characters who are to undergo a "Besserung," repeats and stresses this when she first meets Wimpel and Muff, who at that time do not know her true identity, "Mir ist's ja recht; wann ös aber kein Geld habt's, so glaubet ich, so war nur ein Mittel."[8] There is no suggestion of the problematic aspect that such an assertion contains. Both Wimpel and Muff argue it's not as simple as that: Wimpel, a producer of straw hats, counters that no-one wears these during winter. Consequently there is no work for him, and Muff complains:

> Und im Sommer kein Mensch ein Pelz. Übrigens haben wir auch kein Glück, es geht uns nichts nach Wunsch; wir dürfen thun, was wir wollen, es heisst halt nichts. Es ist völlig schad, wenn wir was anfangen. Alles geht bey uns den Krebsgang - das können wir nimmer aushalten. Mein Freund z.B. ist ein Strohhutfabrikant, kaum hat er aber sein' Werkstatt aufg'richt, sind gleich 70 neben ihm aufgestanden, dass er nichts zu thun g'habt hat; und mein Metier ist gar traurig, jeder Vogel macht schon ein Pelz, wann ihm kalt ist.[9]

Curiously, Arilla does not have a suggestion. Only after the two have listed more of their difficulties, does she finally

offer her help, reveal herself, and send them on their desired journey to Paris, London and Constantinople. Another example of Bäuerle's blind reproduction and support of proverbs may be seen in the following quotation from Die Bürger in Wien (1813), where Redlich notes to himself, "Wer seine Kinder bewacht, hat ihr Glück beacht't! Das ist ein altes Sprichwort; ich werd's nicht vergessen."[10] Redlich has just discovered that his daughter, Käthchen, has a secret lover, Karl Berg, a poet, who ultimately saves Käthchen from an evil fate. Redlich is under the impression that he is able to guard his daughter. This may be true in the physical sense. However, he is unable to control her emotions, as is proven in the play. The assertion "hat ihr Glück beacht't" is also an illogical assumption, in that luck is not the result of a specific human action. But it is the second sentence in the quotation which underscores the profound difference between Bäuerle and Nestroy. The key consideration is the expression "altes Sprichwort," for "Sprichworte" are invariably aged. This one is particularly old, and therefore, according to Redlich, one that must never be forgotten. Here, the customary beliefs are endorsed and transmitted. There is nothing that could force the audience to reflect and question. Instead, it is expected to accept tradition, which is frequently supported by commonplaces.

Nestroy's play Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel also opens with a chorus about work. In this play, however, the girls working for Madam Foulard, a "Putzhändlerin," are not so

convinced of the virtues of work:

> Wenn nur schon wieder Sonntag wär',
> Die Wochentag' sind fad, auf Ehr',
> Die Wochentag' heisst's immer näh'n,
> Am Sonntag nur spazieren gehn,
> Viel z'wenig ist für unsre Plag'
> Ein Sonntag auf sechs Wochentag'. (VI,493)

The first line expresses the wish that it were Sunday, and then the girls assert that work days are dull, as work means trouble and drudgery. The girls refer specifically to themselves--their argument is based on personal experience, which provides added strength, whereas in Bäuerle's play, the choir consists of peasants briefly moving across the stage, while addressing the audience in a rather paternalistic manner. They asseverate that work brings happiness, but do not give any supportive evidence. It is accepted to be axiomatic. The peasant girls' second line, "Lasst uns rüstig wirken," follows naturally, if one agrees with the opening statement. The concluding six lines present rustic images of hiking through the forest, felling trees, and building comfortable houses in preparation for bad winter weather. But these images are lacking in vitality, because they are traditional thoughts in threadbare language. Examples would be : "Lasst uns rüstig wirken," and "Baut . . . ein nettes Häuschen auf." Such expressions betray just how firmly Bäuerle is embedded in repeating traditional moralistic attitudes. All is presented in a pleasant way. It seems that Bäuerle espouses the work ethic as the traditional panacea for all ills.

Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche (1828) is one of Nestroy's earliest plays, which clearly underlines his basic difference to Bäuerle. This work opens in the sphere of the "Zauberwelt." Longinus, Pumpf's twenty-four year old son, has just returned from an extended journey, which was to have been a crucial part of his education. But Nocturnus, Longinus' former teacher, has already warned Pumpf that Longinus, in the company of his servant Crepontes, has become a "Lump." The father must soon agree, and Nocturnus is asked to arrange for Longinus' "Besserung." This is to consist of Longinus spending thirty years on earth as a "Lump." His experiences here are divided into four major parts, and he returns home, supposedly "gebessert," when he is fifty-four years old. Longinus, just prior to his banishment to earth, has a lengthy explanation of his "Tagesordnung," which he concludes with, ". . . das Leben ist doch schön" (I,15). It is a commonplace that might well come out of a Bäuerle play. However, one should first examine the preceding information. Here are several excerpts:

> Um elf Uhr steht man auf, geht ins Kaffeehaus, trinkt Likör, darauf ein tüchtiges Dejeuner à la Frühstück! - Dann geht man auf die Promenade und lorgnettiert die Mädeln, zu Mittag hat man keinen Appetit, schimpft übers Essen, denn nur nichts in der Ordnung geniessen, das ist gemein - trinkt aber hernach vier Schalen Schwarzen, das hält den Geist wach - dann fängt man ein Whist an, das g'freut ein'm nicht lang, denn es ist zu solid, man wählt ein anderes Spiel, und so kokettiert man so lang mit der Treffdame, bis es Abend wird, dann allons! zu den Amuren. Einer macht man einen Heiratsantrag, der andern schwört man ewige Treue - das imponiert höchstens zusammen drei Viertelstunden; so kommt man seelenvergnügt ins Gasthaus zum Souper. Da geht erst recht das wahre Gaudium an - jeder

> erzählt seine Liebesverhältnisse, lügt zehnmal mehr dazu, als wahr ist, und erzählt gerade von dem am meisten, was nicht wahr ist. Das ist ein Genuss, wenn man so recht aufschneiden kann. Darunter leidet zwar der weibliche Ruf, aber was liegt da dran, man macht sich gross vor seinen Brüderln, und das ist die Hauptsache! Findet man dann noch ein Kaffeehaus offen, allons marsch hinein und der Kaffeesiederin so lang geschmeichelt, bis sie auf Kredit einen Punsch macht, wenn man auch ein Geld im Sack hat; nur nichts zahlen, schmeckt alles noch einmal so gut, wenn man's schuldig bleibt! Und dann das Gefühl, ja, das lasst sich gar nicht beschreiben, das muss man empfinden, wenn man so um a drei Uhr nach Haus wackelt, da fühlt man den wahren Lauf der Natur, wie sich die Erde um die Achse dreht, denn man hat gar keinen sicheren Tritt - glückt's einem dann, dass man nicht auf der Gassen liegen bleibt, so fällt man zu Haus neben dem Bett nieder und schläft comme il faut. - O, Vater, das Leben ist doch schön! (I,14-15)

Longinus finds such a life wonderful, but it proves him to be a "Lump," as Nocturnus calls him. One need not analyze the quotation in detail to realize this, in order to understand Longinus' conclusion. By using a commonplace ironically, Nestroy draws attention to the misuse of such expressions in general. The commonplaces appear ridiculous, and lose all substance, because they are used so frequently, and without serious consideration. This reflects a broad and collective dishonesty, which has various manifestations, such as egocentricity in the individual, and tenuity in various human relationships. Therefore, all is not well, a point that Nestroy continues to reiterate. Bäuerle, in contrast, attempts to show that all is well, as long as no-one becomes dissatisfied, as did Wimpel, Muff and Kitt.

As mentioned above, Nestroy repeatedly draws attention to

the fact that human relationships are frequently unsatisfactory. In Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, Adolf, the accountant for Eisenkopf, is extremely depressed since he believes he will not be able to marry Albertine, the daughter of Eisenkopf, and he states, "Albertine, bist du für mich verloren, so jage ich mir eine Kugel durch den Kopf!"(I,20). To which Heinrich, a servant of Eisenkopf, answers, "Sparen Sie diese Kugel, bis Sie fünf Jahre verheiratet sind, dann werden Sie sie vielleicht notwendig brauchen"(I,20). Adolf uses a commonplace to explain his intense unhappiness, but Heinrich uses part of the commonplace and extends it. The key words are the adverbs "dann" and "notwendig," because they point out that presently, matters are not nearly as serious as they might well be after five years of marriage, at which time there may indeed be a true need for the bullet. This view introduces an element of humour, but underlying it, is the serious implication that the institution of marriage is untenable, to the extent that the only solution is suicide. Here is one typical example where Nestroy uses humour to conceal a grave accusation levelled not only at society, but at individuals. The audience is forced to laughter, but while still laughing, it becomes aware of the strong, dark undercurrent. Such awareness should lead to contemplation of unacceptable attitudes. Thus, Adolf's use of a commonplace, shows, on the one hand, that it is applied to situations where not suitable. It is employed too frequently, and therefore,

looses its cogency. Furthermore, it draws attention to the problematic nature of marriage, and in doing so, seriously questions the blind acceptance of traditional modes of thought, as it attacks the language patterns which aid the continuance of such attitudes.

Nestroy implies that blind adherence to tradition is not only foolish, but may well lead to outright disaster. As already mentioned, Pumpf is a rather feeble spirit, who, when told by Nocturnus that he, as father, does not know what has become of his son, counters with, "Als einen hoffnungsvollen Jüngling hab' ich ihn fortgeschickt - die Reisen gehören zur Ausbildung, also wird wohl ein vollkommen ausgebildeter junger Mann aus ihm geworden sein"(I,9). Pumpf's argument is not based on thoughtful reflection--he does not think for himself, but borrows worn-out word patterns like "hoffnungvollen Jüngling," "Reisen gehören zur Ausbildung," and "ein vollkommener ausgebildeter junger Mann": all are examples of hackneyed phrases. Pumpf uses the above expressions, and assumes that they apply to Longinus. Like so many other Nestroy figures, he does not control language, because he is not an innovative user of language. Instead, he continues to speak in clichés and platitudes. He is a language pauper, which reflects an intellectual pauperism. Pumpf simply called Longinus "einen hoffnungsvollen Jüngling," but precisely in what aspect he was "hoffnungsvoll," the father apparently does not know. When saying, "Reisen gehören zur Ausbildung," he could not have had

a clear conception of exactly what kind of "Reisen" Longinus went on, nor what the term "Ausbildung" meant to his son, because, as the plot soon proves, Longinus'"Ausbildung" was the opposite to what the father expected. Pumpf uses the noun "Ausbildung" and the adjective "ausgebildeter," assuming that, since Longinus went through a process of "Ausbildung," he must necessarily be "ausgebildet." In the fourth scene of Act One, Pumpf asks Longinus, ". . . gib Rechenschaft: wie du deine Zeit zugebracht!"(I,13). Longinus complies: "Aufs schönste, aufs angenehmste - meine Tagesordnung spricht ganz für meinen geistigen Aufschwung. Von einer Stadt in die andere reisen . . ."(I,13). Here is his "Ausbildung"; he seems to have received a "geistigen Aufschwung," but the element of "Geist" seems to appear only in alcohol and in deceiving others. He has learned several French expressions, but above all, he has learned to waste the day by playing cards, drinking, pursuing girls, as well as lying to them, and about them to friends. Instead of "Ausbildung, ist es mit der Ausbildung aus," as far as Longinus is concerned. Generally, "Ausbildung" is an extremely vital part of a young individual's maturing. This is certainly how the audience of Nestroy's time would think. It always had been, and still was, very important. Nestroy, however, has Longinus explain his "Ausbildung" in a manner that must lead the spectator to reflect about it, and, when using it in the future, he will inevitably think, if indeed he uses the term correctly: does it describe a process he

really believes to be an "Ausbildung"?

In the opening sentence, Longinus stresses that he has spent his time "aufs schönste, aufs angenehmste." First of all, pleasure was not the primary aim of this journey. Thus, at the very outset, he betrays that his intentions were far different than those of Nocturnus and his father. Secondly, as the rest of his explanation makes clear, what he referred to as "aufs schönste, aufs angenehmste," was a carefully planned waste of time, since he pursued only those endeavours that he found exciting, namely, cheating and deceiving others whenever possible, as indicated by phrases such as: "lorgnettiert die Mädchen . . . schimpft übers Essen, nur nichts in der Ordnung geniessen . . . Einer macht man einen Heiratsantrag, der anderen schwört man ewige Treue . . . jeder erzählt seine Liebesverhältnisse, lügt zehnmal mehr dazu . . . nur nicht zahlen, schmeckt alles noch einmal so gut, wenn man's schuldig bleibt!" No further comments are necessary, as Longinus stands accused by his own words. Thus, the language Pumpf uses proves him to be entirely wrong, as far as his understanding of Longinus is concerned. Nestroy, thereby, shows that if language is taken for granted, as Pumpf does, using it without thought, then what is said does not correspond to reality, and the speaker betrays his foolishness. In Nestroy's <u>Die beiden Nachtwandler</u> (1836), Wathfield in Act I, Scene xii, warns Howart, "Sie sind noch immer der, der Sie waren, der glaubt, mit seinem Gelde alles auszuführen, der seine Worte nicht misst,

sondern sie unbesonnen in den Tag hineinwirft"(VI,304). The careless use of language can have serious consequences for both addresser and addressee. Pumpf must agree with Nocturnus that Longinus' "Ausbildung" so far has been a total failure. Therefore, he will be forced to undergo a process of "Besserung," another form of "Ausbildung." Whether that is more successful than the original "Ausbildung," is debatable. It is significant that Nestroy has shown the ambiguity of "Ausbildung," particularly the one where the parents do not participate. Nestroy points out that thoughtless attachment to tradition--here in the form of a journey as a necessary part of "Ausbildung"--is extremely foolish, and of no benefit to the participant.

One area in which Bäuerle's concern for tradition is especially apparent, is in his unqualified endorsement of patriotism, in this case, the subjected relationship of the individual to the state. In the foregoing discussion of "Ausbildung," the focus was on the individual in relationship to himself, his attitudes and his behaviour, as expressed by his use of language. The state did not figure at all, and it is here that Nestroy differs most radically from his contemporaries. For Bäuerle, it was crucial that the individual respect the state, and submit himself unconditionally to its wishes and commands. Such behaviour would inevitably result in the retaining of tradition. Longinus had failed utterly in his "Ausbildung," and must therefore undergo a long process

of "Besserung." Muff and Wimpel have become very disillusioned with Vienna and Austria, an attitude that is an anathema to Bäuerle, irrespective of the cause, and one which must be eradicated, lest numerous other facets of tradition begin to crumble.

At the beginning of the plot, Muff and Wimpel express their dissatisfaction with Vienna to Arilla, before she has revealed herself as the "Schutzgeist." The two hope that the "Schutzgeist" will give them three magic devices, "O Schutzgeist! Schutzgeist! Gib uns nur deine Talismane, und du, Wienerboden, siehst uns dein Leben nicht mehr."[11] Now Arilla reveals herself:

> Ihr sollt Erhörung finden, Verblendete! Ihr sollt das gepriesene Ausland kennen lernen, wo in die Sitten und Gebräuche des fremden Landes nur der Eingeborene sich finden kann. Ihr sollt mit Erstaunen bemerken, welche Rollen ihr Undankbaren in der Fremde spielen werdet, und wie Sehnsucht euch in das Mutterland zurück treibt. Geht, an euch verliert Österreich nur undankbare Missvergnügte, geht! Doch damit ihr seht, dass der Schutzgeist des Landes nicht einmahl von seinen verirrten Kindern die Hand abzieht, so seyen euch drey Talismane gewährt.[12]

Here is the first criticism for their lack of patriotism. She calls them "Verblendete" and "Undankbare" for their critical attitude toward Austria--not toward other individuals--for their belief that they would have a better life in another country. She also names them "Missvergnügte" and "verirrte Kinder," because they are foolish, and have no valid reason for being disillusioned with Vienna and Austria. The fact that they did not have work for a good part of the year, she

ignores. In order to have the two, later there will be three when Kitt joins them, acquire patriotism, she will provide experiences for them in Paris, London, and Constantinople, that will be so negative, that they will be overjoyed when returned to Vienna.

As the plot develops, there is constant reiteration of a) punishment for unpatriotic behaviour, and b) reward for patriotic behaviour. Thus, there is a continuous emphasis on traditional deportment. In explaining the three "Talismane," Arilla notes about the "Beutel", "Hier ist ein Beutel, so oft ihr mit Liebe und Freude an diesen Boden denkt, wird er sich füllen."[13] This is more like a bribe than an attempt toward a serious change in their outlook. Just before she vanishes, Arilla has a final punishment for them, "Benützt diese Wunderdinge, sie werden euch überall gute Dienste leisten, nur zurück, zurück in dieses segenvolle Land könnt ihr nicht mehr, hört ihr, nicht mehr zurück, und wenn ihr allen Gaben des Glückes gerne wieder entsagtet."[14] This turns out to be a threat only, and was apparently meant as just that, with the intention to have them always think about Vienna, and, thereby, induce in them the wish to return. The first expression of patriotism is made by Muff, "Wir sind Österreicher, das ist ohnehin genug. Es hat ein jeder Respekt für diese Nation."[15] Immediately, the bag fills itself with gold. This statement seems to be more an expression of arrogance than patriotism, as well as a sharp contrast to his previous comment, "O

Schutzgeist! Schutzgeist! Gib uns nur deine Talismane, und du, Wienerboden, siehst uns dein Leben nicht mehr."[16] Nevertheless, the two are rewarded. The next time the bag is filled occurs just after the three, Kitt is now with them, have arrived in Paris, and Wimpel expresses the wish, ". . . indess sag' ich dir so viel, ich verwünsch' die ganze Reis' nach Paris. Wären wir zu Haus blieben.. . ."[17] The flight has frightened Wimpel, who seems like a scared child who cannot manage when away from home; his above quotation hardly expresses thoughts of "Liebe und Freude" about Vienna. Still, they receive more gold. However, because of their foolishness, the three are cheated, deceived and threatened with jail in Paris. Only the direct intervetion of Arilla saves them, and she sends them on to London, Paris having proved to be an exceedingly undesirable place for the three.

Upon arriving in London, they find themselves totally without money. Angered by a callous and greedy innkeeper, who insists they spend the night in the barn, Muff announces, "In Österreich, stolzer Grobian, solltest du gewiss keinen Hund bey schlechtem Wetter ohne Ahndung der Behörden auf die Strasse jagen dürfen."[18] This indignant, but hardly patriotic outburst qualifies them for more gold. They are able to spend the night in the best room with fine service. Aside from praising Vienna, it is interesting to note that the "Behörden" are depicted in a positive light. This is in sharp contrast to Nestroy, where any reference to official authority is nearly always outright negative.

This is particularly so in his later plays, as the following quotation by Kern, from Der alte Mann mit der jungen Frau (1849) will show; "Da drüben wohnt ein Abschnitzel von der Gerechtigkeit und mir scheint, sein Haus wär' für Ihnen die Höhle des Tigers gewesen"(V,442). The "Abschnitzel von der Gerechtigkeit" refers to Hartkopf, a policeman, who is a representative of the "Behörden." Kern warns Anton, a political refugee, who inadvertently sought refuge at Hartkopf's house, which Kern calls "die Höhle des Tigers." Nestroy's view of the authorities in this particular circumstance could hardly be expressed in more depreciative terms: "Abschnitzel der Gerechtigkeit" indicates no "Gerechtigkeit," and "Höhle des Tigers" depicts the authorities as a destructive force, instead of a constructive energy working for the common good. Moments after Kern's comment, Hartkopf appears, furious that his sleep has been interrupted. Unwittingly, he ridicules the authorities; "Wer die Obrigkeit aus'n Schlaf weckt, der lasst sie nicht zu Kraften kommen, greift somit störend in die Staatsmaschine, ist folglich ein Landesverräter, ein -"(V,444). Here too, the double meaning of Nestroy's language is at work. The authorities are asleep. They are unaware of what is happening, as the words "Wer die Obrigkeit aus'n Schlaf weckt" show. They do not want to be awakened in order to take an objective and critical look at the existing situation. Thus, they are not doing a proper job. On the other hand, as this specific incident shows, it is best to leave authorities like these sleeping,

since they treat their subjects unjustly. Another self-incriminating expression is "Staatsmaschine," notably "Maschine," because it underlines the "unhuman" element of this design which is to govern humans. Another element, that further betrays the incompetence and perversion, is Hartkopf's ridiculous appearance, as described in the stage directions, "in Schlafrock und Nachtmütze, aber mit übergehangenem Säbel und Stock." Basically, this shows an unpreparedness in a humorous way, and although just depicting one individual, it relates to the whole authority structure that is no longer tenable. This is the extreme opposite to Bäuerle's view as expressed above by Muff.

Constantinople is the last city the three visit. Here they meet a harem guard, who is a Viennese in disguise. After hearing several phrases in Austrian, Muff goes into a short monologue and song in praise of "die Österreicher-Sprach." He opens with: "Wann ein Wiener's Maul auf macht / Ist's schon ein Freud zuz'hören," and concludes with:

> Drum lob ich d'Wienerstadt, dort geht's vom Herzen,
> Wie's da drin g'schrieben steht, sagt man's heraus.
> Was nutzt „ein süsser Freund",
> Wenn er's nicht ehrlich meint,
> Süsse Wort, kalte Sprach,
> Mag nichts davon![19]

The first two lines are merely a sentimental expression, something that does not occur in Nestroy, but it is supportive of Bäuerle's emphasis on tradition and patriotism. The last stanza quoted above reiterates Muff's preference of Austrian

over "Hochdeutsch." Again, the reasons are merely sentimental. There is no deeper meaning, no penetrating insight; "'s fad," as the Viennese would say. Still, Bäuerle glorifies the Viennese dialect, buttressing tradition, and appearing very patriotic. Just as in Paris and London, the three are once more exceedingly foolish, and when in extreme danger, they call on Arilla, who saves them, as she admonishes, "Mit dem Schreck sollt ihr diessmahl davon kommen. Es ist euch verziehen," and:

> Doch seyd nicht mehr undankbar gegen euer Vaterland. Preist das Ausland, wo es zu preisen ist, aber zieht es nicht muthwillig dem heimischen Boden vor. (Windschauer). Ihr sollt wieder eure Vaterstadt erblicken. Sonnt euch in der Nähe des Pallastes, der des Österreichers Liebstes in sich vereinigt![20]

This is her final warning, with an emphasis on patriotism. Muff gives one last testimony in praise of Vienna:

> Himmel, mein geliebtes Wien wieder! Ja, wann man dich sieht, da kommt freylich ein Sterbender ins Leben. Ich befinde mich wieder gut. Boden! lass dich küssen! Stephansthurm, sey nicht bös! Brüder, wir haben's Lehrgeld geben und bleiben in Zukunft hübsch zu Haus. Reisen wir einmahl wieder, so sey es höchstens nach Hütteldorf zum Bier, oder nach Laxenburg um einen Spargel, oder nach Nussdorf um Krebsen. Paris, London und Constantinopel, es ist überall recht, aber z' Haus ist's am besten![21]

Each statement is a banality trying to outdo that of the others, "Ich befinde mich wieder gut. Boden! lass dich küssen! Stephansthurm, sey nicht bös!" Such repeated and emphatic praise of Vienna and Austria, because of its exaggeration and over-enthusiasm, inevitably arouses suspicion about the validity of these assertions. In Nestroy, there are no examples of such naive praise of Vienna. As a matter of fact, in

several of his late plays, some characters find the situation has become untenable, because of political reasons. An example of this occurs in Der alte Mann mit der jungen Frau (1849). In the final scene, Anton and his wife Therese are quite happy to leave for Australia. The above quotation is indeed an excellent example of Bäuerle's writing, which is limited to a particular time and place, and, therefore, very different from Nestroy's work. The final song of the play reiterates the above trivialities. The following includes several examples:

> Nein, wir werden, sagen s', nimmer weiter gehn,
> Denn in Wien, sagen s', ist's doch gar zu schön;
> Gute Leut', sagen s', und ein lust'ger Sinn,
> In der Welt, sagen s', ist halt nur ein Wien!
> Die Stadt London, sagen s', ist ein schöner Ort,
> Englisch Pflaster, sagen s', ist das echte dort.
> Aber unser Pflaster ist doch auch recht schön,
> Nicht für's G'sicht g'rad, sagen s', doch zum Umagehn.[22]

These are further pleasantries about Vienna, but none of them is supported. They are supposedly to be accepted a priori, thus, these are traditionally accepted expressions. The line, "Gute Leut', sagen s', und ein lust'ger Sinn," gives no specific information about "Leute" or "Sinn," and there certainly was no information about this in any other part of the play. The only Viennese in this work are Muff, Wimpel and Kitt, who obviously did not lend any substance to all the insipid praise of the "Wiener Bürger." Although repeating and emphasizing the importance of patriotism and tradition of Vienna, the spectator is left without any reason why they are significant, and he may well come to the conclusion that Bäuerle is stressing

empty assertions. Nestroy, however, sees the shortcomings of the Viennese, and severely mocks such comments as "Gute Leut' . . . lust'ger Sinn," when he asserts in the play Nur Ruhe (1843):

> Das will nicht viel sagen, es gibt sehr wenig böse Menschen, und doch geschieht so viel Unheil in der Welt; der grösste Teil dieses Unheils kommt auf Rechnung der vielen, vielen guten Menschen, die weiter nichts als gute Menschen sind. (XII,6)

Franz, the manager of Schafgeist's business, has just told Syndikus, that Splittinger, Schafgeist's nephew, who is taking over the business, is "im Grunde ein guter Mensch"(XII,6). Syndikus, however, rejects the commonplace, and posits that there are very few evil people. Still, there is much evil in the world, which must, paradoxically, be caused by the many good people, who are not at all "gute Leute." The latter part of Syndikus' comment above questions the validity of "vielen" and "guten" in this context. The clause, "die weiter nichts als gute Menschen sind," intimates that "gute Menschen" is a meaningless expression--they are just called that without critical reflection about the evaluative term "gute." Ultimately, so much harm must have a cause, and it is found in the many, many fine--really evil--people. Nestroy ingeminates this stance in the final year, when Muffl, in Frühere Verhältnisse (1862), concludes the two stanzas of his introductory song with, "So gibt's viel gute Mensch'n, aber grundschlechte Leut'." (XIV,531). Again, the saying "gute Mensch'n" is unmasked as a trite expression, which, upon critical examination, proves

to be meaningless. It conveys the opposite implication. Language is being used deceptively to mask human shortcomings in general, and by the speaker in particular. It is the latter theme which Nestroy's plays constantly underscore. Thus, for Nestroy, neither tradition nor patriotism, although perhaps not specially denounced, is of crucial concern. Instead, it is the attitude and behaviour as expressed in the language of the individual that he examines and unmasks.

Another traditionally accepted belief, fully subscribed to and espoused by Bäuerle, however, critically examined by Nestroy, is that of marriage and its various aspects. In Wien, Paris, London und Constantinopel, marriage is strongly endorsed. The spouses must live in harmony, and never, except for very short periods, be apart from each other. Muff and Wimpel leave Vienna for economic reasons, but Kitt, who joins them just prior to their departure for Paris, leaves because he can no longer bear the company of his wife:

> Und ich geh' von Wien eigentlich, um meinem bösen Weib aus den Zähnen zu kommen. Mir gings so übel nicht. Einem Glaserer fehlts so leicht nicht an Arbeit, indem bald der Wind, bald ung'schickte Leut, bald B'soffene, bald muthwillige Buben unser einem brav in d'Hand arbeiten; aber mein Weib! mein Weib! ich wollt's segnen, wenn sie fremden Leuten ihr Glas zusamm'massakert hatt', aber mein eignes in ihrem Zorn, das war nicht mehr zum aushalten
> . . . . . .
> besser allein und arm, als mit einem solchen Satan und's schönste Leben."[23]

He calls her a Satan--a stronger expression of dislike is hardly possible. Johanna, his wife, however, accuses him, "Weil ich meinen Mann seine Untreu, seine Unarten und böses Betragen nicht

will angehen lassen, mit andern spienzeln, die Wirthschaft vernachlässigen, und schön saufen den ganzen Tag, so bin ich ein Satan?"[24] Nestroy would probably have her express the concluding statement above in a manner that would permit a 'yes' and 'no' answer. She later intimates that being married to her could be difficult, "Ich fürchte kein' Mann, viel weniger ein Frauenzimmer - nein, mit wem hab' ich denn die Ehre zu sprechen?"[25] She says this to Arilla, who explains:

> Ich wohne auf den Höhen des Wienerberges, und bin die Schutzgöttin dieses Landes. Ich strafe muthwillige Auswanderer, strafe alle, die ihre Heimath verlassen, um der Fremde auf Kosten des Vaterlandes zu huldigen. Ich kenne dich; auch dein Gemahl ist solch ein Verwegener.[26]

The "Schutzgöttin" calls Kitt "muthwilliger Auswanderer" and "Verwegener." She makes no inquiries about specific reasons why Johanna's husband left, and even more surprising, she sees him guilty in reference to leaving the "Vaterland." Again, the stress is on patriotism. Personal relationships are of no importance to Bäuerle, whereas they are frequently the focal point in Nestroy. Arilla then promises, "Gebessert kehrt er in deine Arme zurück."[27] It is not clear whether his "Besserung" refers to his attitude toward Vienna, or to Johanna.[28] Apparently, it refers to both. In London and Constantinople, Kitt is suddenly confronted by Johanna as part of his "Besserung" process, just as Arilla had promised her, "Ich werde dir mächtig beystehen, und du wirst immer dort seyn, wo es nöthig ist. Dein Mann wird dich in der grössten Entfernung wiederfinden, ohne dass du selbst weisst, wie du dahin gekommen bist."[29]

In London, Kitt buys a veiled woman, who assumes the shape of Johanna. He is shocked, and cries out, "O weh! mein eigenes Weib? Nun ist's Zeit, dass wir weiter kommen, um dich rauf ich nicht."[30] Kitt displays a strong aversion toward his wife, which would intimate that both spouses are to blame for their marriage problems. But it seems that Bäuerle's view places all the responsibility on the husband, since he alone is to undergo "Besserung." Therefore, there is no ambiguity, and the solution is relatively simple: Kitt must mend his ways. For Nestroy, there are no readily available solutions, certainly none imposed from an external source, be they metaphysical, political, or social in origin. There are numerous comments about marriage in Nestroy's works, generally pointing to an ambiguity, and very possibly to a dilemma and precariousness, that often seems inevitable in this relationship.

In Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, two marriages are obliquely mentioned, and the underlying problem in both is suggested. Pumpf has had his magic wand broken by his wife, effectively checking his power; in Eisenkopf's marriage, the woman was definitely in command. In both unions, one spouse wholly dominated the other, much to the husbands' discontent. Therefore, the unions were of a problematic nature. It is Longinus' commentary on marriage in Act I, Scene xii, that sets the tone for all of Nestroy's future observations on this topic; "Den Eh'stand auf alle Weis' lobt jeder, der'n nit kennt / Drum hab'n sich an dieser Speis viel' schon 's Maul

verbrennt"(I,33). The first line is indicative of a very common reaction, which is to judge, or in this case, praise something one knows nothing about--marriage is praised "auf alle Weis'." There are no derogative aspects. This line above, especially the clause "der'n nit kennt," by pointing out the ignorance of those praising, questions the accuracy of such praise. The second line leaves no doubt about the error of the first, and the result of "nit kennt" is "verbrennt." Nestroy uses an idiomatic expression, changes "Mund" to "Maul," and draws attention to the difficulties and ambiguities of a traditionally endorsed social institution. The clause "hab'n sich . . . viel' schon's Maul verbrennt," projects also a double meaning: firstly, it conveys the error of such assertion, as the mouth being used in stating a falsity. Therefore, it is punished, and gets burned. Secondly, it implies that once such a person is married, there will be concrete and physical misery. Consequently, those praising matrimony, and then marrying, are not only incorrect, but also experience negative consequences once they have taken a spouse. It is ironic that whatever misery suffered is the direct result of the concerned individual's attitude. Longinus' quotation may well refer to Jakob and Emma, servants of Frau von Bretnagel, who are looking forward to their marriage. Jakob states, "Ich und meine Emma, wir g'freuen uns schon darauf, wenn wir heiraten werden"(I,32). The two have already had arguments resulting from Jakob's unfounded jealousy. These arguments seem to anticipate outright

quarrels once they are married. Longinus' statement also uncovers a dilemma, in that Jakob cannot possibly know about marriage until he has married. By then, however, it is too late, because he cannot return to the unmarried state, at least, usually not. Nestroy's extremely censorious view of marriage begins even before domestic disorder has set in. Longinus' earthly mother, Frau von Bretnagel, describes the preparations for his imminent wedding to Albertine as follows:

> Seit drei Tagen wird schon ununterbrochen gesotten, gebraten und gebacken und das geht heute noch die ganze Nacht fort. Es soll aber auch ein Hochzeitsdiner werden, wie seit meinem Ehrentag keines verzehrt worden ist. (I,27)

Eisenkopf replies, "Auch diese edle Sitte fängt an unterzugehen im Verderben der neuern Zeit"(I,27). The use of "edle Sitte" to describe an orgy of food is, on the one hand, a misuse of the term "edle," because a debauchery of food can hardly be considered a noble custom. Since "Sitte" is modified by "edle," and immediately next to it, some of the pejorative implications of "edle" are transferred to "Sitte" in a general sense, which ultimately may lead to a questioning of customs _per se_. In this is a profound difference from Bäuerle, for whom tradition, of which "Sitte" may be seen as one facet, is a crucial and inviolable bearer and retainer of past modes of thought and behaviour. "Sitte," on the other hand, betrays an emphasis on the wedding celebration, and on that which was an entirely peripheral consideration, namely, more than three days of cooking, frying and baking to provide the necessary

food. The verb "unterzugehen," which refers grammatically to "edle Sitte" and the past, and the noun "Verderben," which relates to "der neuen Zeit," reinforce each other, because they evoke similar connotations of ruin and decay, which extend beyond the intentions of Eisenkopf. Because of their proximity to Bretnagel's statement, and its inherent questionable worth, the meaning and modifying quality is attracted to those words to which they logically belong. Her comment reflects a decaying society, of which the so-called "edle Sitte" is one manifestation. The latter is a tradition that should, in fact, disappear. The allusion to the good old times in Bretnagel's "wie es seit meinem Ehrentag keines verzehrt worden ist," is in actual fact, an unmasking, unintentionally, of course, on her part, of a time and habit that was in the past, and definitely should not be resurrected for obvious reasons. It is an extension of Eisenkopf's inane argument mentioned earlier, "So war's zu meiner Zeit, und meine Zeit war die beste." Thus, a foolish topic is echoed, but in both instances, the context in which it is included inevitably exposes and impugns it. In this manner, Nestroy unmasks certain aspects of tradition, and draws attention to the innate ambiguity that is unavoidably a part of tenacious adherence to tradition. Still, he does not moralize in the sense that his characters praise or denounce in a dogmatic manner. Instead, they express their position in a manner which permits the spectator to discern key statements, and he winnows the wheat from the chaff. The latter may often

be seen as a cloaking device to blunt the severity of a particular point, not only from the censor, but from the general audience. Such winnowing causes a direct and beneficial involvement of the spectator, and he is thereby no longer a passive observer, as is the case with Bäuerle's plays, where the viewer need not reflect seriously upon what transpires on the stage. Instead, he becomes an active partner, even if only momentarily, in the creation of cogent views--views not only projected by Nestroy, but born simultaneously in the mind of the spectator.

An indirect undergirding of tradition in Bäuerle's play may be seen in his portrayal of Arilla, the powerful supernatural being, who protects Vienna. In his particular presentation of her, he stresses tradition, even though it is beginning to be undermined by the reality of Vienna in the 1820s. Bäuerle's representative of the spirit world is depicted as being perfect: her attitude and behaviour are accepted as absolute, and her statements are definitive. Thus, her view of Muff, Wimpel and Kitt, as well as her solution--an unquestionable loyalty to the state, are to be seen as generally applicable. Nestroy's spirits, on the other hand, are presented quite differently: the chorus opening in <u>Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche</u> refers to Pumpf, who, in the list of characters, is described as "ein reicher Zauberer," with:

> Gebt's dem alten Herrn Geister ein, sonst ist er weg,
> Er verdreht d'Augen schon, er stirbt uns auf'n Fleck.
> Die G'schicht', die ist dumm,
> Die Freud' bringt ihn um! (I,5)

Arilla's introduction is a wind tremor and thunderclap, and after she has spoken, Muff and Wimpel go down on their knees. The stage directions note, "Keiner wagt die Augen aufzuschlagen," and she concludes the scene with "Jetzt beugt euch tief, ihr seyd nicht werth, mein Antlitz weiter zu schauen."[31] The stage directions again stress the glory of the "Schutzgeist", "Das Theater erhellt sich herrlich."[32] The supernatural being is shown as omnipotent. Muff, Wimpel, and later Kitt, are fully aware of this.

There is nothing omnipotent about Pumpf--in fact, the above quotation introducing him depicts a typical mortal. The statement "Gibt's dem alten Herrn Geister ein, sonst ist er weg," elicits several levels of meaning. This latter point is a crucial one throughout Nestroy, and a further contrast to Bäuerle: usually the first level relates to the concrete and immediate, while the others refer to the universal aspects of human nature and existence. The adjective "alt" immediately questions the immortality of these spiritual beings. It is immortality, after all, that constitutes one of the fundamental differences between the denizens of the spirit world and humans. But aside from this particular individual Pumpf, "alt," as used above, also sets the tone for the whole sphere of the "Zauberwesen" in Viennese popular theater. This facet of the "Volkstheater" is drawing to its conclusion, and so is a large segment of other traditions. Thus, "alt" is a key word, which describes not only a specific individual, but an era. By

drawing attention to the weakness of the individual, those of the entire era are alluded to most effectively.

The old gentleman is to be given "Geister" as a medicine, "sonst ist er weg." This statement, a warning, reiterates the above interpretation, which shows him as an ordinary man. The opening line, as well as the rest of the quotation, is expressed in language that is humourous, but also disrespectful, something that does not occur in Bäuerle's play. All references to Arilla are solemn and respectful--they do not mention anything personal, as is frequently seen in Nestroy. A case in point is the observation, "Er verdreht d'Augen schon." Again, it might be argued that this, too, reflects not only Pumpf's condition, but that of the whole "Zauberwelt." Of special interest is "Geister," the medicine to be administered to help him regain consciousness. The fact that he is unconscious betrays a further similarity of the spirits with mortals. Pumpf's medicine consists of actual "Geister" like himself, one very small, the other very old. This would imply that the "Geisterwelt" has become cannibalistic in order to survive. However, this can only hasten its destruction. Here too, similarities may be seen with Vienna and Austria as a whole. The term "Geister" also evokes images in reference to alcoholic beverages, images that are reinforced by the chorus; "Er [Pumpf] führt gute Tafel und köstlichen Wein"(I,7). It is an excess of these "Geister" that seem to have been responsible for his unconscious state, rather than the return of his son, Longinus, as Crepontes suggests. This interpretation also

brings out another similarity between the "Zauberwesen" and regular people, and thereby attenuates the former. Nestroy's treatment of the "Zauberwelt" may be seen, on the one hand, as his contribution toward the elimination of a tradition no longer tenable. On the other hand, since the inhabitants of the magic realm are very much like humans, Nestroy uses them to reflect human attitudes and behaviour. Pumpf's weakness, and the administration of medicine, could be explicated as a warning that man is on the path of self-destruction if he continues in his selfish ways, in which he shows little or no consideration for his fellow beings. An example of such self-destructive behaviour may be seen in Longinus as the plot develops.

In Bäuerle's play, Arilla's final appearance, like her first, is accompanied by a gust of wind and a thunderclap, which emphasizes her great power. After a final admonition for the three, she rises onto a pedestal, which again stresses her great importance, especially as seen in her aim to retain and strengthen the Viennese tradition, which is symbolized by the "Burgplatz," the locale of the last scene. This is in marked contrast to the concluding scene in Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, where the returning Longinus greets his father with, "Papa! Papa! Sein Sie's wirklich?"(I,85). Nestroy's inhabitants of the "Zauberwelt" have been humanized, which indicates a movement away from petrified modes of thought. Simultaneously, it provides him with an approach to illuminate

human nature by depicting humanized spirits like Pumpf.

In concluding this particular comparison between the two writers, it is interesting to note that whereas in Bäuerle's play the supernatural element intervenes directly and arbitrarily in the affairs of men, Nestroy's spirits are concerned primarily with themselves, and, except for Longinus, who is to undergo a "Besserung," are not directly involved with humans. Arilla thinks highly of Vienna--she is its guardian spirit. Thus, her general comments about it and Austria are very positive. Nocturnus, however, refers to that part of the "Erdenwelt" where Longinus will be sent as "Der Schlamm des Lebens" (I, 18). The word "Schlamm" is indicative of Nocturnus' low opinion and disgust for the realm of human existence. One basic property of "Schlamm" is that it will disperse, and thereby cover a considerable area. Nestroy was aware of the "Schlamm," or human shortcomings, and sought to expose it, whereas Bäuerle evaded this crucial issue. In the final analysis, it might be posited that Bäuerle uses the "Zauberwesen" as a patent to endorse tradition, and to force the unpatriotic to recognize the goodness of Vienna and Austria. Also, for Bäuerle, the infallibility and omnipotence of Arilla is symbolic of the position of the Austrian state, which must endure in the traditional manner. For Nestroy, however, the magical realm provided merely one other approach toward the illumination of human attitudes and behaviour.

The foregoing analysis sought to examine the use of proverbs

and traditional linguistic modes in the two authors. This difference, although thematic to an extent, was rooted and manifested in the use of language. The following is a detailed collation about a specific facet of language use, namely, that it is on uncertain ground, which we can feel by analyzing the use of evaluative words as applied to people. One of Bäuerle's main intents, is to mark and reiterate the fundamental goodness of the Viennese. Nestroy, however, seeks to unmask and expose human shortcomings, and he does so primarily through the use of language. The two plays to be used in the comparison will be Bäuerle's Die Bürger in Wien (1813) and Nestroy's Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche (1827). Only fourteen years separate the two works, which are both part of the Viennese "Volkstheater." Yet the use of language and the view of human nature it reflects are vastly different.

In Bäuerle's play, Redlich, a "Bindermeister," is at first opposed to the marriage of his daughter, Käthchen, with Karl Berg, a poor poet. However, in the end, the father does agree to the union. In the meantime, Karl has saved Käthchen from a near drowning, which resulted from her flight from Müller, a wealthy merchant, who, with the help of Therese, the girl's mother, attempted to abduct her. When Redlich first met Karl, he argued against his daughter getting married:

> Ich bin keiner von den Vätern, die ihre Kinder bloss reich verheiraten wollen, ich bin ein Bürger und stolz, wenn meine Tochter einem gescheiten Menschen gefällt, denn g'scheite Leut sind bei mir mehr als reiche Leut, und wer was gelernt hat, geht jedem voraus, der, wenn er auch in Gold steckt, seinen

> Namen nicht schreiben kann - allein gescheite Leut sollen auch darauf denken, wie man von der Wissenschaft leben kann, von g'scheiten Leuten seh ich es gern, wenn sie ihr Pfund gut anwenden und ihre Talente auf Interesse legen-.[33]

The opening phrase, "Ich bin keiner von den Vätern," is a testimonial to his sincerity as an upright parent, and is to be accepted as just that. In Nestroy, as will be shown later, such an assertion would be interpreted as a self-righteous one, and could, in fact, be a self-betrayal. Redlich stresses that Käthchen must marry "einen gescheiten Menschen," which means, as far as Redlich is concerned, one that is literate, able to make a living based on his education, and use his talents to the fullest. As the play develops, it will become clear that Karl is "ein gescheiter Mensch." The meaning of "gescheit" is clear and direct without any secondary or deeper intimation. The spectator is not expected to discern any further suggestion, except the one intended by the speaker. Redlich uses "gescheit" again when scolding his wife for her attitude and behaviour toward him:

> Du hast dich wieder ausgezeichnet, alleweil g'scheit sein wollen - nachher wirst ausg'lacht; ich weiss aber schon, woher dein keckes Betragen gegen mich kommt: seit der superkluge Herr Müller ins Haus schleicht, bist du so schnippisch mit mir.[34]

He accuses her of "allweil g'scheit sein wollen," but instead, she has been the opposite, neither intelligent nor sensible. This has been obvious, since she had not been attempting to hide her position in reference to Müller's goal of marrying their daughter. Significant to the task at hand, however, is

the transparency of the use of Bäuerle's evaluative terms. They convey but one connotation, either positive or negative, without any shades in meaning, and unburdened by any ambiguities. It is during the same argument that Redlich describes Käthchen, "Meine Tochter hat nicht viel, aber ist brav."[35] "Brav," the evaluative word here, is meant to have the commonly accepted meaning of honest and fine, which in fact, aptly describes her. In sharp contrast, Redlich notes about Müller, "Er will mein Schwiegersohn werden; ich dank für die Ehr - wer kein braver Untertan ist, kann auch kein braver Ehemann werden."[36] Müller is not "brav." Bäuerle presents a rather simplistic view of human nature--people are either good, like Käthchen, or bad, like Müller. There are only absolutes. The language Bäuerle uses, projects only one level of meaning, and even though "brav" is used several times, it does not convey any allusions and connotation other than the one basic sense. Thus, there is no potential for ambiguities or problematic situations.

In Nestroy's Der Unbedeutende (1846), the various uses of this same "brav" show just how ambiguous language has become. Puffmann, secretary to Massengold, has conspired with Ottilie in the flight of Hermine, whom Massengold wants to marry. Massengold is unaware of Puffmann's actions, and must not discover them. Thomas, a carpenter, happens to be near the spot from which Puffmann helped her to flee. The latter believes Thomas to have knowledge of what transpired. However,

Thomas is under the impression that Puffmann wanted to commit suicide. The secretary, shortly after being discovered by Thomas, tries to persuade him to keep what he has witnessed a secret, and offers him money, saying, "Aber halt' Er Sein Mundwerk im Zaum, braver Handwerker!"(VII,12). Here, the use of "braver" reflects more about the addresser than the addressee. Puffmann has regained his self-assurance, feels he has the situation under control, and, therefore, deals with Thomas in a condescending manner. The intention and effect is very similar to patting a child in order to register approval; at least he wants Thomas to believe that he approves of him, even though this is not true. Just prior to this, Puffmann referred to him as "Freund," implying, thereby, that he thought of him as a peer. Of course, this was obviously a deception, and the use of "braver," which is not homologous with "Freund," would corroborate this view. The terms that Puffmann uses do not carry the regular meaning which he professes. His language does not inform, but instead aims to misinform. It is the manifestation of his deception.

As the play develops, Puffmann, in order to turn Massengold's suspicion from him, pretends he has had an affair with Klara, to whom Thomas' son is engaged to be married. Puffmann, however, is unaware of this situation. Massengold, who is extremely gullible as far as Puffmann is concerned, states, "Ich habe schon alles ergründet, mein Puffmann ist einmal mein braver Sekretär Puffmann und über den lass' ich nichts kommen"(VII,41).

Massengold's use of "braver," referring to Puffmann, is indicative of the thoughtless use of cliché words, thoughtless, because throughout the play, Massengold displays an unconsidered choice of words--either he parrots Puffmann directly, or he uses words only for their very trite emotional content. The fact is, that the Baron is not capable of rational thought. His use of "braver" carries the traditional, worn-out meaning that may be translated with "honest" and "upright," which is a ridiculous statement about Puffmann, and proof that Massengold does not think for himself. Here, "brav" echoes Puffmann's "brav" to Thomas. In both instances, Puffmann is a fool like Massengold. Puffmann is a fool, because Thomas does not really know about his conspiracy, and Massengold is a fool for believing Puffmann to be honest at all times, and aiming to please whenever it is in his power.

Later, Packendorf intervenes and saves Peter, Klara's brother, who is attempting to prove her innocence and Puffmann's guilt. To Packendorf's "Ihr seid ein braver Mann," Peter replies, "Mich g'freut's, denn Euer Gnaden scheinen keiner von denen zu sein, die jeden Brudern brav finden, der eine saubere Schwester hat"(VII,95). Peter is fully aware of "braver" as a cliché, its meaning in the traditional sense, and, therefore, its uncertain meaning in the context of a destroyer of traditional values. In his answer to Packendorf, he unmasks those who use it in such a manner as dishonest and deceiving. The latter is the only one of Massengold's friends who disagrees

outright with the Baron, and is most successful in penetrating Puffmann's deceit and fraud. Here is a definite reason for the use of "braver," since it is based on Peter's attitude and behaviour towards Puffmann, who nearly had him arrested. Therefore, when reason is used, and it is in the correct context, the regular and direct meaning of words is very cogent. But this is in sharp contrast to its indiscriminate use, as reflected in the linguistic habits of Puffmann and Massengold. The discriminate and critical use of words and language is shown here as reflecting positive attitudes and behaviour by both Peter and Packendorf, whereas the opposite is the case with Puffmann, who uses it to deceive, and Massengold, who uses it without thought. In each instance, its use reveals to a certain extent the nature of the speaker, and, therefore, conveys different meanings.

In conclusion, it should be noted that Thomas may be described as "brav" in the normal sense of the word, except for the fact that he accepted money from Puffmann for not disclosing the secret he believed to be a suicide attempt. But he is not "brav" in the way Puffmann wants to see him--as someone who will do his bidding in return for a bribe, and thus, permit himself to be manipulated. Puffmann, on the other hand, whom Massengold believes to be "brav," is just the opposite, not only toward Massengold, whom he deceives, and toward Thomas, whom he attempts to bribe, but particularly towards Klara, whom he has caused great mental anguish. Peter, it seems, is indeed

"brav," that is, honest, sincere and courageous. Thus, the word "brav," which at first may seem an insignificant descriptive term, must be noted as a key word contributing markedly toward a meaningful interpretation of the individual character. Such a laying bare of human psychology seems to be based on the concept--whether this is Nestroy's conscious or unconscious intent is irrelevant--that thought, the intellectual manifestation of an individual's nature, and his linguistic habits are, if not identical, inseparably bound together and reflect each other. Semanticists today bear this out. An example is the following quotation from I.S. Hayakawa's book, The Use and Misuse of Language:

> Human experience . . . consists of selecting certain ones out of innumerable stimuli in the environment; and human behaviour consists of organizing experiences along certain patterns. There is strong evidence that both the selecting and the organizing patterns bear a definite relation to the structure of language and to linguistic habits.[37]

Nestroy realized that in order to examine human nature, it is of crucial importance to be critical of language. He is just that as a writer, and would seem to expect his audience to be the same. Another quote from a different book of Hayakawa again would buttress this argument:

> It was my conviction then, as it remains now, that everyone needs to have a habitually critical attitude toward language - his own as well as that of others - both for the sake of his personal well-being and for his adequate functioning as a citizen.[38]

Therefore, the hypothesis might be made that an individual's linguistic habits reveal a thumbprint of his basic psychology,

and that this in turn would demand a very thorough analysis of a particular character's use of language, in order to gain insight into Nestroy's view of human nature.

On the other hand, Bäuerle uses language in a manner meant to be understood unambiguously by the audience. In the first encounter between Redlich and Müller, the former expresses his antagonism quite openly--there is no subtlety that would demand some measure of reflection by the spectator, "Sie sind kein guter Mensch, kein guter Untertan - Sie sind ein schlechter Patriot."[39] "Kein guter Mensch," as well as "schlechter Patriot," are evaluative words that are absolute in reference to quality, but also generalizations, in that they are not specific as to the precise facet of quality. Thus, one could argue, these expressions are meaningless. This lack of meaning is emphasized by the frequent usage of such words. It is interesting that Redlich seems to be more concerned with Müller's shortcomings as it would affect his citizenship, than its influence on his position as a husband. At the conclusion of the same scene, Müller feels frustrated, and makes a derogatory remark about Karl. Käthchen immediately comes to the defense of the latter, "Ach ja! Lieber Vater, er ist so rechtschaffen und gut -."[40] Her description of Karl as "rechtschaffen und gut" seems to be accepted by her father, even though he does not admit so openly, and it will be proven correct as the play continues. As before, with the other evaluative words discussed, the two above, referring to Karl, convey a single meaning,

readily discernible and valid within the context of the play.

So far, Redlich has made assessments about Therese, Müller, Käthchen and her prospective groom. During his son's farewell party, prior to his departure to the army, Redlich indirectly depicts himself when he advises his son, "Mach mir Freuden, Ferdinand, mach deinem biedern Namen Ehre -."[41] The adjective "bieder," meaning honest, honourable, staunch and loyal, particularly in one's attitude toward the state, best describes Redlich's image of himself. There is no self-doubt as far as he is concerned, and no subtle intimations inherent in the language that might direct attention to a possible equivocation about such a self-image. Bäuerle shows that things are just what they seem in reference to human nature, which is the very antithesis of Nestroy's position. Redlich considers the guests at the celebration to be his friends. They are like him, and it is Hans who underscores this point. The host proposes a toast to his son, all scream "Vivat," except Staberl, who is hard at work, drinking. Hans, an upright servant, notices that Staberl is not joining in the cheering, and immediately confronts him, "Merk dir's, wenn man rechtschaffenen Leuten ihre Gesundheit trinkt, dann musst Vivat schreien, sonst kriegst eine aufs Dach."[42] Here, "rechtschaffen" conveys a similar meaning to "bieder"; Hans also emphasized that all those present were "ehrliche Leute."

Bäuerle continues to stress the righteousness of the Viennese; therefore, he uses evaluative words. In this context,

one more evaluative expression should be noted, namely "Wiener Bürger," specifically "Wiener," which the author presents in such a way that seeks to make it synonymous with "gute Leute" in the widest sense.[43]

> Jetzt, eh die Suppen kommt, hab ich noch einen guten, ehrlichen Einfall. Wir sind hier vergnügt beisammen, lasst uns auch auf die denken, die wegen Armut und Not traurig sind. - Ich bin ein Wiener Bürger und mach für die Notleidenden eine Kollekte - hier sind hundert Gulden, wer folgt nach?[44]

The statement, "Ich bin ein Wiener Bürger und mach für die Notleidenden eine Kollekte," places emphasis on "Wiener Bürger," intimating that compassion and generosity are peculiar to the Viennese. A further example connected with Die Bürger in Wien occurs when Müller complains to the Kommissar about being embarrassed in the presence of some Viennese citizens. The Kommissar rebukes him severely:

> Was? Welchen Ton nehmen Sie an? Unter welchen Leuten stehen Sie? Wissen Sie, wo Sie sind? Auf diesem Ehrenplatz sind Sie noch nie gestanden, mitten unter den Bürgern von Wien, das ist eine grosse Auszeichnung, die keinem Mann Ihrer Art zuteil werden darf. Also marsch, fort von hier! Fort![45]

At this point, Bäuerle expresses the highest commendation for the "Wiener Bürger" in the play. Just standing amongst Viennese is a distinction and honour, but not all are worthy of it. The mere designation "Wiener Bürger" is, in Bäuerle's play, a high distinction and equipollent to such evaluative words as "ehrlich," "rechtschaffen," "brav," "bieder" and "gut," terms which, because of their repeated use, have become threadbare, but are still the logic of the play. Thus, the usage of

these evaluative terms per se, as well as the theme they convey, namely, the inherent goodness of the Viennese, are supportive of the "Volkstheater" tradition. Nestroy, though, unmasks the threadbare quality of language, specifically that of evaluative words, and simultaneously exhibits the failings of human nature, Viennese included.

In sharp contrast to Bäuerle's uncomplicated use of evaluative terms that do not stimulate critical thinking, key evaluative terms in Nestroy possess an undercurrent, and they instigate questions and doubts, and demand close analysis and evaluation. This involves a re-examining of their usage and meaning, not for the sake of the words themselves, but because they inevitably reflect a facet of individual human nature, which is partly responsible for the general human condition. The term "solide," used eight times in Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, will serve as a paradigm. Because "solide" is an evaluative term, its meaning could be difficult to determine, since its connotations may well vary with every person who uses it. There is, after all, no unanimity about values. Still, there must be some measure of agreement, otherwise language would serve no purpose.

Pumpf uses "solide" for the first time to defend himself against Longinus' sarcastic comment, ". . . im schönen Geschlecht haben Sie sich von jeher ausgekannt"(I,12). The father replies: "Ich bin der solideste Mann im Zauberreiche." By reacting so strongly, Pumpf immediately arouses suspicion, as

he is hardly in a position to state this about himself, as would be anyone else. When first on stage, he was unconscious, not a commendable state for a magician. His opening words when regaining consciousness betray him to be inept and foolish, "Ich weiss gar nicht, wie mir geschieht - was soll ich denn sagen?" Moments later, Nocturnus calls him "ein schwacher Vater," and tells him, ". . . darum geniesse jetzt auch die Früchte, die du gepflanzt, ernte, was du gesäet, dein Sohn kehrt als Lump zurück"(I,9). The adjective "schwacher," although referring specifically to his competence as a father, echoes the impression Pumpf made when unconscious. Once more, Nocturnus describes him as "den schwachen Vater" when he reproaches Crepontes and the others around Pumpf for contributing to the latter's failure as a parent. Weakness and foolishness are Pumpf's dominant character traits. Therefore, his claim to be "der solideste Mann im Zauberreiche" cannot be accepted, and, in view of Longinus' statement, it appears that the exact opposite is the case. Longinus, certainly, is not convinced, and retorts, "Hör der Papa auf mit der Solidigkeit!"(I,12). This statement indicates the son's impatience, but also shows that he knows otherwise. In the final analysis, Pumpf's use of the word "solide" projects a meaning opposite to his intentions. Consequently, he is not strong, not respectable and not reliable. Because of his misuse of this term, any further uses of it will inevitably result in the spectator being particularly critical of this word.

Eisenkopf uses it next when explaining to Albertine what type of man she must marry:

> Das Maul gehalten! Ein Bräutigam, der die Tochter fragt, ob sie ihn liebt, hat keine guten Absichten, nur der, der die Tochter noch gar nicht gesehen und den Vater fragt, ob er sie ihm gibt, das ist ein solider Mann. (I,21)

First of all, the expression "solide" in this context is descriptive of the speaker, because it explains a groom who would suit only the father, not the daughter. Therefore, Eisenkopf betrays extreme egocentricity and selfishness. Secondly, such a groom would obviously not be "solide," if it is to mean reliable and strong from Albertine's point of view, since he is not to ask her whether she loves him, but instead ask for the father's permission to marry before he has even seen her. This groom would be precisely one Albertine could not be happy with in marriage, but her father would be delighted, since such a union would be of financial benefit to him. As did Pumpf, so Eisenkopf misuses "solide," and exposes thereby his own shortcomings, particularly in the treatment of his daughter. Only moments later, Eisenkopf speaks to Adolf, "Schon gut! - Beantworten Sie sie nach Ihrem Gutdünken, Sie sind ein solider Mann, in meinem Geschäft kann ich mich vollkommen auf Sie verlassen" (I,22). Here, the term is to register approval, even though Eisenkopf's tone is condescending. As becomes apparent later in the play, Adolf is an individual to whom the commonly accepted meaning of "solide" does apply. However, "solide," as intended by Eisenkopf, certainly does not apply to Adolf, because he and

Albertine love each other in secret. Thus, Adolf is just the opposite to what Eisenkopf believes him to be. This does not detract from Adolf, but rather underscores his positive nature. Eisenkopf's use of "solide" in reference to Adolf, betrays another shortcoming in the former, namely, his lack of perception as far as the feelings of others are concerned. This was already obvious in his treatment of Albertine, and it is now reiterated when dealing with Adolf. It is in relation to the latter that Eisenkopf makes the right judgement, and uses the proper word, even though he believes he is implying a different intent. Here is an example of language eluding the authority of the speaker, and permitting the audience to perceive the correct meaning while simultaneously exposing the speaker.

The next use of "solide" is again made by Eisenkopf. This time, he is speaking about Longinus, who is inebriated, and has just been ejected from a "Wirtshaus", "Ist das der solideste Mensch auf zehn Meilen im Umkreis?"(I,38). The expression, "auf zehn Meilen im Umkreis," was made by Eisenkopf himself, when he attempted to convince Albertine of Longinus' suitability as a husband. Eisenkopf still uses "solide," even though Longinus is heavily intoxicated and making a fool of himself. In doing so, Eisenkopf underlines not only his own foolishness, but that of all those repeatedly misusing words. The result could have been tragic for Albertine, had she been forced to marry Longinus. Eisenkopf's question above registers primarily surprise and

anger. It does not intimate a realization on his part that he has become aware of his misuse of words. While still furious at Longinus, Eisenkopf, whose attention has been directed at Adolf by Frau von Bretnagel, angrily tells the latter: "Ja, sag' ich, es geht ihn was an, ich will's haben, dass es ihn was angeht! Das ist ein solider Mann, sehen Sie, nicht Ihr Neffe, der bekommt meine Tochter, wenn er sie will" (I,39). This is an angry reaction in which he again uses "solide," but once more, he is incorrect about Adolf, Albertine's secret lover, because it was Adolf's attempt to stop Longinus in his desire to embrace Albertine which aroused the ire of Frau von Bretnagel, which led to her outburst, "Wer ist der Mensch, dass er es wagt dreinzureden? Das geht Sie nichts an, was hier vorgeht!"(I,39). This, in turn, elicited Eisenkopf's answer quoted above, which certainly is not the result of critical thought, but an angry verbal eruption, in which he unknowingly endorses what he stated previously and unwittingly about Adolf being reliable and respectable. Even now, Eisenkopf is unaware of the clandestine love between the two. It is true, matters are resolved positively for the lovers, but Eisenkopf continues to misuse language, and thereby betrays his fatuity. Furthermore, his thoughtless use of "solide" also unmasked him, and the shortcomings of both are underscored by those of the other.

The conclusion of Act I saw Longinus being sent away by his aunt, Frau von Bretnagel, because he had foolishly forfeited

his chance to marry Albertine. In the third and fourth Scenes of the second Act, he meets the director of a travelling troupe, who is Nocturnus in disguise, and requests a position as an actor in the group. The director replies, "Sie scheinen nicht ohne Talent, aber Sie sind ein liederlicher Mensch, der einer soliden Gesellschaft nur Schande machen würde"(I,49). On the one hand, the director, really Nocturnus, is interested in "Besserung" for Longinus. Because of this, he reproaches and scolds his former pupil. In this context, "solide," modifying "Gesellschaft," may be interpreted as "respectable and sound," its generally accepted meaning. Therefore, Longinus, in his present state, particularly as expressed through his language in Scene iii, which reiterates that of Scene iv, Act I, would not be acceptable. This could then imply a valid meaning of "solide Gesellschaft" used ironically by the director, and reflecting Nestroy's view of the theater and actors. Furthermore, Nocturnus, being a learned magician, would know about Pumpf's and Eisenkopf's misuse of "solide," and employ it at this particular time to remind Longinus about specific past incidents, in the hope of having him reflect on his present state. There are several connotations to be derived from Nocturnus' use of "solide," all in reference to Longinus and the aim to have him undergo a "Besserung."

Only minutes after the director has left Longinus with a warning, the setting changes to the inn "Zum goldenen Adler," where the proprietors, Heinrich and his wife Lisette, are in

the process of preparing rooms for Adolf, Albertine and their daughter, Therese. Lisette has taken note of the baggage, particularly the strong-box, and comments to her husband, "Diesen Leuten sieht man es aber gleich an, dass sie etwas Solides, etwas Reiches sind"(I,52). For Lisette, "solide" and "reich" are synonymous; "solide" is not a character trait, but indicative of material wealth. This constitutes a further misuse of the word. Whereas all previous instances referred to a particular individual's character, Lisette's use intimates that a person's nature is based on the amount of money possessed. This betrays the speaker's value system, which has other adherents in the play, such as Bisgurnia and Eisenkopf. Moments after Lisette's observation, she and her husband recognize the guests to be the Wallner family, past acquaintances, and, as Heinrich points out, he was not treated well by the Wallners. This realization underlines the error of Lisette's interpretation of "solides," and reflects that part of her nature which values money above all else.

Towards the end of his experiences on earth, Longinus, as was to be expected, has incurred many debts. On the eve of the due date, his creditors send a messenger to remind him that the debts are due the following date; it would be best if he were to pay now. He tells the emissary, "Das kann nicht sein, nicht um eine Stunde früher, als auf'n Wechsel steht. Akkuratesse ist die Hauptsache bei einem solchen Geschäft, und ich bin als solider Mann bekannt"(I,62). Obviously, Longinus

intends "solide" to imply trustworthy and respectable. Therefore, he intends to use it as a ruse to deceive and confuse. In view of his past attitude and behaviour, as already indicated in his introductory monologue, Longinus' statement is not only ridiculous, but also humorous. He insists, "Akkuratesse ist die Hauptsache," whereas, previously he argued, ". . . denn nur nicht in der Ordnung geniessen, das ist gemein"(I,14). Although the latter comment referred to food, it is reflective of his attitude in general, which was reinforced by his behaviour throughout. The persistence on "Akkuratesse" is indeed a mere excuse not to pay the emissary, but it also anticipates the expression "solider Mann." The two are to reinforce each other; however, both underline Longinus' innate dishonesty. He penetrated his father's use of "solide" in Act I, but now he expects the messenger, who is a "Gerichtsdiener," to believe him. The aim of the "Besserungsversuch" was to have him become "solide." This, however, has not been achieved. In fact, Longinus' self-description, which employs "solide," is merely an attempt to manipulate language. Yet, as is usually the case in Nestroy, the would-be manipulators end up being the manipulated, because they are betrayed by their own words.

The song that concludes the play is sung by Longinus, who, according to Nocturnus and Pumpf, has undergone a successful "Besserung." The song opens with: "Die Jugend ist gar selten solid . . ."(I,85). Certainly, this would apply to Longinus' youth, but also to his mature years and old age on

earth. The lack of "Solidität" was also apparent in Pumpf and Eisenkopf, as well as in Lisette and Heinrich. It is, therefore, an element that pervades, if not all, then nearly all of humanity. Lines two to five inclusive list examples of activities that are not "solide," all of which Longinus experienced, thus proving him not to be "solide." This concluding use of "solide" echoes all previous instances, in that it causes the spectator to remember them briefly in the light of this last one.

The various uses of the evaluative term under consideration has caused an interaction between them, which has aided in the interpretation of the different figures availing themselves of this word. In order to acquire a meaningful sense from "solide," as well as from other evaluative terms, the total context must be examined, that is, the addresser and the addressee, as well as their immediate environment. Furthermore, three levels of meaning must be given attention: a) the commonly agreed upon meaning, obviously the same in each case; b) the intent and purpose of the speaker, and c) the denotation and connotations that might transcend both a) and b), permitting the audience to gain a satisfactory understanding of the speakers, each of whom may be seen as contributing an individual link in the chain that describes the perimeter of Nestroy's world view. One of the general conclusions to be drawn from the above analysis of "solide," is that Nestroy shows concern about the frequent manipulation of language by word

tricksters. An example would be Longinus' quotation in reference to the importance of "Akkuratesse," where he emphasizes that he is "ein solider Mann." However, such word tricksters inevitably expose themselves to the audience, precisely because they aim to manipulate others. The langauge, it seems, repays those in kind that intend to do it violence. The misused word might be thought of as a lens that magnifies, without distorting, the shortcomings of those speaking. Thus, Nestroy's language, in this particular case evaluative words, is vibrant with life of its own, which frequently endows it with meanings beyond that intended by the speaker. Nestroy's language is an organic entity, whereas that of Bäuerle, reflecting the tradition it espouses, has become fossilized.

As already mentioned, Bäuerle's Wien, Paris, London und Constantinopel and Nestroy's Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, are designated as "Besserungsstücke." Hence, an identification and analysis of the "Besserung" topic via the language, particularly in Nestroy's play, will contribute to an increased understanding of Nestroy's position in reference to his contemporaries. In Bäuerle's play, Arilla, the guardian spirit of Vienna, explains her functions as: "Ich strafe muthwillige Auswanderer, strafe alle, die ihre Heimath verlassen, um der Fremde auf Kosten des Vaterlandes zu huldigen. Ich kenne dich; auch dein Gemahl ist solch ein Verwegener."[46] Johanna, whose husband is an "Auswanderer," is comforted with these words, "Begib dich in meinen Schutz, und du sollst ihn wiedersehen. Gebessert

kehrt er in deine Arme zurück."[47] In Bäuerle, the need for "Besserung" relates to the individual's attitude toward the state. Furthermore, there is absolutely no doubt as to the success of "Besserung." It is a foregone conclusion that Johanna's husband will indeed be a better man when Arilla has dealt with him. During the various experiences prescribed, in fact, these seem like a series of punishments. Arilla intervenes directly several times, altering the course of events by protecting the three from extreme danger, which she had precipitated in the first place. When they are finally returned home, they are exceedingly happy, and praise Vienna, an action which supposedly means a new and positive view of the city and state. Such an approach to the "Besserungsstück" was endorsed totally by the state, because it portrayed how the subject was made pliable, so he would submit to the existing condition, and accept fully the social and political order in existence. Bäuerle's three characters are relatively easily forced into making statements, construed by Arilla to be indicative of a positive attitude toward Vienna. The main reason for this, aside from the obvious fact that Arilla is omnipotent, is their shallow nature. Furthermore, they seem like mere puppets in Arilla's hands, and it would be most difficult for the audience to identify with them. Longinus, however, is a more fully developed character. He seems more real, and his rather sophisticated use of language is a manifestation of this. In Paris, Muff, Wimpel and Kitt are duped

by the crudest manipulators, one of whom is Vite. The latter describes the travellers visiting Paris with these words:

> Es ist nur auf die Dummheit zu spekulieren; die Unbefangenen, die Leichtgläubigen, ach das sind herrliche Kunden, sie fallen wie die hungrigen Sperrlinge ins Netz, und machen noch so possierliche Sprünge, dass man sich darüber todt lachen könnte.[48]

This comment is a valid description of the three. In London, a painter tells them directly, "Ohne Ihnen zu schmeicheln: Einfältigere Leute sah London noch nie."[49] Arilla herself says of Muff: "Nein, dumm, strohdumm, aber gerade das gefällt mir."[50] Aside from their foolishness, they appear generally bland and banal, as none of the three has any definite negative quality, nor do they engage in behaviour that would be detrimental to anyone. As a matter of fact, they can even be helpful, as is shown in London, where they save the life of a foolish young man, who is determined to commit suicide, because his love has been spurned. Kitt exclaims, "G'horsamer Diener, das leiden wir nicht, dass sich ein Mensch ein Leid anthut."[51] The above statement and action, which is out of context with their other behaviour, since it demands more courage than the three usually have, is apparently to symbolize positive behaviour of the Viennese in general. Except for their conception of Vienna, there is little of significance that requires "Besserung" as far as Bäuerle's protagonists are concerned. No references are made to weaknesses in relationships with other people. Kitt's marriage problems are not part of the plot. They are only spoken about, and he does not live with his wife

during the play.[52] Instead, Bäuerle focuses entirely on the relationship between the individual and his city, where the former is to feel love and respect for the latter, irrespective of whether or not the economic conditions in the city permit him to build a good existence. In fact, Arilla avoided the financial difficulties of Muff and Wimpel, and made no attempt to come to terms with them, because involvement in this matter would undoubtedly lead to the questioning of the existing order, and begin to undermine the various petrifications of tradition. Instead, Arilla treats the three--Kitt joins them just prior to their departure for Paris--like immature children, who are spanked for misbehaving, but given sweets when reacting with accepted behaviour.

One manifestation of their immature nature is seen in their lack of self-knowledge and the absence of serious reflection about themselves and their environment. When they face grave danger in Constantinople, Muff calls out, "Ach, wenn wir nur z' Haus blieben wären! Jetzt gehn wir alle zu Grund!"[53] This is a typical reaction--it shows neither insight nor change in their fundamental attitude, but only great fear and an instinctive cry for help. Wimpel, too, calls out in desperation, "Ich ruf unsere Schutzgöttin an. Hör uns! Erbarme dich unsers Jammers!"[54] Again, helplessness and fear are the only reactions. They do not reflect about their predicament, and have no solutions. The ineptitude the three have portrayed from the start continues to be their dominant trait. Arilla appears immediately,

"Mit dem Schreck sollt ihr diessmahl davon kommen. Es ist Euch verziehen."[55] Her first sentence intimates that there has been no change, certainly no "Besserung," only a momentary trepidation, which is all she apparently intended to have them experience. The second sentence supports the hypothesis that there has been no "Besserung," because she forgives them. Had there been "Besserung," the need to forgive would be superfluous. Being forgiven certainly does not mean that Muff, Wimpel and Kitt have undergone a positive change, yet the latter was the impetus for the adventures. Of course, Arilla had promised Johanna that there would definitely be a "Besserung," at least in reference to her husband. It is somewhat surprising that she sees herself being in a position to dispense forgiveness to the three. Supposedly it is in reference to their unacceptable attitude toward Vienna, which would be a direct affront to her. Although there is no genuine "Besserung," one that would relate to the individual's basic nature, Arilla, in her magnanimity, pardons them nevertheless.

With Nestroy, on the other hand, the reverse is true. As soon as Pumpf realizes Longinus is indeed a "Lump," he calls for Nocturnus, "Mein bester Nocturnus, Er hat recht gehabt, der Bub ist ausgewechselt. Bestraft muss er werden!"(I,16). But the tutor replies, "Ihn zu bestrafen ist nicht mein Zweck, sondern ihn zu bessern"(I,16). Still, Longinus does receive punishment, but his is self-inflicted, and not a part of Nocturnus' plan. In Act III, Scene xxii, Nocturnus makes the following

observation, ". . . das Los der letzten zehn Jahre hat er sich selbst bereitet, die Strafe wird ihn bessern"(I,74). The statement, "hat er sich selbst bereitet," clearly underlines that Longinus himself is responsible for his suffering.[56] Arilla, however, placed a primary emphasis on punishment, "Ich strafe muthwillige Auswanderer, strafe alle, die ihre Heimat verlassen." For Nocturnus, positive change is the foremost aim. The change refers specifically to Longinus' basic nature as it relates to himself, and is manifested in his behaviour toward those around him. This unacceptable deportment is vividly expressed by Longinus in his opening monologue, which has been analyzed in part already. Just prior to Longinus' banishment, Nocturnus specifically designates the area in which he is to undergo "Besserung", "Lerne einsehen, wohin der Hang zur Liederlichkeit führt! - Geh hinunter auf die Erdenwelt und sei durch dreissig Jahre ein Lump"(I,17). Longinus' problem is "der Hang zur Liederlichkeit." He enjoys being a "Lump," which he admits openly when he answers Nocturnus, "Dreissig Jahre ein Lump - meine schönsten Wünsche sind erfüllt"(I,17). The word "Lump," which is also part of the title, merits special attention. "Lump," as well as "lumpen," originate from the late Middle High German term "lumpe," meaning rag. During the seventeenth century, it referred to persons wearing rags and tatters. The verb "lumpen," which is descriptive of a slovenly and dissolute life style, is a valid portrayal of Longinus' behaviour and appearance. The latter is apparent in the stage directions

of the second scene in Act II, which states, "Longinus, sehr abgeschaben gekleidet"(I,43). Two examples of his behaviour are the following: he drinks immoderately as is shown in Scene x of Act I, when von Bretnagel laments, "Um alles in der Welt, er ist betrunken!"(I,38). This leads directly to the loss of Albertine. Furthermore, he steals when in a difficult position. After the messenger from his creditors had left, he decided to steal Adolf's money. However, the latter caught him in the act, and when Longinus pleads for mercy, Adolf angrily retorts, "Du wolltest meine Tochter auf Abwege bringen, drum hab' ich kein Erbarmen mit dir!"(I,73). Adolf's reply discloses a further example of "lumpiges" behaviour of Longinus. The thirty years will give him a carte blanche to pursue the life-style expressed in the above mentioned monologue.

In Nocturnus' warning, the word "Hang" deserves careful attention, because it indicates--this is endorsed by Longinus in his monologue and in his answer to Nocturnus above--a natural and fundamental inclination to behave in a particular manner. But if such behaviour has its mainspring deep in Longinus' psyche, then the question arises whether change, any change, is in fact possible. Of course, one might argue that Nocturnus' warning above does not specifically demand change, only the insight and realization where such negative behaviour can lead; he says, "lerne einsehen." When Longinus has comprehended where his inclination will lead, he will also have gained considerable insight into himself. There is a significant difference between

the aim of Arilla and that of Nocturnus. The latter aims for a new understanding, for self-knowledge, but whether this will actually result in moral conduct is not a certainty. Still, it is far more meaningful in reference to the individual concerned, than is the ultimate goal in Bäuerle's play, the inculcating of patriotism.

In order for Longinus to gain the necessary insight, he must go to earth, "Geh hinunter auf die Erdenwelt"(I,17). The adverb "hinunter" elicits pejorative images, in that he is to descend. This expression inevitably presents the world in general, and Vienna in particular, in a light which is the very opposite to Bäuerle's position. Immediately prior to Longinus' departure for earth, Nocturnus refers to earth as, "Der Schlamm des Lebens, in dem du versinken willst"(I,18). This is an endorsement and expansion of the negative view about earth introduced by the term "hinunter." "Schlamm" echoes "hinunter," and increases the severity of Nestroy's criticism of Vienna. "Schlamm" is a serious indictment, particularly in the ethical and moral sphere of human behaviour as Nestroy saw it.[57] Aside from the human behaviour in general in the Viennese milieu, "Schlamm" also echoes Longinus' "Hang zur Liederlichkeit." "Schlamm" not only hinders an individual's progress, but it will ultimately draw him down, and lead to his destruction. There is further buttressing of the terms "Hang," "Schlamm" and "Liederlichkeit," when Longinus is on earth and tells Nocturnus, whom he believes to be responsible for his loss

of Albertine, "Aha, jetzt wird mir alles klar, Sie wollen mich da auf der Welt herumsekkieren, dass mir die Lumperei zuwider werden sollt'; aber nein, sie g'fällt mir, das ist meine Passion!"(I,40). Here, the key word is "Passion," whose source is the Latin "passio," meaning to suffer, to submit, to be ill. In the seventeenth century, "Passion" assimilated from the French "passion" the new significance of "Leidenschaft," devotion, preference, fondness and partiality. Two connotations are distinct in reference to Longinus. Firstly, devotion and partiality, which echo the word "Hang," underscore that he cannot change his nature, or, as the German idiom expresses it, "Er kann nicht aus seiner Haut heraus." Secondly, it alludes to his inevitable submittance to the shortcoming, and the inescapable result of suffering, which he does not evade as long as he is on earth. Immediately after Scharf, his creditors' messenger, has left, Longinus reflects seriously about his situation--not once does this occur with any of Bäuerle's three protagonists--noting about himself, "Es ist ein Hang zum Wohlleben in mir, ich kann nicht anders!"(I,64). Moments later, he decides to steal Adolf's strong box. Here is a further admission that what he does is wrong, but simultaneously, there is the realization that he cannot be different. The word "Hang" has been used before by Nocturnus in the same reference. Now Longinus uses it himself, and ingeminates it by noting, ". . . ich kann nicht anders." This is a succinct explanation of his behaviour first described in the opening monologue. His

propensity toward "Wohlleben" will continue; irrevocably, he will remain a scoundrel. The brief dream that follows his reflections reiterates this once more, when he tells the Erste Traumgestalt, which personifies honesty, "Der Hang zum Wohlleben? Der beherrscht mich ja. Geh fort!"(I,65). The verb "beherrscht" reverberates not only "Hang" in this statement when it was first noted, it also underpins "Passion." The Erste Traumgestalt is still present when the Zweite Traumgestalt, which represents Longinus' "Hang zum Wohlleben," appears. He asks it to blow out the light so he will not be able to see the Erste Traumgestalt, whose presence he finds unsettling. Longinus consciously blots out what he calls, "ein Funken [Ehrlichkeit]" within him.[58] This is Longinus' fate, a self-inflicted one, unless he will undergo a positive change. Thus, "Schlamm" reverberates negative aspects of Longinus, and thereby presents a specific and concrete individual example of untenable human behaviour in general.

Bäuerle does not admit to such a situation, certainly not if it reflects in any way on Vienna, which he idealizes. There are no pernicious events and situations in this city, only in those visited by the three protagonists. These are manipulated like marionettes, and take no direct and conscious part in their so-called "Besserung."[59] Longinus, on the other hand, does possess a certain measure of self-determination--he is a peer of Pumpf and Nocturnus. Whereas Arilla is god-like, compared to Muff, Wimpel and Kitt, Longinus may choose to return after the

first ten years, provided he has changed. This comes to the fore very clearly at the conclusion of Act I, where he meets Nocturnus, and blames him for losing Albertine; "Aha, jetzt wird mir alles klar, Sie wollen mich da auf der Welt herumsekkieren, dass mir die Lumperei zuwider werden sollt'; aber nein, sie g'fallt mir, das ist meine Passion!"(I,40). The first line shows that he is fully aware of his situation, but he consciously refuses to change his ways, even in the slightest. This quotation indicates that he possesses an awareness, which is already indicated in his opening dialogue, as well as in the statement to Pumpf about the latter's good taste in reference to the opposite sex, and also in his comments to Nocturnus; "Dreissig Jahre ein Lump - meine schönsten Wünsche sind erfüllt"(I,17), and, "Brav, den Schlamm des Lebens lass' ich mir gefallen"(I,18).[60] The expression "Meine schönsten Wünsche" must also be seen as resonating the images evoked by "Schlamm," which in turn, was seen as reverberating "Hang zur Liederlichkeit." "Meine schönsten Wünsche" is a strong reaffirmation of "Hang zur Liederlichkeit," and Longinus is fully aware of the various implications this has.

Here is a valid example of images in Nestroy being anticipated and expanded: "Liederlichkeit" anticipates "Schlamm," and "Dreissig Jahre ein Lump" foreshadows "meine schönsten Wünsche sind erfüllt." None of the three Bäuerle protagonists portrays a measure of self-awareness about particular situations, once Arilla has informed them of her intentions. Instead, they

rely on the "Schutzgöttin" in difficult situations, as seen at the end of their stay in Paris, when Muff calls on Arilla, "Schutzgöttin, hilf uns, aber diessmal nicht durch d' Luft, sondern durch die Erde."[61] It is repeated in the stage directions when they must leave London by boat, "Arilla erscheint auf einem Schiffchen, das die drey Abenteurer aufnimmt."[62] In Constantinople, it happens once more, when Wimpel calls out, "Ich ruf unsere Schutzgöttin an. Hör uns! Erbarme dich unsers Jammers!"[63] At no time does Longinus plead with Nocturnus for mercy; he is certainly a more credible character than any one of Bäuerle's three protagonists.

There are numerous and significant differences to be found in a comparison of Bäuerle's and Nestroy's "Besserungsstücke," as the foregoing comparison and contrast sought to establish. However, there is also one relatively strong point of contact, namely, the apparent success of the "Besserungs" attempt, apparent, because neither Bäuerle's three protagonists, nor Nestroy's Longinus undergo a genuine "Besserung." After numerous foolhardy and foolish experiences in Paris, London and Constantinople, Muff, Wimpel and Kitt are saved by Arilla, and returned safely to Vienna. Muff is the last to speak for the three of them:

> (in höchster Begeisterung). Himmel, mein geliebtes Wien wieder! Ja, wann man dich sieht, da kommt freylich ein Sterbender ins Leben. Ich befinde mich wieder gut. Boden! lass dich küssen! Stephansthurm, sey nicht bös! Brüder, wir haben's Lehrgeld geben und bleiben in Zukunft hübsch zu Haus. Reisen wir einmahl wieder, so sey es höchstens nach Hütteldorf zum Bier,

> oder nach Laxenburg um einen Spargel, oder nach Nussdorf um Krebsen. Paris, London und Constantinopel, es ist überall recht, aber z' Haus ist's am besten![64]

The stage directions stress their enthusiasm, which at this point is an emotional outburst, but it does not register genuine change, even though it is to be accepted as such. His first sentence refers to "mein geliebtes Wien." This is a sudden and totally unexpected reaction--certainly it is not motivated during the course of the play. The only possible causes would be the many pernicious events they experienced in the foreign cities, which were all carefully manipulated by Arilla. Originally, they left Vienna because life there had become untenable. But the events planned for them by Arilla, and intimated by her when she spoke to Johanna, "Ich strafe muthwillige Auswanderer, strafe alle, die ihre Heimath verlassen, um der Fremde auf Kosten des Vaterlandes zu huldigen,"[65] were so extreme, that they could not help but be overjoyed when returned to Vienna. However, this is not indicative of insight or genuine "Besserung," which was supposed to occur according to Arilla. Muff's second sentence is a mere banality in praise of Vienna. Still, this also does not show that there has been a "Besserung." His statement that claims they have had to pay "Lehrgeld," appears to indicate that learning has taken place, but this is not substantiated anywhere in the play. Therefore, it is not valid. He then goes on to suggest that any travel in future will be confined to the immediate vicinity of Vienna, for such mundane purposes as drinking beer and buying asparagus and

crabs. This comment is obviously not indicative of newly acquired insight. Their main concern is food and drink, which is supposedly the mark of a respectable Viennese. Muff's concluding sentence admits that matters are fine in Paris, London and Constantinople, but it is still best at home. The first part is entirely erroneous according to the events in the plot, because matters were definitely not alright. His final assertion, "z' Haus ist's am besten," has no basis in fact, at least not in the play. When the three left, they could not bear staying any longer in Vienna. During their absence, nothing has changed, neither in reference to Vienna, nor as far as the basic nature of the three is concerned. Therefore, matters stand just as they did at the start of the play, with the exception that Muff, Wimpel and Kitt have just had two days of unpleasant, and at times, very frightening experiences. As soon as they have recuperated, all will be just as it was before. Arilla is apparently satisfied with the three, and the spectator is to believe that there has been a genuine "Besserung." However, Bäuerle is not at all convincing, not as far as the positive change of the three is concerned, nor in respect to the validity of the patriotism as espoused in the concluding scene of the play by Muff and the chorus.

In Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, Nocturnus, who is arranging the banishment, tells Longinus, "Nicht eher darfst du wiederkehren, bis du andern Sinnes und unserer würdig geworden" (I,17). Longinus replies, "Ich lass' mich empfehlen, da kann

der Beherrscher lange warten"(I,17). This answer immediately indicates a potential problem that may well hinder the "Besserung." Longinus knows why he is being banished, and forthwith announces he has no intention of changing. Moments later, he reiterates his position, when Nocturnus tells him that he will be a "Lump" for thirty years on earth. Again, Longinus' answer shows will power and determination to continue with his present behaviour, "Dreissig Jahre ein Lump - meine schönsten Wünsche sind erfüllt"(I,17). This reiterates his first quotation above, and leaves no doubt as to the seriousness of his intentions. In fact, the statement, "meine schönsten Wünsche sind erfüllt," shows that Longinus is able to turn what at first glance would seem like a punishment, to his advantage. More important, however, is the intimation in Longinus' quotations that Nocturnus' "Besserungsversuch" will be beset by ambiguities and problems. Longinus repeats his position once more in the same scene, Act I, Scene v, when he tells Nocturnus, "Brav, den Schlamm lass' ich mir gefallen"(I,18). Only because he enjoys being a "Lump" will he also enjoy the "Schlamm." These words buttress each other, because they elicit similar connotations in reference to Longinus.

In Longinus' conversation with the Direktor, the latter inquires, "Wünschen Sie denn gar nicht, zu einem ordentlichen soliden Leben zurückzukehren?"(I,50).[66] Longinus' answer is in accordance with his two quotations above, because he reiterates the same attitude, "Um alles in der Welt nicht, das

wäre mein Tod! Nein, mein einziger Wunsch ist, das es wenigstens noch zehn Jahrln so dauert"(I,50). The declaration "das wäre mein Tod" literally means that if he cannot be a "Lump," he could not possibly exist. There is absolutely no possibility for "Besserung"; he must be what he is, and cannot be anything else. Here, Nestroy lucidly points out that the attempt at "Besserung" is doomed, because it demands an alteration in an individual's basic self. This would mean the self is no longer the self, which in turn, would imply the termination of the person, or, as Longinus expresses it, "das wäre mein Tod."

Longinus' averments are reverberated by several other characters in the play. Crepontes confronts Nocturnus in the twenty-third scene of the last act:

> Und dann - da kann ich dem alten Herrn gar nicht Unrecht geben - er hat durch ein überirdisches Jalougatter herunterg'schaut auf die Welt, und da hat er g'sehn, dass es mit Ihrer Besserungsanstalt einen Faden hat, der junge Herr wird von Jahr zu Jahr ein ärgerer Lump, das hätt' er im Geisterreich auch werden können. (I,75)

Crepontes' words clearly support the difficulties of a "Besserungsversuch" already promised by Longinus, when he first replied to his former tutor,"Ich lass mich empfehlen, da kann der Beherrscher lange warten"(I,17). The idiom "einen Faden hat" underlines the problems that Nocturnus is experiencing, but more serious is the assertion, "der junge Herr wird von Jahr zu Jahr ein ärgerer Lump, das hätt' er im Geisterreich auch werden können."[67] Before, Longinus was merely a

"Lump." However, during his supposed "Besserung," he is becoming "ein ärgerer Lump." This use of "Lump" echoes all previous references to "Lump," and adds further images of Longinus' ruinous mode of behaviour. The description "ärgerer Lump" is later endorsed indirectly by Madame Speer, who knew Longinus at the beginning of his "Besserungsversuch," which was thirty years prior to their meeting near the end of the play. At this point she says to him, "Ja, die dreissig Jahre haben eine Veränderung hervorgebracht. - Du lieber Himmel! Wenn das die selige Frau Tante und der noch seligere Herr Onkel sähet -" (I,80-81). Longinus is now a prisoner and street sweeper. It is obvious that he has continued in the course as described in his first monologue, and adhered to his promises made to Nocturnus. From Madame Speer's point of view there has been a change, a "Verschlechterung." However, there has been no alteration in his basic character. As far as Nocturnus is concerned, the opposite to what he aimed for has occurred. In his final monologue on earth, just after Madame Speer has left, Longinus readily admits what he is, and who is to blame:

> Weit ist's gekommen mit mir, und wer ist daran schuld? Ich ganz allein! Wer hat mir denn geschafft, dass ich ein Lump werden soll? Warum bin ich nicht einmal da umgekehrt, wie mir's Wasser schon ins Maul g'loffen ist? - Jetzt sähet ich's freilich ein, aber um zwanzig Jahre zu spät! - Jetzt ist's vorbei, der Ölfleck geht nicht mehr heraus. In der Jugend soll man auf einen honetten Weg trachten, im Alter gibt einem kein Mensch mehr einen Kreuzer für die Besserung. (I,81)

He was always determined to be a "Lump," and has been very successful in this endeavour. All his previous quotations, and

those of others attest to this. Thus, there is no new measure of self-awareness here. There is, though, a new element of remorse, but he is still honest, and blames only himself, "Wer hat mir denn geschafft, dass ich ein Lump werden soll?" His answer is simple, "Ich ganz allein!" He continues to remain a "Lump" even now, because he does not embark on a new course. Instead, he remarks, "Jetzt ist's vorbei, der Ölfleck geht nicht mehr heraus." The "Ölfleck" may be seen as the ineradicable mark left by his "Hang zur Liederlichkeit," which was a basic component of his nature. His "Liederlichkeit" has been transformed into an "Ölfleck," which is the mark of "Liederlichkeit" that continues to be an irrevocable part of his basic nature. Ultimately, he does not undergo a "Besserung," even though he fully realizes the consequences of having lived the life of a "Lump."

Nocturnus interprets Longinus' last monologue as an indication of "Besserung," and informs Pumpf, who observes, "Besser haben wir's halt doch, als die Leut' dort unten, einer irdischen Braut wär' schlecht geholfen, wenn man ihr einen Bräutigam dreissig Jahr lang bessern tät"(I,84). This, in effect, states such a "Besserung" would be of little benefit to an earthly fiancée, because of the time involved.[68] His comment echoes Crepontes' statement to Nocturnus, where he notes, "dass es mit Ihrer Besserungsanstalt einen Faden hat"(I,75). Thus, such a "Besserung" is totally in vain when related to mortals. In response to Pumpf's sceptical comment about the usefulness that

such "Besserung" would have for "eine irdische Braut," Nocturnus suggests, "Darum bessern sich die Menschen erst im Eh'stand"(I,84). But Pumpf retorts: "Ja, anpumpt!" Nocturnus' comment indirectly compares marriage to Longinus' "Verbannung." This, in turn, intimates hardships, which Nestroy placed in the context of marriage throughout his career. Pumpf's reply, which is in sharp disagreement with Nocturnus, emphasizes once more that "Besserung" does not occur, not even in marriage. But if Longinus has not undergone "Besserung" so far, as has been argued previously, then there will surely be a continuation of Longinus, the "Lump." It seems that Nocturnus' suggestion above is a hint that he too does not believe Longinus has been bettered during his banishment. However, it is hoped that marriage leads to the goal of "Besserung." But Pumpf's retort quickly punctures a hole in this argument. Ultimately, there is no hope that "Besserung" is possible.

In the final analysis, Crepontes' warning to Nocturnus, "mit Ihrer Besserungsanstalt hat es einen Faden"(I,75), applies equally to Arilla's efforts, although in Bäuerle's play, the inherent difficulties in the "Besserungsstück" are just not admitted. Bäuerle's work remains firmly entrenched in the tradition of the "Besserungsstück," doggedly pursues the old route, while Nestroy uses the "Besserungsstück" as a mold, into which he works an original core through his revolutionary use of language, thereby unmasking human shortcomings, and positing that the possibility of "Besserung" is highly ambiguous. Nestroy

uses a traditional genre to point out those traditional modes of thought, that have become petrified and are, therefore, detrimental to those adhering to them. Bäuerle's play, for reasons already mentioned, is local and passé, whereas Nestroy's work as a whole, because of its critical use of the language, which reflects a critical view of human nature, remains timeless and universal.

Chapter II has sought to mark some of the profound differences (as seen through language) between Nestroy and Bäuerle, who was used as a representative of Nestroy's contemporaries. Now that Nestroy's position in relation to his contemporaries has been circumscribed, we turn our attention in the following chapter to the relationships between language and personality in Nestroy's plays. Through a close look at the underlying identity between how a person expresses himself, and what he really is, despite the changes in the plot, a further understanding of several dominant themes reverberating throughout Nestroy's work will be acquired. In addition, we will attempt to examine the growing independence a speaker's words seem to take on, and the dangers this independence poses for the speaker.

Chapter III

> Nestroy ist der erste deutsche Satiriker, im dem sich die Sprache Gedanken macht über die Dinge.
>
> K. Kraus

In order to examine the Nestroyan universe as created by his language, Chapter III will seek to identify three basic linguistic devices that are representative facets of Nestroy's revolutionary use of language within the framework of the "Wiener Volkstheater." These basic devices pervade all of Nestroy's works. Firstly, single words and phrases are often taken by the audience in an ironic way. This results in a boomerang effect, which unmasks the speaker in defiance of his own aim in speaking. Thus, language comments upon the speaker in a critical manner. Secondly, language acts as a thumbprint. That is, it stamps a character--once he has spoken, he retains his linguistic habits, and does not change them, which implies that his basic nature, as reflected through his use of language, remains constant. Thirdly, language manipulates the apparent manipulator, which results in the speaker being trapped by his own words. These devices will be critically analyzed as to pertinency and effectiveness. During this examination, certain dominant themes relating to human attitudes and modes of behaviour, manifested in the linguistic habits and patterns of individuals, will emerge. Permeating all is Nestroy's trenchant

and censorious study of human nature, which will become apparent when utterances quoted in this chapter are subjected to some or all of these questions: a) What is said? b) How is it said? c) Why is it said?

An appropriate example of the boomerang effect of language may be seen in the linguistic habits of Simplicius, the protagonist in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel (1838). At the beginning of the first act, Simplicius is in a millinery, buying a hat for his bride, when Schnapp furtively enters the store followed immediately by two clerks from a different store. The clerks confront Schnapp, and discover a piece of stolen silk cloth under his jacket. Schnapp is unmistakably a thief. Simplicius refuses to accept the obvious, and does not believe that Schnapp is indeed a thief. Instead, he claims to be his friend, pays for the stolen article, and states, "Lernen Sie daraus, meine Herrn, dass man nie nach dem Scheine urteilen soll"(VI,499). He advises the two clerks, "Lernen Sie daraus." Logically, this should be directed at himself, because the facts prove him to be totally in error. In this manner, the language acts like a boomerang, and unmasks his own foolishness, which is the mainspring for his actions. The second part of the suggestion, "dass man nie nach dem Scheine urteilen soll," is in itself commendable. However, in this particular situation, there is no "Schein," there are only facts. Simplicius' use of a commonplace points out that he does not really think for himself. Instead, he uses ready-made word

patterns, which are not necessarily appropriate when used in an instance such as this. Not only does he judge according to appearances, but he actually creates for himself a "Schein" if it is absent. Madame Foulard, the proprietress, also draws attention to his fatuity when she notes, "Das ist ein Mann, mit dem eine ein Glück macht"(VI,499). This echoes Muffl's comment about Scheitermann, "Wär' er nicht so reich, hätt' sie ihn nicht geheirat't; wär' er nicht so dumm, hätt' er sie nicht geheirat't" (XIV,541). Because Simplicius is so foolish, the girl who marries him is lucky, since he is wealthy, and she will be able to manipulate him. In his first appearance in the play, Simplicius' language has illustrated very ironically a specific mode of behaviour, namely, a foolish one, through which he has thumbprinted himself. The question now to be asked, is whether this behaviour is merely an exception, or whether it is anticipatory of his future activity. The verification of one or the other will be found by examining further respresentative passages spoken by him.

Just prior to the above incident, Simplicius had returned to his hometown, and within the first hour had fallen in love with Aglaja, whom Florfeld calls a "Kokette." This led to an immediate engagement. Within a few days, however, Simplicius discovers Aglaja to be unfaithful, and he is therefore determined to dissolve the pledge. But Aglaja and her mother, Frau von Perlthau, succeed in deceiving him into believing her to be innocent. Simplicius succumbs to the ruse, telling Anselm,

his servant," Anselm, es hat sich aufgeklärt, sie ist unschuldig, und ich bin ein Stockfisch, wie die Brandstatt keinen zweiten aufzuweisen hat" (VI,523). The structure of this remark repeats that of the one above. The word "aufgeklärt" implies that there has been a misunderstanding, which is not true, and that matters have been set straight. There was a misunderstanding, originally on his part, when he believed Aglaja's response to be genuine, which was not the case. But there was no misunderstanding, because Simplicius was standing very close to Aglaja when he discovered her relationship with her lover, Narciss. Furthermore, matters have not been set straight, since he permitted himself to be duped again. His self-evaluation, "ich bin ein Stockfisch," is true, though not in the sense that he implies it, namely that he had been accusing her unjustly of deception. This incorrect reason for being a "Stockfisch" heavily underscores the fact that indeed he is one. Thus, he says the right thing for the wrong reason, reiterating thereby his fatuity betrayed in the episode with Schnapp. The ironic understanding of the sentence by the audience in both cases leads to the establishment of his foolishness.

Aglaja, who is determined to retain her close relationship with Narciss, easily persuades Simplicius to accept Narciss as a friend. Simplicius readily agrees, "Dich zum Weib haben ist ein unsinniges Glück, dann noch (Narcissens Hand ergreifend) so einen Freund, der wahrhaft an meinem Glücke teilnimmt, das ist

ja der Himmel auf Erden"(VI,527).[1] The modifier "unsinnig" is the key in this self-unmasking incident, because it relates more to his behaviour than to its modified noun, since his behaviour has been "unsinnig," not only in believing her to be faithful, but particularly in agreeing to a friendship with Narciss. Furthermore, it relates to "Glück" in the same way as the above examples. The audience understands that this "Glück" is "unsinnig" in a different sense than he means. In fact, the modifier "unsinnig" is generally descriptive of Simplicius, not only in this immediate and concrete context, but also in his total existence. Simplicius' foolishness is exposed again, and reiterated in his reference to Narciss as "einen Freund, der wahrhaft an meinem Glück teilnimmt." The verb "teilnimmt" is much more meaningful than Simplicius suspects it to be, since Narciss is Agalja's lover. Here too, the audience understands it in a different way. This being the case, Simplicius' "Glück" will indeed become "unsinnig." In fact it will be an "Unglück." In this sense, "unsinnig" is used correctly, but here too, Simplicius is unaware of the various connotations of his words, whose reverberations are discerned by the audience. Aglaja marries Simplicius solely for his money.[2] This she clearly stated just before Simplicius discovered her with Narciss, when she told the latter, "Warum besitzen Sie nicht Vermögen? Warum er nicht Ihre Liebenswürdigkeit?"(VI,518). Thus, Simplicius persists in being "unsinnig."

In the second part of the play, Simplicius is a widower whose fortune has nearly all been dissipated due to the squandering of the late Aglaja. He meets Patschiparoli, a croupier working for Schierling. Patschiparoli, who feels Schierling has insulted him, decides to have his revenge by duping Schierling into believing that Simplicius, who has very little money left, is wealthy, and would be a suitable husband for Blandine, Schierling's daughter. Schierling, being in great financial difficulties, falls into the trap. On the other hand, Patschiparoli tricks Simplicius into believing that Schierling is very wealthy, and will present his daughter with a one million "Gulden" dowry. Simplicius, just a little suspicious, queries matters, but Patschiparoli dupes him, "Kein Gedanken! Sie ist sehr sauber; übrigens gehört das gar nicht hierher, hier ist gar nicht von Liebe die Red', Sie sollen eine Vernunftheirat schliessen"(VI,537). Simplicius quickly agrees, "Vernunftheirat, richtig . . . eine Vernunftheirat (VI,538). The word "Vernunftheirat," in view of his past behaviour, evokes images of "Unvernunft" instead. He still behaves as one who is "unsinnig." Just as he was duped before by Aglaja, so he is now fooled by Patschiparoli. His statement, "ich mach gleich Hals über Kopf eine Vernunftheirat"(VI,538), implies an exact repetition of circumstances when first meeting Aglaja. This is best described in Florfeld's report to Richard, Simplicius' brother:

> . . . so hat er denn auch sinen Eintritt in seine Vaterstadt gleich auf eine glorreiche Art bezeichnet.

> Mit einem Fuss auf dem Wagentritt stehend, verliebt er sich schon sterblich in eine vom Fenster gegenüber herabblickende Schönheit, und ehe noch eine Stunde vergeht, hat er das Glück, sich ihren Bräutigam nennen zu dürfen. (VI,501-02)

The idiom "Hals über Kopf," aside from its usual meaning of precipitous haste, in this particular context also elicits images of acting without using one's head, without thought and reflection, which in turn underlines the foregoing meaning. As such, it acts like all the other idioms Simplicius has used, in that it comments ironically on the speaker. Furthermore, the audience gets a comic concrete message of him falling on his head. Schierling, who is just as eager about the marriage as Simplicius, says of the latter, "Patschiparoli, Er hat sich ausgezeichnet, so reich und so dumm, da gibt's kein zweites Exemplar"(VI,549). In reference to Simplicius, Schierling is only partly correct, namely, in so far as "so dumm" is concerned. But the other evaluations, "so reich" and "da gibt's kein zweites Exemplar," are not correct. Simplicius is certainly not wealthy. But more important, Schierling is exposing his own gullibility, therefore his foolishness. He, in fact, is "das zweite Exemplar." Needless to say, this marriage does not materialize.

The third "Abteilung" opens with Simplicius' economic situation deteriorating drastically--he is a labourer for a highwire performance troupe. But his brother intervenes, presenting him with a capital of fifty thousand "Gulden" so he can retire comfortably. Instead of following Richard's advice and retiring with dignity, since he is already sixty years old,

Simplicius once more is determined to marry. This time, the girl's name is Claire, who, like Blandine, in the second "Abteilung," does not want to marry him. However, the parents force her. As before, it takes only a few minutes, and Simplicius has decided. His brother attempts to convince him of the foolishness of this union: "Kränkung, Elend, Reue, Jammer warten deiner. Noch ist es Zeit, du hast ihr dein halbes Vermögen verschrieben, das kann ich dir auch noch ersetzen, nur schliesse die törichte Verbindung nicht!"(VI,598). But this is Simplicius' answer:

> Ersetzen? Die Seligkeit der Liebe willst du mir ersetzen? Mit was denn? Mit dein' Geld? Armer Narr! Raub' erst den Postwagen von Indien aus, und du bist noch ein Bettelbub' für das Geschäft . . . Da kommen s', der ganze Hochzeitszug! (VI,599)

At first glance, the answer seems to be convincing, but after an analysis of several key terms, it is an ingemination of all previous incidents exposing his foolishness. Simplicius starts with the word "ersetzen," which Richard has used in reference to the money pledged to Claire, but which is used by Simplicius in reference to the bliss of love. Were Simplicius and Claire truly in love, the opening argument by Simplicius would be valid, but she despises him, and his main reason is disclosed in this note to himself, "Wenn ich s' heirat', so feire ich ja über den Balance einen Triumph ohnegleichen" (VI,595). Thus, there is no love as claimed by him, and he should be delighted to have his generous brother replace the money so foolishly forfeited. Simplicius' condescending remark, "Mit dein' Geld,"

is extremely ironic in a self-incriminating sense, since this was the sole reason why Claire's parents forced her into this marriage. Furthermore, it lifted him out of poverty and misery. Even more ironic, of which he is not aware, are his words, "Armer Narr!" Firstly, Richard is wealthy, but he, Simplicius, was a pauper until his brother intervened. Even now, Simplicius is impecunious in comparison to Richard. "Narr" is also a boomerang word, in that the full force of its meaning strikes at Simplicius. As a matter of fact, his entire argument can be seen only as that of a "Narr." This term definitely echoes "unsinnig," which he used when describing his luck with Aglaja. Later, he commented to Patschiparoli about that marriage, " . . . mit der ich gute sechs Jahre in der übelsten Ehe gelebt habe"(VI,531). The marriage about to take place will inevitably take the same course. The expression, "übelste Ehe," was the consequence of Simplicius' assertion, "unsinniges Glück," which anticipated it. Both were examples of self-unmasking and unchangeability.

Fatuity is the dominant manifestation of Simplicius' unchangeability, and it was Florfeld who expressed this very succinctly to Richard, when the two discussed Simplicius' engagement to Aglaja:

> Du hättest recht, wenn die Dummheit eine Geistesschwäche ware, leider ist sie aber eine furchtbare Stärke, sie ist ein Fels, der unerschüttert dasteht, wenn auch ein Meer von Vernunft ihm seine Wogen an die Stirne schleudert. (VI,502-03)

Foolishness, indeed, is a powerful force in Simplicius. In the

concluding scene of the play, Florfeld reiterates the above quotation, "Was für Gottheiten, um allegorisch zu sprechen, haben sich bemüht, mit Gewalt ihn weise zu machen: der Gott des Zufalls, die Göttin der Erfahrung, der Gott der Zeit, die strenge Göttin Nemesis - umsonst -"(VI,599). But even without Florfeld's observations, it has become abundantly clear, due to Simplicius' self-incriminating remarks, that Simplicius has been unable to accomplish even an iota of change in his foolish attitude and behaviour.

The use of self-incriminating utterances as a linguistic device provides firstly, an excellent description of the unwitting incriminator. Secondly, it draws attention to what, for want of a better term, will be designated as the unchangeability of human nature. Thus, it may be concluded that for Simplicius the linguistic pattern of sentences is used in an ironic fashion, to boomerang single words or ideas back on the speaker, so that they make a fool of him by clearly meaning the opposite--to the audience--of what he intends to say. It is not only single words that work in this fashion, as we shall see in the latter part of this chapter, but lengthy segments of plays as well, segments in which gradually the audience becomes aware that the very words of a character are beginning to close in on him, and will eventually catch him in a trap. This process is intimately connected with the second device we have proposed to examine, which is the linguistic thumbprinting of the individual. It is essential to this entrapment that the character talks in the same way throughout. In the figure of Simplicius, we have

already met someone who illustrates the connection between linguistic and personality identification. The unchangeable nature of his language reflects the unchanging nature of his dominant personality trait, his stupidity.

We have looked at Simplicius, and have seen the boomerang effect of language, which marked foolishness as his basic characteristic. In the next part of the chapter, an attempt will be made to show how two diametrically opposed characters are identified by their language from the start to the end of the play, by referring to representative selections from Der Unbedeutende (1846). Here, Puffmann uses language entirely as a smoke screen in order to deceive. His language seeks to confuse, because it is infused with a basic double meaning. He firmly believes that if one can manipulate language, one can deceive people. With Peter, on the other hand, language reflects the intentions of his thoughts--he seeks to tell others about himself and his views. He is an example of a character who uses linguistic images to convey the meaning understood by the audience. This determines the essence of his being. Both characters convey the basic truth of their reality through images and metaphors. Consequently, language informs on Puffmann, and Peter informs through language.

We begin with a brief outline of the plot. Puffmann is determined to retain his control over Massengold, and attempts to manipulate all those with whom he must deal at length. Massengold has a ward, Hermine, whom he wants to marry. Puffmann,

his secretary, is determined to thwart this plan, because otherwise he would lose control over the wealthy Massengold. Thus, he helps Hermine escape, but Thomas surprises Puffmann, whom he mistakenly believes wanted to commit suicide--Puffmann was about to jump into a boat, of which Thomas was not aware. Thomas insists on accompanying the other back to town, but Puffmann fears that Thomas has heard the incriminating discussion he had with his accomplice, Ottilie, and with the fleeing couple. Only at the very end does Puffmann discover that Thomas knew nothing about his conspiracy. Therefore, he had never been in a position to threaten Puffmann as the latter believed. Since Puffmann has been absent during Hermine's flight, Massengold's friends insist that he account for his absence. In order to save himself, Puffmann contrives a story: he has spent the time with a girl, Klara, Peter Span's sister. She happens to be the girl Thomas' son is going to marry. Puffmann has made certain that rumours of his purported visits to Klara have been circulated. Peter and, to a lesser extent, Thomas, are determined to clear Klara's name, and their success concludes the play.

Just after the successful escape of Hermine and von Gröning, Puffmann had informed Ottilie that he had altered Hermine's date of birth on her birth certificate, in order to make her of age. Ottilie is extremely frightened, because she feels there is always a chance this action, as well as her complicity, could be discovered. She leaves immediately, and Puffmann reflects

briefly:

> Schwache Geistin! - Und wer kann mir beweisen - wer kann mich nur anklagen? - Wenn ich aber jetzt den gewöhnlichen Weg nach der Stadt geh', wie leicht könnte da - am andern Ufer wär' es sicherer - da is ja sonst immer ein Fischerboot angehängt. (VII,9)

He refers to Ottilie as "schwache Geistin," which conveys his scorn for her, because she expressed great concern. This statement also conveys--in a comic manner--the idea that he is very self-confident, and the following assertion, "Und wer kann mir beweisen - wer kann mich nur anklagen?" underlines this self-confidence. In the course of the play, this self-confidence, appearing at times to be outright arrogance, will be reflected in specific linguistic expressions. Yet at the same time, there is a slight undercurrent of doubt and worry about the possibility of discovery. He then decides not to go home the usual way, just as a precautionary measure, thus showing that he is concerned. His choice of an unusual way home is indicative of his craftiness in general, as reflected in his language, which ultimately entraps him. Here too, his attempt to be cunning misfires, for just as he is about to jump into the boat, Thomas suddenly appears, "Halt! (Packt, indem er hinter dem Gebüsch am Ufer, wo er gelegen, sich erhebt, Puffmann am Rockschoss.)"(VII,9). This seems to be an answer to Puffmann's, "Und wer kann mir beweisen - wer kann mich nur anklagen?" The secretary's latent concerns are thrust into the forefront of his consciousness as he calls out, "Ha - wer da -!? . . . Wer untersteht sich da zu sein?"(VII,10). His first outburst

and questions are a spontaneous reaction, but the second part already shows his shrewdness and intent to manipulate the stranger. The verb, "untersteht sich," marks his attempt to force the other person into a disadvantageous position, because it implies that the stranger had no right being here, a preposterous assumption. Puffmann's choice of verb suggests no-one should be here. Therefore, who is it that dares to go contrary to his wishes? This choice is dictated by a desire not to say what is really meant. Puffmann's verb presumes that whoever is present, must be subordinate, socially speaking. It is a pompous verb meant to confuse the listener, and place him in a subordinate position. Furthermore, it stamps Puffmann's language toward Thomas. All of the secretary's future dialogue with Thomas shows the former to think of himself as vastly superior, not only socially, but also intellectually. "Unterstehen" also means "to be subordinate to," which again reflects Puffmann's attitude toward Thomas. Moreover, in the physical sense, if one examines the two components of the verb as "unter" and "stehen," the above meaning is reiterated. However, it is comic and ironic that even with Thomas, Puffmann's manipulative forays ultimately fail, because, so it would seem, Thomas' naiveté, combined with a certain measure of peasant cunning, inadvertently deflect the secretary's intentions. This failure is a subtle foreshadowing of how language ultimately entraps its manipulator, which is to be discussed in the next part of this chapter. Looking at the whole statement, it becomes apparent

that instead of genuinely asking, "Who is there?," Puffmann protests and denounces, without even considering questioning the stranger as to his intentions and business.

When Thomas has identified himself as "ein ordinärer Zimmermann," Puffmann's self-confidence, which was shaken when Thomas appeared suddenly and unexpectedly, now reasserts itself, and, with an arrogant choice of words and sentence structure, Puffmann attempts to dismiss the annoying stranger as quickly as possible, "Geh' Er Seine Weg," and, "Kann Er nicht allein gehn, alberner Mensch?"(VII,10). The use of "Er" stresses that he thinks of Thomas as an inferior, because it was used when addressing persons of a lower social standing. Thus, he hopes to have Thomas obey, thereby forestalling any further involvement. The second time Puffmann uses "Er," he also describes the other as, "alberner Mensch," which is to underline Puffmann's intellectual superiority. It also echoes his reference to Ottilie, namely, "schwache Geistin," which stamped the arrogant trait of his nature. Thomas, however, refuses to follow Puffmann's commands, and finally says, "(Puffmann freundlich, aber zudringlich am Arm nehmend.) Sie gehn halt mit mir!" (VII,11). It is obvious that Puffmann's arrogance and attempts to order Thomas around have failed. The secretary wonders why, and soon begins to suspect that the other has overheard what he said to Ottilie, "(erschrocken, für sich). Teufel! Der hat am End' gehört -! (Zu Thomas). Liegt Er schon lang da?"(VII,11). His arrogance and courage, which were apparent the moment he saw

himself in a superior position, have vanished as quickly as they arose, and he begins the probing process of attempting to find an answer, without asking any real questions, and thus avoids further difficulties. When Thomas calmly states, "Auf jeden Fall lang genug . . ."(VII,11), the secretary can barely contain his fear, and asks foolishly: "(Laut zu Thomas mit innerer Angst.) Hat Er gehört, was dahier -." Puffmann still uses "Er," but he no longer gives orders. Instead, he asks politely. The answer is not specific, yet still very disconcerting for Puffmann, "Ich bin grad zurecht aufg'wacht." The "grad zurecht" is what causes the other great anxiety.[3] Nothing definite is stated; nevertheless, these words have a potentially large spectrum of meaning, which allows the secretary to choose the one he believes to be correct. Puffmann now attempts to manipulate Thomas through a carefully calculated use of words.

Whereas before, he called Thomas, "ein alberner Mensch," Puffmann now addresses him with, "Still, Freund, still! Da hat Er zehn Gulden . . . und geh' Er!"(VII,11). The marked change from "alberner Mensch" to "Freund" signals the change toward a full use of manipulative language. To emphasize that he is sincere, Puffmann gives him money. For Puffmann, money is one of the most important, if not the most important, means to influence people, because it is so important to him. This is shown when von Gröning pays him for aiding in the escape of Hermine. Puffmann responded, "(entzückt). Also tausend Dukaten?? - Glänzender

Belohner, jetzt freut's mich erst, dass ich das Dokument-wagstück unternommen hab'. (Gibt ihm eine Schrift.) Nehmen Sie!"(VII,6). His love for money, even though he does not need it, due to his secure position with Massengold, is betrayed by the admission, "jetz freut's mich erst, dass ich das Dokumentwagstück unternommen hab'." Money, and with it the power to influence people, is what Puffmann seeks to gain and achieve. The term "glänzender," emphasizes the money aspect which is foremost in his mind, and it is in contrast to an adjective like "freigebig," which would stress the human quality of such an action. It seems that for Puffmann, money has an intrinsic value, to be possessed for its own sake, and not as a means to buy the necessities and luxuries of life.

To Puffmann's horror, Thomas thanks him for the money, ". . . aber auslassen tu' ich Ihnen nicht"(VII,11). The secretary now resorts to libelous language, "Er Buschklepper, Räuber -." This is one further manipulative use of words as he attempts to scold and perhaps even frighten Thomas, since these words are serious accusations. Puffmann's last words are a certain facet of his smoke screen use of language, namely, his linguistic adaptability--if friendly words fail to achieve their goal, he may immediately adopt a different linguistic approach, in order to manipulate his opponent successfully. Again, Thomas does not respond, neither to the money, nor to threats. Instead, he counters, "Wenn S' glauben, so geben S' mich halt an bei der Torwacht, da werd' ich dann sagen -"(VII,11). Puffmann

misinterprets what Thomas is saying, and is frightened of what he thinks the other is about to say, and therefore, readily agrees to accompany Thomas to the city, calling him, "Herzensfreund, Zimmermann meiner Seele -," which is in sharp contrast to "Buschklepper" and "Räuber." Here, he quickly reverts back to his former amiable self. These accusations, particularly "Räuber," are more descriptive of the speaker than the addressee, if one considers Puffmann's action from a legal point of view. Certainly Massengold would think him a "Räuber," since he has just robbed him of Hermine. In the process of attempting to manipulate others by manipulating language, Puffmann not only works unwittingly toward his own entrapment, which will come by way of language, but also unmasks himself in the eyes of the audience. The secretary still has not determined what language will succeed fully to manipulate Thomas, hence his alternating of friendly and hostile names. Nevertheless, Thomas remains fearless and determined to accompany him. One reason why Puffmann misinterprets Thomas, aside from not permitting him to finish a sentence, is due to the fact that he misuses words in order to deceive and confound, and, therefore, assumes that others will do the same. Thus, Puffmann reads a meaning into Thomas' words that does not exist, and mistakenly believes that all language is deceptive.

Suddenly, another worry strikes the secretary, namely, whether Thomas knows his identity, "Aufrichtig, Freund, - kennt Er mich?"(VII,12). It is ironic that he expects others to be

"aufrichtig," since he himself is usually not. In fact, at this very moment, he is not honest, because he most certainly does not consider Thomas his friend, but in order to delude him, he misuses language again. By using "aufrichtig," Puffmann attempts to appear sincere himself, and thereby convince Thomas that he too should be honest. This word, like "Räuber," is descriptive of himself. Here is an example of language making critical notes about the speaker--it boomerangs on Puffmann, as it did on Simplicius. It becomes increasingly obvious that Puffmann does not use language to communicate and inform, but to deceive and confuse. In the process of realizing this, the audience also begins to note that this language is the determining characteristic of Puffmann himself.

The question, "kennt Er mich?", is significant, not only in reference to this particular moment, but in that it is anticipatory of future developments. Firstly, Thomas does not know Puffmann's name and position, but Thomas does believe he knows what the secretary was about to do. Yet ultimately, he knows nothing incriminating. Secondly, as the play develops, Puffmann commits a crime against someone he does not know, namely, Klara, and conversely, Peter and Thomas do not know who is causing so much difficulty for Klara. Thirdly, Massengold is unaware of Puffmann's true nature, his successful plan of helping Hermine escape, and his determination to retain control over Massengold. Finally, Puffmann fails to understand the people he must deal with: a) he is unable to rid himself of Thomas, even

though during their first encounter he gave him money in order to buy his silence. Yet Puffmann does not know what he bought, since he is unaware of exactly what Thomas knows. b) The secretary is unable to understand the determination and tenacity with which Peter works to clear Klara's name. c) In conclusion, as we shall see, a web of misunderstanding will close in on Puffmann, as he misjudges Ottilie when he feigns love for her, believing and hoping that she would reject his love, and refuse to marry him. However, because she fears possible repercussions, Ottile accepts his love, and, to Puffmann's great chagrin, the two will have to marry. Thus, this apparently innocent question, "kennt Er mich?", originally part of Puffmann's attempt to manipulate Thomas through a calculated use of language, will reverberate and wax in meaning till the last scene of the play, where he inadvertently spins the final webbing that will ensnare him, underscoring his foolishness for the last time; and the audience, at least, will be able to answer this question.

After Puffmann has successfully contrived an alibi, one that will later prove to be his undoing, he is able to face Massengold and his friends. Massengold laments, "Millionen hab' ich zehn, Braut nur eine einzige. Warum hab' ich nicht lieber eine Million verloren?"(VII,39). Puffmann's glib reply shows he feels relatively secure, "Weil man Bräute weit leichter wiederfindet als Millionen, das wird sich das Schicksal gedacht haben, wie es so unartig war, Euer Gnaden zu beleidigen"(VII,39). It is also an attempt to have Massengold believe that he will

have no difficulty finding another fiancée. This, of course, would take time, which again would serve Puffmann's purpose, because that would permit him to gain even further control of the millionaire. His reference to fate seeks to show that Massengold should meekly accept what has happened as an irrevocable event. There is also the implication that Puffmann would like to see himself as Massengold's fate, and thus have absolute control over him. This consideration is part of an ongoing endeavour by the secretary. At this particular moment, he indirectly uses flattery by describing fate as "unartig," behaving in a naughty manner toward someone as important as Massengold. The adjective "unartig" depicts fate--by inference--as a mischievous child in relation to the Baron, who, therefore, stands above fate. Puffmann's remark is also a sarcastic one, but this Massengold will not recognize, since in his eyes, Puffmann cannot speak on two levels.

Due to Packendorf's insistence, Massengold finally feels compelled to have his secretary explain his absence, "Puffmann, durch eine Erklärung können Sie sie alle schlagen"(VII,41). Massengold seems to be incapable of believing that his secretary would deceive him. Franz, one of Massengold's servants, expresses very succinctly the millionaire's attitude toward his secretary, "Weil er am Sekretär so ein'n Narr'n g'fressen hat" (VII,13).[4] The key word here is "Narr," which applies to both Massengold and Puffmann. The former is a fool, because he trusts the other blindly, even though his friends, especially Packendorf,

are very suspicious of the secretary. But Puffmann is also a fool, because he is convinced he can continue to delude and dupe others without ensnaring himself. Puffmann introduces his answer to Massengold's request with, "Wenn mein Baron und Gebieter es durchaus wünscht -"(VII,41). The flattery in this statement is obvious, particularly noticeable is the word "Gebieter" which seeks to assure Massengold that all of Puffmann's activities are the direct result of Massengold's wishes and orders. Again, the secretary uses language not to inform, but to misinform others in his attempt to manipulate them.

Puffmann's answer, especially the phrase, "es durchaus wünscht," also is presented in such a way as to give the impression that he is most reluctant to comply, even though his "Gebieter" requests him to do so, because he wants to project a feeling of embarrassment in order to lend a greater credence to his alibi stated in the following quotation, "Nun denn - es war ein Liebesabenteuer, eigentlich nur Liebelei, Passeletang, und ich muss einigermassen erröten, wegen dem Rangabstand ihrerseits und der Herablassung meinerseits"(VII,41). The words, "Nun denn -," are further professed embarrassment, aimed not so much at Massengold, but at the others who are still not convinced. He pretends to have "ein Liebesabenteuer." Moments later, he gives the name, occupation and address of the girl. In a sense, love was involved, but only as far as Hermine and von Gröning were concerned. Puffmann himself had an "Abenteuer," which he found not only annoying, but frightening because of

Thomas' persistence in accompanying him back to the city. The pretence, "und ich muss einigermassen erröten," again attempts to show that he is embarrassed, and thereby aims to emphasize his reluctance in talking about this incident. But these words also intimate on a different level that he should indeed be embarrassed and ashamed, not only for telling a blatant lie, but also for involving Klara, a total stranger to him, and an innocent in the fullest sense of the word. Once the nature of Klara is known, it becomes obvious that whatever "Rangabstand" there is in terms of character, he, not she, is on a far lower rank. Furthermore, the aspect of "Herablassung" would only be possible from her point of view, if she had indeed permitted him to see her. In the introduction to this part, it was pointed out that individuals like Puffmann, who manipulate language inadvertently, build an ever stronger web which finally and irrevocably ensnares them. Puffmann's quotation above is one such example. He believes he will protect himself, and gain further control over Massengold, when in actual fact, as will become clear in the further development of the play, he sets a trap for himself with these words, words with which he hopes to manipulate reality. The cleverness of "Liebesabenteuer," "Liebelei" and "Passeletang," which leads the listener away from the truth, and which, with the linguistic subtleties of several relations, will turn out to be foolish to the extent that he is trapped by them. In the latter part of this chapter, we will see how the trap closes on him. Now we

must turn to an examination of his main opponent, Peter, Klara's brother.

In order to acquire a basic understanding of Peter's use of language, which ultimately will reveal his personality, reference must be made to his opening song--a "Metierlied"--and to the monologue. A closer analysis of the two will follow later. Peter uses images from his profession, and thus conveys his reality in a heightened fashion. He employs specific, concrete terms that are understood by the audience as he understands them, and wants the audience to understand them. Thus, deception is totally divorced from his use of language. This aspect constitutes a major difference from Puffmann. Furthermore, Peter's direct and clear use of words thumbprints his character--in his attitude and behaviour towards others, he is direct and non-manipulative. There now follows an analysis of several excerpts from the song and monologue, "Wann i als Zimmermann arbeit' hoch ob'n auf'n Dach / Da g'schicht's mir oft, dass ich Bemerkungen mach'"(VII,21). The first two lines of Peter's song point out two significant aspects. Firstly, it states his physical position, "hoch ob'n auf'n Dach," which also implies a mental superiority. Secondly, from this vantage point, he is able to make sound and objective observations about men in general, because there is a certain distance between him and his object. Already these lines show a definite outward looking nature, objectively interested in the activities below. This is the very opposite to Puffmann's interests, which are motivated

only by subjective, selfish concerns.

The next two lines specify one general observation he makes; "An der Aussicht auf d'Leut' herab tu' ich mich lab'n / Seh' ich, was s' oft all's treib'n, ohne a Aussicht zu hab'n" (VII,22). Peter's "Aussicht" leads him to observe that the aims of those below, frantically scurrying about, will not be realized. Those below, however, do not recognize the futility of it all, because they do not stand back, in a cerebral sense, and reflect. They do not use reason in their daily activities. The statement, "was s' oft all's treib'n," aside from referring to the specific examples Peter cites, also includes man's activities in general, and simultaneously anticipates those of Puffmann, which are also doomed. It must also be reitereated that the basic quality of Peter's language is its directness. His language and metaphors lack that kind of double meaning which unwittingly conveys to the alert spectator the speaker's attempt to deceive the addressee, and thereby betrays a negative character trait in the speaker. Then there is also Thomas who continues to pursue Puffmann, even though he is unaware of just how much his presence agitates the secretary. Finally, Peter must be noted, because he too joins in the "Puffmann Treiben," and brings it to a successful conclusion. It must also be observed that Puffmann, because of his actions toward Massengold and Klara, has been driving himself in the sense that he alone is responsible for his being hunted. Thus, Puffmann is certainly not blameless. In fact, the manipulation of

Klara causes her, as well as Peter, to be the innocent victims of malicious rumour. Consequently, they too were pursued and hunted by the insinuations and scornful remarks to the neighbours.

Although Peter obviously cannot possibly be aware of the various images evoked by the term "treiben," his statement does contain them in latent form, which can be brought to life in the spectator's mind as the play develops. The audience recognizes that these various meanings corroborate Peter's basic statement. They enlarge the scope of it, but do not reflect back on the speaker. This is entirely unlike Puffmann's language, but the difference is a crucial one. Generally speaking, Puffmann's language contains a self-destructive element, whereas Peter's endorses, expands and strengthens his position, and thereby, thumbprints his particular nature. Peter gives several examples of "was s' oft all's treib'n," one of which will suffice to elucidate his keen perception of human nature, needed later when confronting Puffmann. The following two lines provide an appropriate example; "Der sucht Schwiegersöhn', wo sich liess' Geld herausbradeln / Und hat gar keine Aussicht, zu schiech sind die Madeln!"(VII,22). The word "Schwiegersöhn'" underscores the selfishness of this individual. He sees things only from his particular point of view, thus the word "Schwiegersöhn'" instead of husbands for his daughters. Such a father is identical to Maxenpfutsch in <u>Nagerl und Handschuh</u>, and Eisenkopf in <u>Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche</u>,

in that both of them were determined to have a rich son-in-law for their benefit, not the daughters'. In the above quotation, the statement, "wo sich liess' Geld herausbradeln," leaves no doubt as to the motivation of the father. The well-being of his child does not matter, and the prospective son-in-law is seen only as a source of money, and will be dealt with in such a manner that money will be extracted from him, even if against his own will. It is precisely such selfishness that undermines and frustrates the hopes and plans of the people in his immediate environment--ultimately the people are "ohne Aussicht."

Peter concludes his song with, "So Ideen bilden unter mein' Dachstuhl sich aus / So oft ich ein' Dachstuhl wo setz' auf a Haus -"(VII,22). He returns to the "Dach" image, reiterating that at times, one needs to be removed from people, if not physically, then at least mentally, in order to acquire an objective and rational view of man and his endeavours. The words, "Dach" and "Dachstuhl," also allude to man's "Dach"--that is, his head, which must be used if one wants to gain a perspective of oneself and others, and thereby avoid activities, "die keine Aussicht haben," as do those of Massengold and Puffmann. In conclusion, it should also be noted that the individual looking for "Schwiegersöhne," as well as the others who have no "Aussicht," are pursuing a goal they do not deserve to realize.

In the first three lines of the second stanza, Peter notes, "Doch wann so vom Dach sich mein Kopf herabbeugt / Meine Aussicht

auch Leute mit Aussicht mir zeigt / Sein's aber Aussichten, wo der Mensch z'frieden sein kann?"(VII,22). The expectation itself contains the nucleus of its own destruction, because the moment it is conceived also marks the beginning of the end. This is not due to some malicious fate, but is the inevitable result of an innate shortcoming of the particular individual, and is manifested in the very hope and expectation portrayed. The following line succinctly offers the answer, "D' meisten Leut' haben nur eine, und da is nix dran"(VII,22). Although Peter has not yet met Puffmann, and is not aware of Massengold's desires, he has nevertheless provided a general world view which is symbolic of such behaviour, showing that endeavours like these are destined to end in failure. But even more significant is the fact that his linguistic patterns do not boomerang on him as is the case with Puffmann and with Massengold, but instead, underscore his sincerity as well as his understanding of human nature.

An examination of the first example will elucidate this position, "Der Alte kauft Schmuck, dass 'r a jung's Weiberl kriegt / Und sein' einzige Aussicht is, dass s' ihn betrügt" (VII,22). Already the first line, without reference to the second, intimates the inherent error of such an action. The old man literally attempts to buy the fancy of a young girl so she will marry him. Such a marriage is not based on reciprocal love, but on jewelry, which is not a bond founded on emotions and reason, but on material goods. Here, unlike earlier examples

that have been looked at from Puffmann, what is said is what is meant. The audience's view of the character is founded in the directness and truth of his language. Never does the audience read a second meaning into it which reflects back negatively on the speaker. "Der Alte" has unreasonble hopes in expecting that jewelry will buy him the love of a young wife. She will marry him. However, it will not be the kind of marriage he expects. The second line leaves no doubt as to what will happen--the result of "kauft Schmuck" is "betrügt." Thus, the old one acted foolishly when he bought the young girl's agreement to marry him. She, of course, cheated on him. Neither acted wisely, therefore, the "Aussicht" for both of them will be one with which they will not be happy. Both have fatuous wishes and desires. In reference to the plot, there are three characters, namely Puffmann, Massengold, but also Ottilie, who are specific examples of individuals who have foolish anticipations and prospects. The song clearly indicates Peter's non-manipulative use of language, which is part of the reason why he will be able to confront Puffmann successfully in his aim to prove Klara innocent.

In the song, Peter has dealt with people who have either "keine Aussicht," or one that will not make them happy. However, no-one else, only the concerned individual is responsible. In the monologue that follows, the raissoneur delineates his position beginning with this sentence:

> Das Schönste an ein' Zimmermann is, dass er kein Zimmermann is, dass er nicht im Zimmer arbeitet, sondern

> draussen auf'm freien Platz, drum hat unsereins auch ganz ein' andern Geist als so viele andere Professionisten, für die die frische Luft nur ein Sonntagsschmaus is, für die es gar keine freie Natur gäbet, wenn einmal den Kalenderdruckern die rote Farb' ausging'. (VII,23)

Peter uses the word, "Zimmermann," first of all to repeat what his trade is, and in so doing, shows that he is content with it, and proud of it. More important though, is the assertion, ". . . dass er nicht im Zimmer arbeitet, sondern draussen auf'm freien Platz." He uses an easily understandable metaphor, and the audience understands it the way he understands it. It is not meant to deceive, nor does the audience conclude that in the course of the play. Peter's true language reflects his true personality. Working in a room would be far too confining for him, first of all, in the physical sense, and figuratively speaking, unbearable, because he must be free from the influences and authority of others. This, in turn, causes him to have "ein' andern Geist als so viele andere Professionisten." Therefore, he perceives things more clearly than those confined to a relatively small space, since the thinking of the latter becomes very limited and constricted. The expressions, "freien Platz," "frische Luft," and "freie Natur," underscore his commitment to freedom, not only physically speaking, but also cerebrally. The phrase, "ganz ein' andern Geist," underpins the latter point. This freedom was already intimated in the preceding song, where his physical location, the "Dachstuhl," saw him at a distance from his fellow man, and his mental attitude was unencumbered by the petty and foolish pursuits engaged

by those he commented upon. His antagonist, Puffmann, on the other hand, is a "Zimmer-Mann für den es keine freie Natur gibt," precisely because he is compelled to give chase to goals for which there are no "Aussichten," or only unsatisfactory ones.

Another reason for becoming a "Zimmermann," aside from his love for freedom, is cited in the following sentence:

> Ich war als Bub sehr gern auf der Welt und hab' mich fleissig mit Hund, Tauben, Katzen und Kinigelhasen g'spielt, und da wir dem Altmeister unserer Zunft, dem Archenzimmerer Noah, unser Dasein verdanken, so wie auch das Glück, dass wir von Viechern umgeben sind, so hat mich eine Art Dankgefühl zum Zimmermann-handwerk getrieben. (VII,24)

His sarcastic comment, "dass wir von Viechern umgeben sind," is the core of the above excerpt. The term, "Viechern," is a further reference to the people described in the song and those in the opening of the monologue as not having a free spirit. Then, Peter becomes even more censorious than before. The term, "Viech," clearly anticipates Puffmann. But Peter is not intimidated by individuals that are "Viecher," because he is a "Zimmermann," who, like Noah, "der Archenzimmerer," is able to deal with them. Noah was, after all, able to collect the animals and control them while on the ark.

Significant is also the comment, "und da wir . . . dem Archenzimmerer Noah, unser Dasein verdanken . . . so hat mich eine Art Dankgefühl zum Zimmermannhandwerk getrieben." Peter says that he is thankful, yet this gratitude is expressed in such a way that it acquires somewhat of a tenebrous quality.

The verb, "verdanken," here means not only to be indebted or obliged, but also intimates that Noah is, in a sense, responsible for all, including, "dass wir von Viechern umgeben sind." The intimation raises the question whether it was indeed worthwhile that Noah saved man from extinction. This ambiguity is apparent again in "eine Art Dankgefühl," because it elicits the query, "Was für eine Art?" Does it signify thankfulness in its commonly accepted meaning, or does it imply its antithesis? Merely by causing the spectator to ask such questions, Peter intimates that Noah's action is open to criticism, and that he, for one, is not at all thankful. Yet there is nothing that a man like him can do, except continue with his chosen profession, be it the actual work of a "Zimmermann," or that of the raissoneur, who, in sharp contrast to those around him, uses reason as he unmasks the foregoing.

Peter continues his observations about human shortcomings when he reflects about the use of the "Zollstab," one of the "Zimmermanns" tools not to be used "ohne zu denken." The latter phrase reiterates the importance of reason, one of the significant deficiencies in Puffmann's and Massengold's behavioural patterns. Peter employs the "Zollstab," which is symbolic of man's intellectual skills or reason, as an aid in discerning and recognizing greatness:

> Der Zollstab gibt uns die wahrste Ansicht von Länge und Breite, von Grösse überhaupt, und wann mann die einmal hat, da fallen einem dann allerhand Missverhältnisse auf - wie so mancher so gross herauskommt, und wenn man ihn genau abmesst, so klein is, dass man ihm gern noch was aufmesset. Wie mancher ein Langes

> und Breites zusammenschreibt und nur eine schmale Kost damit erwirbt, wie oft kleinwinzige Frauen mit langmächtige Männer gar so kurz angebunden sind. (VII,24).

What one discovers, however, as one becomes critical, and uses direct language, is not genuine greatness, but another common shortcoming, pointed out by the following observation; ". . . wie so mancher so gross herauskommt, und wenn man ihn genau abmesst, so klein is, dass man ihm gern noch was aufmesset." Here, Peter uses the concrete language of the "Zimmermann" in order to elucidate an abstract facet of human behaviour, namely, the attempt to present and appear more than one really is. The audience understands these concrete images, and draws the conclusions which he wishes them to draw. They are also Nestroy's conclusions. Again, it must be noted that here, Puffmann is anticipated, especially when he insists; "Kann wer auftreten gegen mich-?"(VII,43), or when he gleefully notes, "Der Alibi-Beweis steht juridisch fest. Triumph der praktisch-kasuistischen Genialität!"(VII,32). He believes himself to be very powerful and clever, but ultimately proves to be rather weak and outright foolish.

At the time of the song and monologue, Peter was totally unaware of Puffmann. In fact, the latter had not yet set his intrigue in motion which is to affect Klara so adversely. However, once Puffmann has created the rumour about his alleged affair with Klara, it does not take Peter a long time to discover the former's person and identity, and he confronts him immediately.

In the dialogue which follows, there is an excellent demonstration of the comedy and the tragedy apparent when two characters speak, one of whom has been thumbprinted by his manipulation of words, the other by the directness of them. As soon as Puffmann discovers who Peter is, he is on the defensive, which means that he will attempt to manipulate the latter through a calculated and crafty use of words and expressions. Peter, however, takes either particular key words themselves, or their meaning, and turns them back on the secretary, on whom the images close in, in a kind of linguistic trap.

Puffmann's first response to Peter--once Klara has left--clearly shows that he does want to avoid being belligerent, since provoking Peter would not serve his interests. He therefore starts with an apparent pleasantry, "Und der Herr is der Bruder? Älterer Bruder vermutlich. Na, mich g'freut's, dass ich die ganze Familie kennen lern'"(VII,88). He calls Peter "Herr," even though he obviously does not consider him one, but Puffmann hopes this might mollify the brother. Thus, the secretary first attempts to manipulate Peter with friendly words. The remark, "Älterer Bruder vermutlich," is an attempt by Puffmann to have Peter realize that he, Puffmann, understands an older brother's concern for the well-being of his younger sister. Here is a further try to abate Peter's anger which the secretary undoubtedly senses. Obviously, Puffmann does not want to understand Peter's direct language at all. In fact,

their use of language and image are so diametrically opposed, that this dialogue can be seen as a kind of struggle between direct and distorted use of language. The comment, "Na, mich g'freut's, dass ich die ganze Familie kennen lern'," starts with a blatant lie, one that deals with two aspects. Firstly, he is not happy to meet Peter, which the latter is keenly aware of. Secondly, this involves the concluding statement, where Puffmann implies that he already knew Klara prior to this meeting arranged by Peter. Puffmann's deception is not only easily recognizable, but also extremely foolish, and this manipulative attempt can only rebound and attack him.

Peter continues with Puffmann's intimation that he is acquainted with the whole family, and he retorts, "Besteht nur aus zwei Personen, aus einer beleidigten Schwester und aus einem Rechenschaft fordernden Bruder, is ganz eine unbedeutende Familie"(VII,88). He rejects Puffmann's "mich g'freut's," and explains what this family consists of, but qualifies what kind of a sister and brother the two are. Peter's words are chosen to describe the reality of his world rather than a disguised version of it. They do not seek to manipulate, but instead underscore the validity of adjectives and nouns. "Beleidigt" really means "beleidigt," but with Puffmann, the audience will understand the opposite. The root of "beleidigt" is "Leid," exactly what Puffmann has caused for Klara, and to a lesser degree, for Peter. Puffmann's words are responsible for this "Leid," and ultimately his words that caused the "Leid," will

deflect back on him. The sister has been slandered, and this has led directly to the brother's intervention, who demands that Puffmann account for his actions. Only now will Puffmann become truly acquainted with the whole family, particularly in reference to its concept of "Familienehre." The secretary concluded his first statement with, "dass ich die ganze Familie kennen lern'," and Peter describes himself and Klara, ". . . is eine ganz unbedeutende Familie." He again uses some of Puffmanns' words to state his own position. However, the term "unbedeutende" implies more than what the secretary understood. When talking with Thomas, Peter emphasized that in matters of "Familienehre," the "Unbedeutende" has the same right to demand that which is faultless, as does the important individual. Therefore, in this matter, Peter considers himself to be Puffmann's equal, and the secretary will have to deal with him as a peer.

Puffmann now attempts to shift the blame from himself, and thereby deflect, or at least blunt, Peter's attack, "Es scheint bei der ganzen Sache die Obwaltung eines Irrtums stattzufinden"(VII,88). Puffmann uses "scheint," because it places the statements which follow it on a shifting base. It allows flexibility of response. He also refers to his spreading of false rumours with "die ganze Sache," as he tries to avoid words that Peter might find particularly offensive. Finally, he suggests, because he uses the verb "scheint," that all is the result of "die Obwaltung eines Irrtums." His use of "Irrtum"

seeks to suggest, first of all, that there is a general misunderstanding; this is definitely not true. He carefully planned the spreading of the rumour, so that there would be an alibi. Furthermore, Klara's honour has been ridiculed when the neighbours expressed their contempt and disdain for her. As a result, she has been suffering extreme mental anguish. Peter has been able to establish beyond a doubt that Puffmann had given Hansi money so he would not tell anyone of his visit to Klara. Obviously there is certainly not an "Irrtum" in this whole matter. As the pressure begins to build on Puffmann, it becomes apparent that he was in error when he chose to exploit Klara. Thus, the word "Irrtum" indirectly unmasks his own foolishness.

When Peter replies, he again refuses to be duped by the words of the unctuous secretary. Once more, he chooses the root of a word already misused by Puffmann, and gives it a diametrically exposed interpretation as a weapon against its original speaker, "Bei Ihnen kann man sich auch leicht irren, ich, zum Beispiel, hätt' Ihnen für einen honetten Mann gehalten. Entschuldigen, das kommt von dem distinguierten Futteral, in dem Ihre verleumderische Schlechtigkeit steckt"(VII,88). Thus, Puffmann again becomes the unwilling target and victim of his own misuse of words. Peter readily agrees that it is easy to err in reference to him, Puffmann, but not as far as his despicable action toward Klara is concerned, rather in relation to his quality as a human being. This is the extent of the

erring. Peter even excuses himself for thinking that the secretary could be an honest man--the "Zimmermann" does not like to be in error, but if it does happen, he immediately apologizes. The possibility of such an error is due entirely to the "distinguierte Futteral" worn by Puffmann, which hides his "verleumderische Schlechtigkeit." The expression, "distinguierte Futteral," echoes Puffmann's own comment to Ottilie, who accused him of egotism: "Mein Eigennutz hat etwas Respektables, seitdem er sich in den Salonfrack des Dominierens geknöpfelt"(VII,8). Both "Futteral" and "Salonfrack" are a facade that hide his true self. He admits that he is "eigennützig," but still believes it to be respectable. Peter, however, makes no attempt to ameliorate Puffmann's nature, and calls it "verleumderische Schlechtigkeit." Because of this "Futteral," which Rumpf, the palace guard, described in these words, "Güterintendant, Generalinspektor, geheimster Sekretär, Kassendirektor und Fadteekoktum des Herrn Baron von Massengold . . ."(VII,73), Puffmann believes, here he is "im Irrtum," that he is exempt from prosecution and punishment. But Peter does not agree with that, as his verbal thrusts clearly indicate. He is neither reluctant nor afraid to refer to Puffmann with, "Ihre verleumderische Schlechtigkeit." This is not a vague allusion to a general shortcoming, but the naming of a specific and malicious act, which reflects the secretary's behaviour in general. Peter's last words underscore his conviction that his attitude is indeed justified.

Puffmann now attempts a different linguistic approach, "Freund, bedenk' Er, was Er spricht!"(VII,88). His opening is to give the appearance of amiability, but it is another deception, since neither considers the other a friend. It is a switch to amiability, which we have already seen in his speech patterns. His thumbprint is clear, and the audience knows how to read it. He then warns Peter that he should consider what he says. It is ironic that Puffmann gives someone else such a warning, since he himself is the one that misuses language constantly, as is the case in this dialogue. Puffmann, of course, believes that he must carefully consider each word he speaks, because he is usually attempting to manipulate the other person, and therefore, is usually dishonest, but must conceal this.

Here is another instance where Peter uses a slight variation on the secretary's words in an opposite sense, and to his own advantage, "Ich sprech', wie ich denk!"(VII,88). His thumbprint too is becoming legible. This is a clear statement in defence of the truth of his language, and, by implication, the falsity of Puffmann's. It is a crucial quotation, because it is a succinct explanation of his way of speaking, which is direct and unambiguous.

The secretary then seems to gain courage, and tells Peter, "Denk' Er, was Er will, aber menagier' Er sich im Reden!" (VII,88). Here, it becomes quite obvious that Puffmann does not care in the least what others think about him, as long as

this is not voiced, since it then may become common knowledge, which is irritating and threatening. Language is a real threat to him. Also, this reiterates Puffmann's attitude towards language. That is, one must not say what one thinks. Instead, one should use language as a manipulative vehicle. Peter quickly agrees with Puffmann that he has been talking too much, "Ja, ja, ich red' zu viel und vergiss, dass ich handeln soll"(VII,88). Whatever key word or thought the secretary confronts Peter with, the latter uses to his own advantage. This is a slightly different aspect of the boomerang effect. Firstly, it contains an immediate self-destructive element, with which Peter destroys Puffmann's argument the moment it is voiced. Secondly, it foreshadows the inevitable closing of Puffmann's language trap on himself. It must be noted though, that Peter's threat is not an idle one--in a conversation with Thomas, he referred to his "Arme" as not only working for him, but also defending him, ". . . schlagen den nieder, der mir was tun will -"(VII,27).

At this moment, Puffmann, who is not quite certain what Peter will do next, confronts him with, "Hat Er Beweise?"(VII,89). The secretary is not concerned about denying his action, only about the proof others might have. Whatever Peter presents, Puffmann will immediately challenge. It also seems he doubts whether there is any definite proof against him. Puffmann himself was asked to prove where he had been on September 7, the day Hermine fled. When Tupper informed him, "Sie müssten dann Beweise liefern, wo Sie heut' Abend waren"(VII,17), he complained,

"Beweise - das Beweisfordern is eine wahre Malträtierung der Menschheit. Wie schön könnte man sich ausreden, wenn das nicht wäre!"(VII,17). The key remark there, was, "Wie schön könnte man sich ausreden," and he was able to do just that by fabricating the story that he had a lover. Puffmann's dislike of "Beweisfordern," in fact the whole statement, is also a significant reflection of his relationship to language, which in turn mirrors his essential being. He calls "Beweisfordern eine wahre Malträtierung der Menschheit." The audience, however, realizes without the insistence on "Beweisfordern," "Malträtierung" would occur frequently, and go unpunished. In fact, in only a few hours, Puffmann will instigate rumours that will prove to be a true "Malträtierung" for Klara and Peter, and only because of Peter's tenacious insistence on "Beweis," where the secretary spent the evening of September 7, can Klara's further "Malträtierung" be stopped. Ultimately, Puffmann is not experiencing a "Malträtierung," but is responsible for causing it for someone else. His solution when being confronted to justify himself consists of such "Ausreden," which he attempts to do in varying degrees throughout the play. But, as will become increasingly more apparent, his "Ausreden" results in a "Festreden," because he incriminates himself more and more. He cannot use subterfuge successfully with Peter. Still, remembering his own difficulty in quickly producing an acceptable excuse, the "Beweis" leads him to think that Peter will now too not be able to confront him with a "Beweis." It must also be noted

that Puffmann's proof of where he spent that evening is beginning to cause him as much trouble as, if not more than, he thought to avoid by fabricating a story, which shows that the manipulator of language is beginning to be manipulated by it.

From the foregoing analysis of the language of Puffmann and Peter, separately and in a dialogue with each other, the following conclusions may be reached. In reference to both figures, it may be posited that their respective use of language provides the audience with an X-ray of their basic personality.

Already in Puffmann's opening statement, his cunning and deceptive nature, even though talking to himself, can be observed. Although he insists to himself that no-one can convict him of the conspiracy that led to Hermine's successful flight, he decides not to go home "den gewöhnlichen Weg." Similarly, he does not use language "im gewöhnlichem Sinne," that is, to inform. Instead, he uses it to deceive. His language is as fluid as the water of the river he wants to cross in a small boat, just before Thomas' physical intervention. His words distort the truth, seeking to confuse and manipulate. The audience, however, recognizes this relatively early in the play. Instead of entering a regular boat to cross the river, and thereby confuse anyone who might see him enter the town, Puffmann uses language as a vessel to deceive. Language has become his boat in the metaphorical sense, and ultimately, it founders on the shoals of his deceptive use of words.

It is interesting that of all the people Puffmann seeks to

deceive, only Klara's neighbours and Massengold seem to fall victim. Ottilie sees in him "den habsüchtigen Schmutzian"; Thomas unwittingly does not permit the secretary to manipulate him; Peter, of course, recognizes Puffmann's true nature from the outset. Massengold succumbs to the secretary's manipulations for obvious reasons, namely, because of his stupidity. Puffmann's slander of Klara has been temporarily successful, because Klara's neighbours are unwitting but strong allies of the secretary, who relish hearing and disseminating gossip. They have no definite proof that Klara has been receiving a male visitor, yet they condemn her outright, thereby betraying their foolish nature through their language.

Peter's language is direct, and seeks to inform. In his opening song, he presents his views using images and metaphors in a direct way, which the audience readily understands to reflect his true thoughts. From the start, the spectator recognizes, "dass er sagt was er denkt." Because of this, he is able to confront Puffmann's linguistic craftiness and deception successfully, as well as prove the neighbours to be wrong.

Let us now see how linguistic webs are spun, and how the trap closes on those Nestroy characters who strive to manipulate the truth with language--that is, how language manipulates those who think they can manipulate it.

Puffmann had sought to rid himself of Peter, who disdainfully rejected offers of a bribe, by having him temporarily arrested with the assistance of Tupper, a servant of Massengold.

Packendorf, however, intervened, and had Tupper arrested instead. On the following day, the "Nachkirtag," there is a celebration attended by Massengold and his friends, as well as by Puffmann and Ottilie. Also present are Klara, Peter, Thomas and the neighbours. Puffmann senses danger, "Hm, diese Spazierfahrt - Packendorf hat sie über Hals und Kopf arrangiert - ich wittre Unheil"(VII,98). In this quotation are three distinct statements, which, although in one sentence, are not integrated. This indicates his lack of preparedness, due to the fact that he believes Peter to be imprisoned. Thus, there seems to be no visible, imminent danger, or so he thought. Nevertheless, he is anxious. The comment,"ich wittre Unheil," especially the verb "wittre," implies the agitation of a hunted animal. Packendorf, whom Puffmann has called a "Brackierhund," is responsible for this "Spazierfahrt," which the secretary seems to feel is turning into a hunt where he will be the game. Puffmann's feelings echo those found in the statement he made immediately after Massengold decided to look for his "Vormundschaftsdekret" and Hermine's birth certificate, "Ah, ich hab' wirklich viel von einem gehetzten Eber an mir; immer der ganze Rudel über mich her, der Packendorf als Brakierhund voran" (VII,42-43). Here, he refers to himself as an "Eber," an animal that can be extremely dangerous, and totally lacking fear. Puffmann has been dangerous, not only as far as Massengold is concerned, but also in reference to Klara and Peter. However, he is not fearless, as his emotions now show. Also noteworthy

is that he called Packendorf a "Brakierhund," since he referred to himself as an "Eber." He views himself as the stronger, certainly on a one-to-one basis. Nevertheless, it was Packendorf's decisive intervention that prevented Peter's imprisonment and arranged this "Spazierfahrt." The image of the pack closing in is appropriate to the misused words which are closing in on Puffmann. By misusing words, Puffmann misuses people, particularly Klara and Peter, and at this point in the play, both are about to have their revenge. This is an encirclement that should be followed closely, for it is a crucial ingredient in Nestroy's presentation of a world built on a linguistic bog. In this particular case, it is of Puffmann's making.

Puffmann's anxiety is well-founded, because only moments later, he sees Peter and Klara. From Peter's remarks, Massengold soon relizes that Puffmann's story about Klara is a lie. Packendorf, whom Puffmann previously called a "Brakierhund" pursuing him, now lives up to this name, when he states, "Da das vorgebliche Abenteuer Lüge war, steht der unbewiesene siebente Septemberabend wieder als Ihr frischer Ankläger da"(VII,101). This accusation is quite succinct. The secretary, as well as all the others present, know that Puffmann's answer must be conclusive and convincing. Still, he refuses to be honest. In fact, he cannot be honest, because this would require a fundamental change in his nature. He notes to himself, "(für sich, eine Idee erfassend und Hoffnung schöpfend). So putz' ich mich

vielleicht nochmal heraus"(VII,101). This is fully consonant with his past attitude. Also, it betrays his foolishness, for it should now be obvious to him that the result of lies could be very detrimental to him.

Puffmann addresses himself specifically to Massengold, "Euer Gnaden - ich bitte um stilles Gehör. - (Leise.) Es ist mit Händen zu greifen, folglich wird auch Dero Scharfsinn -" (VII,101). He obviously believes that he can still deceive and manipulate the "Baron," if he chooses his words carefully. Puffmann knows he must project humility and an attitude that will convince Massengold of Puffmann's trust in him. He therefore addresses him with "Euer Gnaden," using language obsequiously, as we have seen previously. The request, "ich bitte um stilles Gehör," seeks to convey, indirectly, a slight feeling of embarrassment, which is to intimate a reluctance on his part to discuss such a sensitive matter. The aim of this is to have Massengold take his part, and protect him from the scorn and wrath of all present, which also includes Massengold himself. Here begins Puffmann's last attempt to dupe and manipulate the Baron. The adjective "stilles," must be analyzed separately because of its subtle implications. Firstly, it is to convey to Massengold that only he is to hear what he has to say, because it is such a delicate matter, and the others would only misunderstand. It is another veiled attempt at flattery. Secondly, "stilles" intimates that the Baron is to listen quietly, just accept what Puffmann has to say, and not consult the others

as to what should be done. The assertion, "Es ist mit Händen zu greifen," seeks to emphasize that the implications of what has happened are obvious. Of course, they are not, especially not to Massengold, because only moments ago, he realized that Puffmann's story was a lie. Thus, the secretary's words can only confuse him, which is in fact their intent. Puffmann then continues with flattery once more, ". . . folglich auch Dero Scharfsinn -." "Scharfsinn" is definitely not one of the Baron's talents, but because he lacks it, he believes that he possesses it. So far, Puffmann has not said anything of substance, but he has only flattered and added to Massengold's confusion. He has succeeded what he set out to do. But he is about to begin a series of spontaneous statements, which are going to take on a life of their own, and trap him.

Massengold is still totally in the dark, and impatiently tells his secretary to be specific, and is given the following answer:

> (leise zu Massengold, den er ganz nach dem Vordergrunde links führt). Aus übertriebener Herzensgüte hab' ich mich etwas voreilig prostituiert. Ihnen aber bin ich Wahrheit schuldig. Mit meinem Besuche bei dem Mädchen hat es seine Richtigkeit, dringen Euer Gnaden daher auf keine weitere Erklärung! (Mit Heuchelei.) Schonen Sie die Arme, wie ich sie geschont, und sagen Sie -. (VII,101-02)

Puffmann makes certain that only Massengold hears him, since he is the only one whom Puffmann thinks he can still dupe. The words, "mich etwas voreilig prostituiert," echo the tone of his previous statements, where he noted about himself: "und der Herablassung meinerseits," and "die momentane Michhinweg-

werfung"(VII,41). Thus, he attempts to have Massengold believe once more that he, Puffmann, now realizes that someone in his position must not lower himself to accommodate those whom Peter calls "Unbedeutende." But Puffmann still has an excuse for this unethical behaviour, one that he describes as "übertriebene Herzensgüte." Here is a fine example of a distorted root leading to a misleading word and false phrase. "Herzensgüte" would imply empathy and compassion, two qualities totally alien to him. He claims to have prostituted himself, implying thereby that he sought to protect Klara, when in actual fact, his behaviour sought to achieve the opposite--he used Klara's reputation to protect himself. In a different sense though, one that neither he nor Massengold, but only the audience comprehends, Puffmann did in fact prostitute himself, in that he sacrificed his independence, honesty and honour for money and influence, which he strove to acquire in the service of Massengold.

Puffmann's next assertion, "Ihnen aber bin ich Wahrheit schuldig," is, first of all, again flattery. Secondly, it appears to be true, because Massengold is his master, and so far has trusted him implicitly. But actually, this is the beginning of another ruse, another attempt to manipulate Massengold through a crafty use of words, that will misinform him in a way that will be expedient for the secretary. This time, the deception is built completely on the assertion of truth. The latter then confirms, "Mit meinem Besuche bei dem Mädchen hat es

seine Richtigkeit.. . ." This is indirectly true in the physical sense, even though she was not aware of it. That is, Puffmann was at her residence, and saw her figure through the window. But it is also a carefully worded distortion of that truth. This was the extent of his visit, although he does not tell Massengold that. The latter is led to believe Puffmann's visit was of a more intimate nature. Thus, the secretary tells only a part of the truth, and thereby projects a lie, because that which he does not tell is of critical importance, while that which he admits is merely a peripheral matter.

To avoid further questions that would inevitably lead to incriminating answers, Puffmann adds, ". . . dringen Euer Gnaden daher auf keine weitere Erklärung! Schonen Sie die Arme, wie ich sie geschont." As Puffmann already intimated in his comment just previously, he now asks the Baron specifically not to demand particular details, because once he is asked for precise facts, or as he calls it, "Beweisfordern," the truth would come out, and his use of the terms "Wahrheit" and "Richtigkeit" in this quotation stand as accusers before him. This would be symbolic of language turning on those that do it violence. The secretary concludes his explanation as he began it, namely, with a lie. The word "schonen" ultimately reflects Puffmann's egocentric nature. In fact, with these very words he attempts to preserve and protect himself, while simultaneously causing more injury to Klara, whom he professed to shield.

As Puffmann had hoped, he is able to dupe Massengold, who tells the others that the secretary has justified himself satisfactorily. Peter objects, still insisting on an open explanation as to where he was on the evening in question. At this point, Thomas steps forward, saying, "Er hat sich am siebenten September Schlag achte ins Wasser stürzen wollen" (VII,103). Peter is finally satisfied. But now the question arises, which is expressed by Massengold, "Mein Puffmann wollte sich entleiben und ein entseelter Leichnam werden!? - Ja, aber warum? -"(VII,104). These words, especially "entleiben" and "entseelter Leichnam," are ridiculous and comical in view of the situation, and once more reflect Massengold's ignorance of the true nature of Puffmann. In the expression, "entseelter Leichnam," either term is redundant if used with the other, particularly so in view of the verb "entleiben" in the foregoing clause. In the past, his secretary has always had an answer for him, this time, however, he is desperate, "Warum? - (Verlegen und verwirrt für sich.) Bankrottes Hirn, fallt dir gar nix ein? (Zu Massengold.) Aus - aus Verzweiflung" (VII,104). His initial comment to himself echoes Peter's sarcastic remark, "Wie doch der letzte gute Freund des Schlechten, das bisserl Verstand, Reissaus nimmt in der Angst!"(VII,91). The answer "Verzweiflung," is of course a lie, yet it is a suitable description of his mental and emotional state at this particular moment. Therefore, it is valid, though not in the sense intended by Puffmann. Furthermore, it anticipates his imminent and

even greater distress when he is forced to marry Ottilie. Inadvertently, by choosing the answer, he draws the noose tighter around his neck, and he is about to be entrapped by his own words, a process that has been occurring from the start, but now has greatly increased its speed.

There must, however, be a reason for his desperation, and Massengold wants to know this. Peter, who has been observing Puffmann's embarrassment, notes to himself, "Mit dem muss es noch ein kurioses Nisi haben; denn dass der aus Liebe -"(VII,104). The secretary hears only the last words, and believes he has an answer, "Unglückliche Liebe war der Grund"(VII,104). Peter's reasoning use of a word is carried on in deceptive fashion by Puffmann. This certainly is one more of Puffmann's lies. Nevertheless, "Unglückliche Liebe" has other levels of meaning. Firstly, Puffmann felt that Massengold's love for Hermine was "unglücklich" for him, Puffmann, since a marriage would terminate his influence and control over the Baron. That love has resulted in an even greater "Unglück" for Puffmann at this very moment. Massengold seems to be at the point of discovering his true activities on the evening of September 7. Secondly, love has also been "unglücklich" for Massengold because of Hermine's successful flight. Thirdly, "Unglückliche Liebe" reverberates Ottilie's comment in the fourth scene of Act I, "Die Liebe, die er [Massengold] mir damals herzlos versagte . . ." (VII,8). It was Massengold's rejection of Ottilie's erstwhile love that led her to conspire with Puffmann in freeing Hermine from the Baron.

But fourthly, and most important, it leads directly to Puffmann's final entrapment, due to his manipulative use of language, which is indeed "eine unglückliche Liebe" for both conspirators. Massengold still insists on knowing who it is that his secretary loves. It is again Thomas who, as always extremely inopportune for Puffmann, speculates, "Wahrscheinlich logiert wer im Schloss Eschenau, weil er grad in der Nachbarschaft so gern ertrunken wär'"(VII,104). Aside from the humorous implications of this statement, it foreshadows Puffmann's feelings at the conclusion of the play, when he probably wishes he had drowned himself. Massengold's so-called "Scharfsinn" recognizes Puffmann's object of love as Ottilie. The secretary desperately seeks an escape, "(nach kurzer Überlegung, für sich.) Das muss ich ergreifen, ich riskier' nix dabei. - (Laut zu Massengold.) Euer hochherrlichen Gnaden, es is so, wie Euer Gnaden zu erraten beliebten" (VII,104-05). Puffmann still thinks it best to dupe and deceive Massengold and the others if possible. The terms "hochherrlichen" and "Gnaden," as well as "beliebten," are a continuation of his flattery and obsequiousness, which seek to impress upon the Baron Puffmann's high regard for him and his judgement. With the help of this professed attitude, the secretary hopes to manipulate Massengold as he finds expedient. The latter is at a loss as to why Puffmann would want to commit suicide. His answer, "(mit Beziehung auf Ottilie). Ist diese Liebe nicht unglücklich genug?"(VII,105), tries to intimate that

such a love would indeed be "unglücklich," because the two have no sympathy, much less love for each other. Indeed, their relationship is one of hostility, not love, and the mere thought that he would have to love Ottilie is sufficient reason to commit suicide. However, Massengold's answer lucidly shows that he has not understood, or does not want to understand, his secretary's subtle hint. Instead, he notes: "Sie wäre es, wenn ich nur strenger Gebieter und nicht auch milder Verwandter, wohlwollender Gönner wäre"(VII,105). He sees himself as "milder Verwandter" and "wohlwollender Gönner," and thus, seems to imply that he will not only endorse such a marriage, but also provide necessary assistance. Puffmann sees his hopes dashed, and in desperation turns to Ottilie, "Sie werden mich doch ausschlagen, hoff' ich?"(VII,105). But the web he has been spinning so assiduously from the outset is about to close over him, because Ottilie replies, "Kann ich's, ohne neuerdings Verdacht zu erregen, ohne neuerdings in Todesangst -"(VII,105). When she heard of his "Dokimentradierung," she lamented, ". . . ich will nichts wissen - Gott, wenn die Gerichte - ich bin des Todes!" (VII,9). The cliché "ich bin des Todes," begins to have added meaning for both conspirators, in the sense that each abhors what is about to happen to them--they will be forced to marry each other. Here, the following statement of Dickkopf, a misanthrope in <u>Heimliches Geld, heimliche Liebe</u> (1853), seems to be applicable in a sinister way, "Gibt's eine kommodere Gelegenheit, eine Verhasste unglücklich zu machen, als wenn man s' heirat't?" (VIII,46-47).

Already then she showed extreme fear of being discovered as a conspirator and accomplice in the birth certificate forgery, and although despising Puffmann just as much as he despises her, she is far too frightened not to accept him in marriage. Puffmann's self-spun linguistic web has closed around him. His final, quiet appeal to her, "Aber ich bitt' Ihnen -" (VII,105), is unanswered by her. Meanwhile, Massengold speaks:

> (Zu Peter). Sie werde mit ihrem Bräutigam in meiner Schlosskapelle am selben Tage wie Cousine Ottilie und Puffmann getraut. Übrigens kann ich Ihre Verbindung, die ich des Eklats wegen toleriere, doch nicht zu sehr protegieren. Ottilie hat kein Vermögen und bekömmt auch nichts von mir. (VII,106).

Here, the emphasis is entirely on "strenger Gebieter"--forgotten is the "milder Verwandter" and "wohlwollender Gönner." Particularly upsetting to Puffmann must be Massengold's final sentence, because the former considers money extremely important. The secretary's obsequious linguistic deception toward the Baron and the others has created a trap that is foolproof, and Puffmann proves to be the fool.

Puffmann's first comment about himself is an attempt to justify his attitude and behaviour to Ottilie, who has accused him of "schnöden Eigennutz." He retorts, "Mein Eigennutz hat etwas Respektables, seitdem er sich in den Salonfrack des Dominierens geknöpfelt"(VII,8). He readily admits to being selfish, but qualifies it with respectability, not "schnöde." However, this assertion, like his others, is a linguistic ruse. Thus, his deception, as well as his manipulative use of language, which seeks to dupe others into believing whatever he finds

expedient at the moment, is intimated early in the play. The justification for his selfishness is the "Salonfrack des Dominierens," but this is merely an external element which does not affect the basic nature of "Eigennutz." Instead, it is merely one facet of his deception that serves as a protective device, in that "Dominieren im Salonfrack" helps conceal his craftiness, and permits him to argue that whatever he is doing is part of his responsibility as a dominator. Also, in case of a serious challenge, he is in a position to crush it, if necessary by illegal means, as happens when he attempts to arrest Peter because of his determination to have Klara exonerated. Therefore, instead of justifying himself, a dominating position leads to further, more intense craftiness and selfishness, in order to retain such a position, even though it costs another person's respect and peace of mind. Such an action is indeed unrespectable, thus mocking his assertion, "Mein Eigennutz hat etwas Respektables"(VII,8), and drawing attention to the inherent fatuity of his schemings.

Just as the "Salonfrack des Dominierens" cloaks his "Eigennutz," so his unctuosity in the use of language conceals his true, selfish intention, as he attempts to dupe and manipulate others. Yet the more urgent the attempts become, the more noticeable his foolishness is, and the more he becomes the victim of his machinations.

In his opening song and monologue, Peter describes himself as a "Zimmermann," and explains in direct and understood meta-

phoric terms his attitude toward man and life in general. Two of the fundamental constituents of Peter's linguistic habits are directness and clarity in explaining himself and in communicating with others. These traits are underpinned by rationality and sagacity, which again are reflected in his use of language. From Peter's initial, indirect contact with Puffmann, until Klara has been fully exonerated, the confrontation between Puffmann's double and deceptive use of language, and Peter's single or clarifying use, is manifested and reflected vividly in their respective attempts to communicate the situation in words, not only when the two are involved directly in a hostile verbal encounter, but in their deployment of the language in general. As is true of all other major Nestroy characters, neither undergoes any true change through a confrontation with dramatic words, despite the great changes of plot. In both cases, their approach to language directly mirrors the important facets of their personality. The two are but one--though significant--example of Nestroy figures, whose specific use of language is an expression of their characters. Although there is a happy ending, it does not imply that the deception caused by the misuse of language has been defeated. Puffmann is not a changed man, linguistically or morally. Instead, the happy ending merely indicates that this is one of a number of elements of the "Wiener Volkstheater" Nestroy has retained, largely at the insistence of the censor. More significant is the intimation that deception cannot be eradicated.

Instead, it can only be recognized in the language of people, and must be dealt with on a daily and on an individual basis. Those like Peter, who use language directly in order to inform, are not immune to the "Malträtierung" of those like Puffmann, who use language to misinform. However, the former can defend themselves by recognizing linguistic manipulation, and by fighting it with linguistic clarity.

In this chapter, the attempt has been made to elucidate through an analysis of the two representative plays and a few of their key characters, three crucial linguistic elements that pervade Nestroy's writing. Firstly, it has been sought to show in the language of Simplicius, in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel, that individual words and expressions comment censoriously on the speaker by unmasking a particular shortcoming. In Simplicius' case it proved to be his stupidity. Related to the boomerang effect, but including all the language of a given character, is the thumbprinting quality of language--language reflects the essential nature of the character. This linguistic device was dealt with in reference to Peter and Puffmann, two vastly different figures in Der Unbedeutende. Peter's language was seen to inform directly and lucidly his true thoughts without any ulterior motive. On the other hand, Puffmann's language was a smoke-screen that sought to deceive and manipulate for selfish reasons. His words were not verbal extensions of his true thought, but were carefully chosen for the purpose of confusing and distorting reality.

The third and concluding part of this chapter also dealt with Puffmann, in order to show the final result of his attitude toward and (mis)use of language. His manipulative and deceptive use of language was seen to spin a linguistic web that in the end irrevocably trapped its creator, showing that language inevitably turns on those that seek to manipulate it. This latter aspect will constitute a key theme in the following chapter, which will attempt to draw all previously noted devices together in an exegesis of the language of Titus Feuerfuchs, in Der Talisman, Nestroy's most talented linguistic magician.

Chapter IV

Nichts am Menschen täuscht mehr als die Ohren (XI,451).

A. Titus Confronts a Prejudicial World (I)

In chapters II and III, certain dominant and recurring elements, as reflected and manifested in Nestroy's unique use of language were analyzed. The following will not only endorse and buttress the foregoing, but also expand upon them through an in-depth or critical analysis of the language in Der Talisman (1849). This will necessitate primarily a close scrutiny of the interplay of Titus' language with that of the other figures in the play, as he seeks to assert himself, and come to terms with himself and the environment, which is predominantly a hostile one. An extremely skillful and dazzling use of language is Titus' most potent weapon, which at times also proves to be a handicap. Throughout the exegesis, numerous marked differences in reference to use of language, to contemporary and antecedent writers of the Viennese Popular Theater, of which Bäuerle is used as a representative figure, will become apparent.

The reason for an analysis of Der Talisman in the concluding chapter of this dissertation, is not only because it is one of

Nestroy's greatest plays, but also because Titus, the protagonist, is a very complex figure, who, in part, combines the dominant traits as manifested in the language of both Puffmann and Peter, two extreme representatives of the manipulative and honest uses of language. Titus, even more so than the two above, has an acumen for, and command of, the language. He uses it with great success for a time in order to overcome the problem of prejudice, which constantly confronts him. Initially, the audience is certainly on his side. In fact, a certain measure of empathy is always with him. However, as the play develops, it becomes obvious that he often uses language in devious ways as a smoke screen, similar to Puffmann, in order to manipulate people. Although Titus' use of language elicits humour, and seems to be justified, particularly because he must always battle prejudice, it becomes increasingly apparent that even in the hands of an individual who has the empathy of the audience, language is a dangerous instrument whose metaphors can be seductive in relation to the speaker. To put it bluntly, it turns on those that are turned on by it. Like Puffmann, Titus also is entangled by a linguistic web of his own making, but he is still able to redeem himself, because his basic decency has never been lost, even though he temporarily succumbed to the seductress of language. We will see just how vulnerable a language manipulator can be, even one that is not evil like Puffmann. In Act I, Scene x, Titus meets Marquis, another language manipulator, whose life he has just saved. The latter

cunningly talks himself out of giving Titus a well-deserved monetary reward. In fact, he even obliquely insults him by rewarding Titus with a black wig.

In order to examine the above mentioned elements thoroughly, emphasizing especially the aspect that language can become a dangerous instrument working against its user, the approach will be a close textual analysis of the words of a major figure from beginning to end. It is partly for this reason that this analysis is relatively lengthy. Only through a detailed textual analysis of the language of a character like Titus, and of the situations which come back to threaten him because of his language, can Nestroy's unique use of language be realized, particularly in reference to Kraus's statement, "Nestroy ist der erste deutsche Satiriker, in dem sich die Sprache Gedanken macht über die Dinge."[1]

To facilitate an overview of the analysis, it is best seen in three basic parts, each one showing Titus as he adapts his language appropriately, in order to come to terms with different linguistic opponents. In the opening section, Titus, the master user of language, encounters firstly two figures, Plutzerkern and Salome, who do not understand the numerous denotations and connotations elicited by his sophisticated linguistic combinations. Secondly, he is confronted by Marquis, who is also extremely skillful in the cunning use of language. Indeed, it might be posited that he gives Titus a lesson in the devious use of language manipulation. In part two, Titus

is in a far more dangerous area as far as the boomerang effect of misuse of language is concerned. Here, he deals primarily with three women, Flora, Constantia and Frau von Cypressenburg, who believe themselves to be, in ascending order, sophisticated, and think that they can deal with Titus on his own linguistic terms. However, this is dangerous for him, because he allows language to burst forth in what might be described as a spontaneous manner, in a response to slight challenges. Inevitably he overwhelms the three women, but precisely at this point, where he is especially spectacular with his usage, language begins to think about itself, that is, "über die Dinge," and thus turns on him.

The beginning of part three sees Titus in a position very similar to the one in which he found himslef at the opening of the play. Initially, even though his manipulative use of language has resulted in a fiasco, he continues to employ the same approach. But at the conclusion, when he has been assured of financial security, and although still using language very adroitly, he no longer uses it deceptively for selfish reasons. He re-adapts his basic stance, as intimated in his opening song prior to his decision to be deceptive and manipulative.

Der Talisman is an adaptation of Dupeuty and F. Courcy's Comédie-Vaudeville Bonaventure, which opened in January, 1840, in Paris. Only the basic plot was retained by Nestroy and is significant within the frame of this paper. Crucial is the language, which is the very life-blood of the play, and entirely

Nestroy's creation. Der Talisman was a resounding success when it premiered in Vienna on December 16, 1840. The Theaterzeitung wrote:

> Das Publikum wie die Kritik haben sich daran gewöhnt, Nestroys neue Produkte als Ereignisse anzusehen, und das mit vollem Rechte. Denn wenn auch ein oder das andere nicht ausserordentliches Glück macht, so gilt dies doch zuverlässig von dem dritten, vierten, und dann ist der Eindruck so grossartig, so allgemein ergreifend, wie dies bei Lokalstücken anderweitigen Ursprungs nur selten der Fall ist! (X,632)

Similarly impressed were the Wiener Zeitschrift, Der Humorist, and Der Sammler. The latter noted:

> Es ist schon zu einer stereotypen Redensart unserer Rezensenten geworden, dass sie dort, wo sie eine Jeremiade über den Verfall der Lokalposse anstimmen, generaliter beifügen: Ein Akt einer Nestroyschen Posse enthält Witz genug, um ein Dutzend unserer gewöhnlichen Lokalstücke reichlich damit auszustatten. Dieser Satz ist schon so verbraucht, dass man ihn zu den Gemeinplätzen werfen, d.i. vermeiden sollte, ihn ferner zu gebrauchen, wenn sich nicht die Gelegenheit bei diesem ‚Talisman' zu auffällig darböte, noch einmal zu sagen: ‚Es ist wahr!'" (X,641-42)

It continues to be one of the most performed comedies of the German language stage.

The play opens with peasant youths about to start dancing in the "Dorfplatz." All find a partner except Salome, a "Gänsehüterin," who, as always, is scorned and ridiculed because of her red hair. Soon Titus, also red-haired, who is a "Barbiergeselle," appears in shabby worn-out clothes and without luggage. He has run away because he has been treated like an outcast, not only by strangers, but also by Spund, a wealthy relative who sells beer. Like Salome, Titus has had to suffer scorn and ridicule because of his red hair. As the two are talking, a passing

stranger loses control of his horse, and a serious accident appears imminent. However, Titus intervenes, and saves the man's life. For his effort, Titus is given a black wig which he dons, and is able to gain entrance to the local "Gutshof," where he is received favourably by three women of ascending social importance. But Marquis, the individual Titus saved, is the lover of Constantia, who is one of the three women. He becomes extremely jealous, believing that Titus has designs on his woman. Marquis, also a barber, takes the black wig back. Titus is desperate, but finds a blond wig. Nevertheless, his red hair is discovered, and he is driven into the street like a criminal. Meanwhile, Spund, who has decided it would be dishonourable for him not to assist Titus, arrives and offers to buy him a business. Titus rejects a chance to become Spund's "Universalerbe," and marries Salome. This is the skeleton of the plot Nestroy borrowed from the French vaudeville. But the comedy rides on a different vehicle, namely, the linguistic virtuosity of Titus, and its effect on the characters we meet in the course of his rise through the social order.

When Titus first appears, he introduces himself with a song. Part one of the first stanza succinctly defines his problem as one that he cannot avoid, but must learn to come to terms with at present and in the future:

> Der hat weiter nit g'schaut,
> Beinah' hätt' ich'n g'haut;
> Der Spitzbub', 's is wahr,
> Lacht mich aus weg'n die Haar'!
> Wen geht's denn was an,
> Ich hoff' doch, ich kann
> Haar' hab'n, wie ich will,
> Jetzt wird's mir schon z'viel. (X,390)

Titus' problem is a deadly serious one--he is the victim of prejudice. His solution proves to be linguistic rather than physical attack. The above quotation already stamps Titus' mode of behaviour toward those whose bias he must face, that is, he 'speaks' rather than acts aggressively. His position is a very precarious one, and sharp animosity is the governing quality of his interrelationships with those he has had to deal with every day. The phrase, "weiter nit g'schaut," in the opening lines, shows that the antagonist was not in the slightest concerned about his attitude toward Titus. He was merely behaving in his usual manner toward people who have red hair, indifferent to the fact that he was biased. For many, bias seems to be part of an ingrained trait in their behavioural pattern. Such people have absolutely no concern about the effect that such an attitude has on their victims. This is betrayed by the first line, "Der hat weiter nit g'schaut." The statement, "nit g'schaut" must be particularly infuriating for Titus, since it betrays a general apathy. The result of this "nit g'schaut" was "beinah' g'haut." However, because Titus is keenly aware and understanding of the various nuances in the relationships between people, he realizes, firstly, that such biased behaviour is an indelible part of the mental and emotional constitution of these people, and secondly, that a violent action on his part would only aggravate, not solve, the problem.

The adverb "beinah'," and the subjunctive "hätt'," emphasize that he nearly did lash out physically, and more important, that he actually verbalized it instead, thereby venting some of his anger, and simultaneously creating a greater emotional

distance between himself and that event, even though there is already a time cushion. By speaking about an infuriating incident, Titus diffuses its explosive quality. He seeks to come to terms with his environment by mastering it through language. These particular words indicate his desire and ability not to allow himself to become entangled too closely with his emotions, a situation that would inevitably lead to an inability to control himself and his environment. Language provides Titus with an invaluable means, not only of defence and attack, but also of permitting him to be detached and objective, when reflecting about himself specifically, and man in general.

Titus refers to the one who ridiculed him as a "Spitzbub'," a word that has several meanings. Firstly, its common meaning of rogue and thief signifies that he has robbed Titus of something, namely, his peace of mind, since this song clearly shows his state of agitation and anger. Later, it will become apparent that the "Spitzbub'," and others like him, have robbed Titus of far more. Secondly, "Spitzbub'" is a compound word: "spitz," aside from meaning sharp and pointed, therefore something that can injure, also implies a derisive attitude, one that projects barbs of mockery and sarcasm at the innocent victims of prejudice. "Bub" itself, aside from meaning boy, also designates scamp or rascal. ("Bubenstück" is a piece of villainy). Thus, "Spitzbub'," as well as "spitz" and "Bub," endorse and buttress each other, and individually, as well as a unit, elucidate Titus' present difficulties, and anticipate

future problems. For Titus, society as a whole is a "Spitzbub'." Titus' manner of expression in this opening song reveals the character the audience will get to know in active form in the course of the play.

The key statement giving the reason why he is aroused is an empirical one, "Lacht mich aus weg'n die Haar'"(X,390). It is devoid of evaluative words; the meaning is clear, and because it can be verified from the experience that Titus continues to have as the play progresses, it is a true statement. In fact, all of the statements he makes in reference to prejudicial behaviour directed towards him are clear, non-ambiguous statements. It is important to establish the truth of the above quotation, since it is of crucial importance to his attitude and behaviour toward those he must deal with throughout the play, and toward man in general.

Although very disconcerted, Titus refuses to submit. Instead, he asks, "Wen geht's was an," a valid question which in no way betrays doubt or uncertainty. It is a question which flings a challenge at all those who have been, and still are, biased towards him because of his red hair. He will repeat this challenge indirectly as the play progresses. The following two lines, "Ich hoff' doch, ich kann / Haar' hab'n, wie ich will" (X,390), project a very strong self-image. Again, it must be pointed out that an individual's language reveals his fundamental nature. Furthermore, his thumbprint is basically honest language, but he manipulates it as a matter of self-defence. Here

the key words are, "ich hoff' doch," and "ich will." The former marks a sanguine trait which endorses his challenging and self-assured nature, and also has him look with anticipation into the future, while the latter is indicative of his courage and determination to force positive things to happen. Indeed, the "hoff'" and "will" traits are responsible for him having left his former domicile, in order to seek a new home.

When he talks to himself, his language is straightforward and he states the truth. In this reference, he is like Peter. However, as soon as Titus talks to others, he tries to manipulate language. The fact that Titus' language is truthful when he talks to himself, is indicative of his basic honesty and his unchanging self. In part two of the first stanza, Titus unmasks the utter foolishness of the prejudice under which he suffers:

> Rote Haar' von ein' falschen Gemüt zeig'n soll'n?
> 's is 's Dümmste, wann d'Leut' nach die Haar' urteil'n woll'n.
> 's gibt G'schwufen g'nug mit ein' kohlrab'nschwarzen Haupt,
> Und jede is ang'schmiert, die ihnen was glaubt;
> Manch blondg'lockter Jüngling is beim Tag so still
> Und schmachtend - warum? Bei der Nacht lumpt er z' viel.
> Und mit eisgraue Haar' schau'n die Herrn aus so g'scheit
> Und sein oft verruckter noch als d' jungen Leut'!
> Drum auf d'Haar' muss man gehn,
> Nachher trifft man's schon schön. (X,390)

The opening two lines specify the bias which is then disposed of with empirical assertions. Already, the conclusion of the first, namely, the word "soll'n," underlines the foregoing assumption. The fact that it is in question form also queries the validity of this commonly accepted belief. Thus, the form of the statement and its choice of words already weakens its

assertion. One might further argue that, aside from a question, this line is also a challenge, a continuation of the one already referred to in the first part above. It is, furthermore, an attack on the careless use of language and the thoughtless repetition of a ready-made phrase, which is indicative of the apathy pointed out in part one of this stanza. The line also betrays an intellectual laziness, in which the individual simply repeats what seems to him at a particular moment a suitable set of words. In so doing, he reinforces a deleterious mode of thought, something that Nestroy unmasks throughout his plays. The second line is no longer a question, but an outright denunciation of that belief. It is not merely "dumm," but "'s Dümmste" to evaluate people according to the colour of their hair. The fact that this is not possible is intimated by the last two words of this line, "urteil'n woll'n." People want to judge. However, the want betrays that this is only an intention, an action that cannot be done in a just manner. This bias is depicted as one of the numerous facets of fatuity.

Although Titus vigorously denounces the belief that red hair is indicative of a deceptive nature, he does not assert that people with red hair do not possess one. Instead, he insists that many black, blond, and grey-haired people also cannot be trusted. They are not what they appear to be; "Und jede is ang'schmiert, die ihnen was glaubt." He certainly is not partisan. In fact, he concludes a reversal of values. Out of the attack on red, he arrives at the dubiousness of brown and blond.

The third and fourth lines deal with black-haired men, but the word that introduces them is itself a severe criticism, in that it refers to them as "G'schwufen." The negative associations this evokes are reinforced by the adjective "kohlrab'nschwarzen." These very negative intimations are further strengthened by the term "ang'schmiert," that describes how he treats those that trust him. In the two lines commenting on the men with black hair, Titus uses three key words, a noun, an adjective and a predicate adjective as he depicts the nature of these individuals, by giving them a certain name, by referring to their hair with a particular word, which in another context would not have negative implications, and by noting what happens to girls who trust a man like that. The choice and positioning of words, as well as the associations they evoke, buttress and reinforce each other, and thereby, individually and as a whole, begin to convince the audience that they are hearing a word-magician. One might be tempted to dismiss the noun "G'schwufen" as an evaluative term lacking a common consensus. However, the fourth line is an empirical statement attending to meaning and making verification possible. Thus, it may be accepted. Later, Titus, wearing a black wig, literally proves this, when he deceives Flora and Constantia. Here is prefigured one significant theme: Titus is the accuser, but will become the accused, when his own language will come back to judge him.

Thus, lines three and four, also lines five to seven, are

anticipatory of his own behaviour. The clause, "die ihnen was glaubt," and the phrase, "is ang'schmiert," clearly indicate that those having "kohlrab'nschwarzes Haar" have been lying. This is precisely what occurs when Titus, wearing a black wig, meets Flora and Constantia. With each, he uses language as a smoke screen, manipulating it in order to manipulate the addressee, but inevitably creating a serious problem for himself. The adjective "kohlrab'nschwarzes" needs close attention, because of its plurisignation quality--besides meaning a very deep black in reference to colour, "schwarz" is also used to describe a pernicious nature, as in the idiom "eine schwarze Seele haben." This will take on a special meaning when Titus wears the black wig given to him by Marquis, and, partly because of it, experiences temporary success with the three women. What appears to be an innocent and clever use of metaphor by Titus, is, in retrospect, the first strand in his own web of self-accusation. Language has not yet shown itself to be an independent entity, but in retrospect, the audience can already feel it beginning to get out of Titus' control. Titus concludes the first stanza with a couplet that is ironic and sarcastic, "Drum auf d'Haar' muss man gehn / Nachher trifft man's schon schön"(X,390). Obviously, he means the opposite of what he states, challenging the spectator to examine his own thinking, to judge for himself, and not merely to parrot what is generally said. In this manner, Nestroy attempts to involve him in a direct confrontation with prejudice, and thus, start a process

that may possibly mitigate some of the injurious effects that prejudice has everywhere. The couplet also foreshadows significant events that occur as the play develops: Flora, Constantia and Frau von Cypressenburg will be fooled because they have an inordinate liking for black curly hair; Titus will also be deceived, because he puts so much trust in a hair colour that is not his own. Ultimately, all are deceived to a very large extent by their own behaviour. It would seem that they are responsible for their own misery and that of those they must deal with in their daily existence. This thought clearly anticipates Titus' future problems, which are to a large extent caused by his smoke screen use of language that leads to his own entanglement.

The first part of stanza two, like that of stanza one, deals specifically with Titus' situation and his attitude toward it:

> Mir soll einer trau'n,
> Der wird sich verschau'n,
> Auf Ehr', dem geht's schlecht,
> Denn ich beutl' ihn recht;
> Der Kakadu is verlor'n,
> Wenn ich in mein' Zorn
> Über d'Haar' ein' kumm,
> Der geht glatzkopfet um. (X,391)

He has found that he cannot trust anyone, and now threatens that no-one will be able to trust him, "Mir soll einer trau'n / Der wird sich verschau'n." Here is another challenge for those who have been mistreating him. These lines also indicate courage and determination, even more so than the opening part of the first stanza. He has been maligned due to the common belief

that those who have red hair cannot be trusted. Against this common way of thinking he rebels. He will now be like his tormentors, misusing the trust that others have in him. Thus, trust, the bond that cements relationships between individuals, is being eroded, and, as the play develops, this lack of trust continuously undermines meaningful relationships between people. Like the concluding lines of the first stanza, so the opening two of the second foretell his actions, specifically in reference to the three women, who will all be fooled by the colour of his hair. The line, "Mir soll einer trau'n," especially the word "trau'n," as used by Titus, underscores the deception that will dominate his actions toward others. As used here, this term conveys a meaning opposite to what it usually stands for, i.e., people should not trust him if they do not want to be misused. When speaking these words, Titus is angry and distressed. He fails to recognize that such behaviour will lead directly to difficulties for which he himself will be responsible to a large extent. There is a certain similarity with Puffmann. However, it must be noted that the latter's need for manipulating language was not really a need at all, whereas Titus chooses such behaviour in order to survive. The specific word that turns the meaning of "trau'n" to its opposite is achieved by the modal "soll." This term was used once before at the start of the second part of the first stanza, and there too, it implied the opposite to what the statement said in a normal context.

Since the various attacks that Titus must contend with are always aimed at his hair, the threats that he levels at others also are dressed in words that refer to the head or hair. In using these particular words, Titus is able to be much more effective than if he were to employ language that did not make use of these terms. With these, he continues to reiterate the fact that undue emphasis is paid to external appearance, and this opens a Pandora's box of metaphors. Indirectly, Titus also intimates that the head is not at all seen as it should be, that is, as man's reason. Thereby, he draws attention to the importance of the use of reason which is, unfortunately, lacking in those that make life difficult for him. Thus, the images referring to head and hair evoke numerous associations that expand beyond the immediate concern of his interests at this point. Nevertheless, they expand to include the whole of the play, and in retrospect are significant, because they create a bridge--as yet invisible--to future events of the play. The line, "Der Kakadu is verlor'n," anticipates the scene when Titus loses "his" black wig, after inadvertently arousing the jealousy of Marquis, and, thus, comments on his own rapid fall from power. Obviously, Titus is not referring to himself here, yet in his attempt to deceive others, he becomes the victim of his own linguistic arrows. For all intents and purposes, he was indeed "glatzkopfet" after Marquis took back the black wig. His choice of words continues to be tailored specifically to the content, so the word itself and the

meaning it conveys are a unity, in that they reinforce each other to the extent that the word itself is also the referent.

The first part of the second stanza has established his position. The concluding section deals with man in general, namely, with his shortcomings. But whereas he dealt with men before, he now looks at women:

> Die rothaarig'n Madeln, heisst's, betrüg'n d'Männer sehr;
> Wie dumm! Das tun d'Madeln von jeder Couleur.
> Die schwarz'n, heisst's, sein feurig, das tut d'Männer locken,
> Derweil is a Schwarze oft d' fadeste Nocken.
> Die Blonden sein sanft? O! A Blonde is a Pracht!
> Ich kenn' eine Blonde, die rauft Tag und Nacht.
> Doch mit graue Haar' sein s' treu, ha, da stund man dafur,
> Nit wahr is, die färb'n sich s' und geb'n auch keine Ruh' -
> Drum auf d' Haar' muss man gehn,
> Nachher trifft man's schon schön. (X,391)

This part too consists of four couplets, and in each one the first line presents a commonly held view, "Die rothaarig'n Madeln, heisst's, betrug'n d'Männer sehr." This is obviously a prejudice, but not because this is untrue of red-haired girls, or as Titus expresses it, "Wie dumm! Das tun d'Madeln von jeder Couleur." Again, prejudicial thinking is defined as stupid. As Titus refers to blonde girls, he becomes very specific, "Ich kenn' eine Blonde, die rauft Tag und Nacht." He argues by drawing from his personal experience--undoubtedly many in the audience will automatically do the same--and does not just call her behaviour deceptive, but cites a concrete example. Here is an empirical statement leaving no doubt as to the meaning, because it contains only descriptive words, and is in sharp contrast to the vague, evaluative assertion: red-haired girls deceive men. In his arguments, Titus tends to move from the personal

to the general, and from the general back to the specific and concrete, a line of argument that cannot be disproved from his particular point of view, one that he shares with others, e.g. Salome. Titus' comments about black, blonde and grey-haired women, that they are either dull or quarrelsome, or both, are later verified in his dealings with Flora, Constantia, and Frau von Cypressenburg. Salome, the one with the red hair, though rather naive, is the only one with definitely positive character traits.

In the song, Titus deals with his own situation in the first part of each stanza, and in the other parts, consisting of couplets, comments about prejudice in general. However, he still cites concrete examples, sometimes from personal experiences, but always narrating succinctly in empirical terms, statements that can be verified, therefore, true statements. Those comments of his that do contain evaluative and attitude statements, are clear in meaning, and can be verified from his past experiences, or from the events in the play as they occur.

The monologue that follows the song reiterates that prejudice is stupidity because it betrays a lack of reasoning, and results in blindly following traditional beliefs. Since he is concerned with the colour of hair, he builds his monologue around the various uses of "Kopf," and with this repetition, underscores that man should use his reason, be concerned about what is in his head, rather than emphasize the colour of the hair. Here, a general similarity with Peter, the "Zimmermann" in

Der Unbedeutende may be noted. Both use metaphors from the sphere of their occupation. Peter begins his monologue by referring to his physical position, the "Dachstuhl," and later mentions specific tools he uses. Titus, a barber, uses the terms head and hair. However, both are strong advocates of man's use of reason. For Titus, however, the complex linguistic play with "Kopf" leads him into more and more dangerous ground, as he himself will alter his "Kopf" with various wigs, but his statements here will come back to condemn him. The term "Kopf," furthermore, indicates Titus' way of using a concrete term in order to refer to something abstract, namely reason. As a matter of fact, this term would seem to combine both meanings, the physical as well as the cerebral, and in so doing, is able to evoke twice as many associations as would be possible with the word "reason." Man, however, does not use his reason, at least not in the manner he should. Because of this, traditional beliefs have become petrified, that is, they are now a prejudice, and once this has occurred, it is futile to use reason against it, "Das Vorurteil is eine Mauer, von der sich noch alle Köpf', die gegen sie ang'rennt sind, mit blutige Köpf' zurückgezogen haben"(X,391). Again, Titus uses a concrete example, the wall, to stand for something abstract, namely prejudice. A wall is solid and fixed--it does not move because of its very nature, and aside from being immovable, a wall also confines and severely restricts movement--all qualities that aptly describe prejudicial thinking. Just as it is utterly futile to

use, in the physical sense, one's head against a wall, so it is futile for reason to counter prejudice, to confront it openly. Therefore, Titus has withdrawn, really retreated. The ones that are prejudicial cannot be just, just as a human head cannot inflict damage on a wall. Equally as disconcerting is the fact that prejudice need not pursue its victim, since, as already noted, prejudice acts like a wall confining and limiting movement. Sooner or later--it is only a matter of time--irrespective where Titus turns, there will be another wall. If he is to survive, he must not fight with brute force, that is, head on, rather, he must use cunning. He should use language in such a way that by manipulating it, he may gain some measure of control over those around him, and over his environment in general. But as already mentioned, this too is dangerous, because a manipulative use of language, particularly if it continues to increase, leads to the manipulator's entanglement by a web of his own making.

The general comment comparing prejudice to a wall is the introduction to Titus' own situation. His home environment had been very confining and outright destructive as far as Titus' relationship with others had been concerned. He states, "Ich hab' meinen Wohnstiz mit der weiten Welt vertauscht, und die weite Welt is viel näher als man glaubt"(X,391-92). This succinct statement explains an action he was forced to take because of prejudicial behaviour towards him. Key terms are, "die weite Welt," which at first seems to mean nothing more than the

Romantics' idea of "Wanderlust." However, the repetition of it brings in the alienation, but in an almost comical way, which is typical of Titus, comical because of the violent shift in the understanding of "weite Welt." Leaving home proved to be of no benefit, since the isolation and resulting loneliness he thought to avoid by leaving home, is everywhere. There appears to be no escape from problematic and ambiguous existence. It is a metaphor, originally a semi-parody of romanticism, which immediately takes on a serious connotation, and eventually will comment on Titus' journey within the play as well. The adjective, "weite," is the significant term that is able to evoke the ideas of great distances between people, of being unable to communicate meaningfully. It elicits different associations than "Mauer," which stood for prejudice. Yet it too shows that the individual is alone, and that meaningful relationships between people are not possible. One reason why they are not possible, is due to man's inability to use language effectively, firstly, because language is becoming very imprecise, and secondly, because this very impreciseness leaves it open to manipulation by those who understand its ability to deceive, a tendency that is also to be found in Titus.

The problems encountered at home that led to further alienation in "die weite Welt," originated from the "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," an image that endorses the associations already evoked with "Mauer." It strengthens them and simultaneously expands on them. "Dorngebüsch" implies that

progress, or movement, is not possible without considerable exertion and pain, where the individual thorns are the specific instances of prejudicial treatment Titus experienced. Here the spectator may recognize a faint reverberating of the word, "spitz," which was analyzed earlier as part of "Spitzbub'." Again, Titus uses a concrete image to refer to a situation that includes a great variety of human experiences. The image, "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," is extended, when Titus noted that out of this, he fashioned himself a "Wanderstab." It seems that just as the stick he made himself grew out of the "Dorngebüsch," so the images he uses continue to grow out of each other. In this way, his language is what it is, because of the ability of Titus to reflect his particular nature in metaphorical terms, which are different from that of anyone else.

In taking the "Wanderstab" with him, Titus will always have a reminder of why he left home, and because he can always be reminded of this, it seems that he has come to terms with these experiences. But there is a greater significance in the fact that he has been able to derive something beneficial from an adverse situation, mastering thereby, at least to a certain extent, a problematic and ambiguous environment. Furthermore, it would seem that even though he left his home, retreated in a sense, he continues to attack, because the image "Wanderstab" may also denote a weapon. Not that it could be used in the manner of a sword, rather, it may be seen as symbolic of his

great skill with words and language, which in fact he does use very effectively, indeed so effectively that it, the "Wanderstab" (language), ultimately grows back into a "Dorngebüsch" of his own making, i.e., when he attempts to have Flora and Constantia fired, but instead, has Frau von Cypressenburg discover that he has red hair.

The concrete image of "Wanderstab" is augmented and reinforced with the terms "chiappa-via-Stiefeln" and "Adje-Kappel," words that reiterate the fact that he is travelling. Ususally when travelling, there is a feeling of anticipation and elation, but this is not the case with Titus. Indeed, there is a measure of sadness as indicated by the Phrase, "und 's Adje-Kappel in aller Still' geschwungen"(X,392). He finds it impossible to remain at home, yet does not look forward to going into a strange area. The moment of farewell is a quiet, personal experience, and no-one was to share the sadness felt by him. This incident would seem to show that Titus is not a misanthrope, even though he has shown a considerable amount of disgust and anger toward those tormenting him, scorning and ridiculing their prejudicial thinking.

He notes that when he left, he was immediately "in der weiten Welt," using this phrase for the third time. It appears that "die weite Welt" really begins right at home. Indeed, isolation is everywhere. It is this knowledge of the impossibility to escape that is already intimated when he makes his quiet farewell. The repetition of this particular phrase lends it a

considerable impact--the world becomes more distant and more difficult to communicate with every time the phrase is used. The first time it appears, it is in a usual sense, ". . . mit der weiten Welt vertauscht"(X,392). Certainly this is not an unusual event--he is merely moving. However, when it is used for the second time, ". . . die weite Welt is viel näher, als man glaubt," there is definitely an intimation that one had not thought it so close. Indeed, one wishes it were not so close. There is an uneasiness because one feels the isolation more acutely. The third time, ". . . so is man mit einem Schritt mitten drin in der weiten Welt," reiterates the suddenness of finding oneself more alone than expected, and stresses indirectly once more the alienation, even though one is in the middle of the world. There is a gradual but very definite awareness of a growing isolation and loneliness that cannot be reversed. In this manner, the image, "weite Welt," working in conjuction with other images, gives a lucid description of Titus' position, past and present.

With the concluding sentence, Titus moves to the immediate present, hoping for good fortune, "Glück und Verstand gehen selten Hand in Hand - ich wollt', dass mir jetzt ein recht dummer Kerl begegnet', ich sähet das für eine gute Vorbedeutung an"(X,392). Titus uses a proverb not in the usual way in order to explain human behaviour and life in general. Instead, he employs it in reference to his particular situation at this precise moment. Furthermore, here is a commonplace

used against common people, and he too is a commoner; so he seems to be using it, indirectly, against himself. However, he is definitely not "ein dummer Kerl," but in order for luck to occur, there must be one nearby. Since Titus is constantly confronted with prejudiced people, and since prejudice is, according to him, "Dummheit," he should always be in luck. This is, of course, not the case. So, if at this moment he hopes for a "dummer Kerl," he must also expect to be faced with more prejudice. The above quotation also points out Titus' tenuous position: if he makes use of reason he will not be lucky. Previously, it became apparent that because of this, he was also subjected to prejudice. Thus, it seems that not only his fellow men, but also transcendental forces are against him. In spite of this, Titus does not give up hoping, as his use of the proverb attests. Aside from stressing Titus' serious position, the concluding sentence of the monologue also has a humorous side. First of all, there are the two nouns and their adjectives, "dummer Kerl" and "gute Vorbedeutung." It is comical that the latter should be dependent on the former. Secondly, the use of this proverb in order to conjure up good luck, using it almost as a magic formula in a rather serious situation, also lends humour. Once again, we see Nestroy using proverbs in an inverted sense. It is this humour that is indicative of Titus' courage and optimism which already became apparent in the song. This element of humour, if it accompanies him throughout the play, would be a valid indication that his basic nature does not undergo any significant change.

Titus' unique use of the above proverb indicates a strong sense of self-assurance and independence. He knows he has "Verstand," therefore, he cannot be lucky. This thought echoes Peter's position in Der Unbedeutende, when he says to Thomas, ". . . mir haben die Lehrer in der Schul' schon's Glück abg'sprochen. ‚Das is a g'scheiter Bub!' haben s' gesagt, und da is 's schon vorbei. Schau' s' nur an beim Gipsmann, so a Fortuna; die hohle Kugel, über der sie schwebt, is das Sinnbild von ihre Favoritköpf'"(VII,28). But Titus is more hopeful than Peter. Therefore, he wishes to meet "einen dummen Kerl." Thus, he has a solution to overcome the implications of this proverb, asserting, thereby, his independence because he refuses to submit to its law. This has been possible for Titus, because he does not feel bound by traditional thought patterns that result partly from the reiteration of prejudices.

The ambiguous nature of Titus' condition is very apparent in the final statement of the monologue, in that he posits that the appearance of "ein recht dummer Kerl" would bring him luck. In the song, as well as in the beginning of the monologue, stupidity was seen not only as the cause of prejudice, but also as its equal. From this, one might deduce that good and bad fortune will always appear simultaneously, or follow each other immediately. This does indeed seem to be the case as the play develops. Thus, Titus might have said, "Glück und Unglück gehen immer Hand in Hand." But it appears that Titus is the one, due to a large extent to his skill with words, who fashions his own

good luck out of adverse situations. A symbolic expression of this is seen in him making a "Wanderstab" from the "Dorngebüsch" that he found in his home. But it must be noted, in view of future events, that he is also responsible for his bad luck. Here would seem to be a possible means to overcome the problems that he is constantly facing. However, independence and courage, which Titus possesses, are necessary prerequisites if one is to turn adverse situations into positive ones. But at least there does seem to be a chance for man.

In the song and monologue are contained in nucleus form the basic themes of the whole play. Titus is depicted in a precarious position, which has been caused by the absurd prejudicial behaviour of others towards him and, to a lesser degree, by his reciprocation of such behaviour. This has resulted, firstly, in isolation, and secondly, what is even more destructive, in alienation. Isolation has been caused by a physical separation from others. There is, thus, a lack of meaningful interaction. This has led to alienation, i.e., a psychological barrier between him and others, which in turn has resulted in hostility and animosity between Titus and those around him. The individual is then unable to meet the basic requirements of life. In Titus' case, it meant that he had to go hungry. On another level, it frustrated a meaningful relationship with his fellow man, which in turn meant further alienation and outright misery. But despite the above, Titus does not lose all hope, nor does he become a misanthrope, although there are

moments when he does show great anger and disgust toward those betraying petty, mean, and prejudicial behaviour. Instead, he tries as best he can to maintain a precarious balance, however dubious and provisional, in the attempt to retain his strong sense of courage, independence, and individuality, as well as a positive self image. The latter demands extra determination for Titus because of the continuous ridicule leveled at him since he has red hair. His chosen weapon in this attempt is linguistic manipulation--he deceives the world by confusing it with words. The above aspects can be analysed best through a close look at his choice and use of words and language, e.g., his use of the expression "weite Welt" and of the proverb, "Glück und Verstand gehen selten Hand in Hand." In both instances there seems to be nothing unique in their use when looking at them superficially. However, upon closer examination, it becomes quite apparent that they are used in a special way in order to convey a particular spectrum of meanings. They are frequently intentionally ambiguous, since life as a whole is depicted as being ambiguous and problematic. In fact, man himself is a problematic being. Because Titus continues to act as he does, not accepting futility, not admitting defeat, it does seem that he is basically an optimist in the sense that he deems it worthwhile to continue the battle in the face of harsh adversity, an attitude that Nestroy finds commendable.

Titus' first meeting with another individual, a servant of Frau von Cypressenburg, develops into a confrontation

depicting the prejudicial behaviour toward Titus, commented upon in the foregoing song. Plutzerkern, the servant, notes as he sees Titus, "Ein Fremder gestaltet sich vor meinem Blick?"(X,392). Here is a ridiculous use of flowery and turgid language that unmasks the speaker as an oaf and buffoon. Titus notes to himself, "Schicksal, ich glaub', du hast mich gehört" (X,392). He has not heard Plutzerkern's remark above, nevertheless, he recognizes him to be a fool. Although later Titus is proven to be correct, at this moment he is betraying that type of behaviour which causes so much difficulty for him. For the first time, we may argue that his own linguistic mastery is beginning to betray him. His comment is a comic and paradoxical remark which works off his own (mis)use of a parable. It works comically, but it inadvertently reveals prejudice.

Plutzerkern continues to comment to himself about Titus, "Wuchs gross, Mund gross, Augen sehr gross, Ohren verhältnismässig - nur die Haar' -?"(X,392). This physical description is symbolic of some of Titus' character traits. The large mouth is indicative of his great facility with language and his enjoyment of using words extravagantly and lavishly. It evokes the idiom, "ein gutes Mundwerk haben," which has positive connotations. However, there is also a faint allusion to "ein grobes Mundwerk haben," namely, saying malicious things, which indeed Titus does in reference to Flora and Constantia. The very large eyes intimate his keen powers of observation, particularly in reference to human nature, which has already

become apparent in the song and monologue. The ears are relative to the previously mentioned features, therefore also large, implying thereby, that his hearing is keen. Thus, he is very perceptive of what is said, particularly in reference to himself. But when Plutzerkern notices the hair, he has no comment, just a question, which suggests that he too is biased towards it. Plutzerkern's foregoing remarks are a further indication of his foolishness, because he pays so much attention to external physical appearance. Therefore, it is apparent that he will also be very mindful of Titus' red hair.

Plutzerkern then addresses himself to Titus, "Sucht der Herr hier ein Brot?"(X,392). He attempts to sound formal and grave, but again appears ridiculous. Thus, his words unmask him. Yet it must also be noted that at this very moment, Titus indeed "sucht ein Brot," because he is hungry. Only a few minutes later he says so openly when meeting Salome. Plutzerkern's words, although pompous, touch on a sensitive subject as far as Titus is concerned. The spectator of Nestroy's plays must always be aware of the general plurisignation quality of the language in order to perceive the full spectrum of meaning projected, which is necessary for a satisfactory understanding of a play. Titus who, as already noted, sees the other as a fool, playfully uses Plutzerkern's words, "Ich such' Geld, 's Brot wüsst' ich mir nachher schon z'finden"(X,392). Titus does not answer directly, yet conveys more than was asked, as he also uses the idiom "ein Brot suchen" in order to convey his outlook

at this moment. It is this type of response, an indirect answer, that expands beyond the specific query, and which, therefore, can act like a smoke screen or a manipulative effort, that Titus employs with ever greater cunning and skill as the play progresses. The ultimate result for Titus is a self grown "Dorngebüsch," just as pernicious as the "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen." Firstly, he mocks Plutzerkern's pompous language, and secondly, he underscores the importance of money. The term "Brot" is far too limiting, since it basically refers only to food. Money, on the other hand, is far more inclusive, because it is one of the prerequisites for a satisfactory life. By changing the idiom slightly--"Brot" becomes "Geld"--Titus also ridicules, indirectly, the use of commonplaces, because they are ready made word patterns that seldom meet a particular individual's specific needs. The questioning and ridiculing of commonplaces is a recurrent theme in Nestroy's plays.

Titus' answer, which only confuses the servant, is not only an indication of the latter's fatuity, but exemplifies also Titus' manipulative skills with words. Plutzerkern notes to himself, "Er sucht Geld - und das verdächtige Aussehen - auf d'Letzt' is Er ein Schatzgraber?"(X,392). Since Plutzerkern used "sucht" when he spoke the idiom, he supposedly knew that it does not mean literally "search for bread." But now he is confounded, and interprets Titus' answer to mean a specific searching for money, and deduces the other could be a "Schatzgraber." Although the servant attempts to use formal language, it is obvious that he

does not understand it, and only repeats Titus' attempts to confuse, thereby exposing his own foolishness. Plutzerkern tries to use metaphorical language to impress people. Titus often uses it to deceive people, but whereas he is highly successful in his endeavour to manipulate language, Plutzerkern succeeds only in being manipulated and exposed by it. His assertion, "und das verdächtige Aussehen," is based only on opinion, since his previous physical description of Titus in no way discovered anything "verdächtig," unless, of course, Plutzerkern is referring to the colour of Titus' hair upon which he has not yet commented directly.

Titus answers mockingly, "Wenn mir der Herr ein' Ort zeigt, wo einer liegt, so nimm ich gleich bei ein' Maulwurf Lektion" (X,392). He picks up Plutzerkern's imagery, and carries it into a metaphysical region which the servant does not understand. Titus' use of the word "mole" relates indirectly to Plutzerkern, who, rather like a mole, appears to dig indiscriminately for answers, but is only confused by Titus' retorts. But this answer also does not satisfy Plutzerkern, so he continues, "Oder is Er gar ein Rauber?"(X,393). Were Titus one, this question would have been exceedingly foolish, since a robber would hardly admit to this. Since he is not one, it might easily have aroused his anger, but Titus, sure of his linguistic position, is not about to lose his control, even though this query could well be interpreted as an insult. Instead, Titus' answer is in the form of a complex linguistic image, the

subtleties of which Plutzerkern cannot possibly understand, "Bis jetzt noch nicht, mein Talent ist noch in einer unentwickelten Bildungsperiode begriffen"(X,393). The opening, "Bis jetzt noch nicht," only states that so far he has not become a robber, but does not rule out the possibility that he might become one. It is a subtle threat in response to Plutzerkern's ridiculous question. Titus' answer also intimates his openness and has adaptability to any situation, since he is in the process of "Bildung." It underlines the ambiguity of his existence, because the term "Bildung," by definition, means progress in some area, yet the adjective "unentwickelten" negates the idea of progress. Firstly, this contradiction seems to imply that his potential for "Bildung" has been frustrated, and the reason for this would be the hostile behaviour towards him by people like Plutzerkern. Secondly, it lends humour when thinking of the term "Bildung" in reference to the "Bildungsroman," e.g. Goethe's Lehrjahre, where the tone is predominantly a serious one. Thus, it works somewhat parodistically, as does the previously analyzed "weite Welt."

The servant asks questions demanding a specific and definite answer, but again he is fooled. After all, Titus does consider him a fool. Still, Plutzerkern makes one more attempt, "Versteht Er die Gartnerei?"(X,393). Again, Titus' answer is as ambiguous as before, "Ich qualifiziere mich zu allem"(X,393), underscoring, thereby, his adaptability which becomes increasingly more important as the play progresses. The servant has

asked Titus five questions, but none have been answered directly. All have been answered in a manner meant to deceive linguistically, and confuse the question without actually lying. Still, he surmises Titus must be the new servant, the one whom he has been told to find. Each concrete question that Plutzerkern asks tends to contribute further to the comical effect, in that it is rather ridiculous, particularly in view of the convoluted answers from Titus. The latter, in turn, seems to enjoy playing with Plutzerkern. However, the humorous effect in no way mitigates the seriousness of Titus' situation at this very moment, for he has neither money nor a job in order to satisfy his most basic needs. Titus' playing with Plutzerkern through a cunning use of language, anticipates his future behaviour, particularly in reference to the three women.

In the brief encounter with Plutzerkern, Titus portrays the behaviour that he always tends to use when confronting an individual from whom he hopes to gain something. He consistently does not permit the other to control the conversation, nor will he say anything he is reluctant to say. He is very skillful in guiding the conversation in a direction suitable for him, and because of this, never needs to commit himself and never lose his independence. By giving only open-ended answers, which still attend indirectly to the question, e.g., "Ich qualifiziere mich zu allem"(X,393), Titus underscores the problematic nature of his life, and of life in general. He must be willing to adapt himself if he wants to survive. This

adaptability comes into focus once he enters the estate of Frau von Cypressenburg.

Plutzerkern has asked Titus five questions without receiving any definite answer. As soon as he stops quizzing, he becomes very rude, "Mit so einem G'hilfen wär' ihr schon g'holfen - wie die mich jaget, wann ich ihr das Florianiköpfel brächt'!" (X,393). The term "Florianiköpfel" betrays his prejudice, and although a clumsy effort, nevertheless succeeds in angering Titus. Besides insulting Titus, Plutzerkern also expresses pleasure in infuriating the "Gärtnerin-Witwe." In this behaviour of Plutzerkern, one can see the image of prejudice likened to a wall. None of Titus' words have had any effect on the servant at all because prejudice simply prevents a meaningful communication. As is to be expected, Titus answers, "Herr, diese Äusserung empört mein Innerstes"(X,393). To all of Plutzerkern's questions, Titus had an immediate and superior response, but to this very personal insult, he can only express indignation and anger. The servant now feels superior, and terminates the conversation with, "Fahrst ab, rote Rub'n?" (X,393), which is an even coarser insult than the first one. The word "Florianiköpfel" draws attention to his red hair by alluding to Saint Florian, the patron who provided assistance when there was danger from a fire. However, "rote Rub'n" is much more derogatory, since it compared Titus to a vegetable. This is ironic, because the speaker of this statement, not the addressee, repeatedly betrayed foolishness. He does not use

reason, and this term is therefore descriptive of him, not of Titus, i.e., the term is a boomerang word. Throughout the dialogue, the servant inadvertently unmasked his pompous foolishness, which Titus was always quick to recognize and comment upon indirectly in his replies. At the end, Plutzerkern exposes himself even further by betraying his prejudice, and thereby heavily underscores his foolishness. When the servant leaves, Titus has experienced once more what he rebelled against in his opening song and monologue.

The above encounter between Titus and Plutzerkern clearly shows the pernicious aspect of prejudice and its destructive effect on meaningful relationships, and on life in general. Through the use of comedy, Nestroy compels one to look at prejudice and draw conclusions about it. Furthermore, in using comedy as he does, one not only becomes willing to see prejudice in action, and recognize it for what it is, one also condemns it by laughing at it. In a sense, Nestroy ridicules prejudice, because denouncing it in direct terms would merely achieve a recognition by the audience.

The pattern of the dialogue followed by a monologue, where the latter grows out of the former, and where Titus reflects on his situation, permits a close monitoring of his attitude toward his total environment. "Ich bin entwaffnet!"(X,393) is the first thought that he expresses; disarmed because his weapon, his choice and use of words, has no effect on those whose thinking is frozen into platitudes and proverbs and untouchable by

linguistic mastery. They cannot think for themselves, but rather repeat common attitudes and beliefs, in Plutzerkern's case, that red hair supposedly indicates an undesirable character. There is a sudden turning away from the comedy of the previous scene to dejection, which underscores Titus' weariness. His language trickery demands a more sophisticated adversary, one who claims to understand the various levels of language meaning. He is about to meet these adversaries as he moves into the "Schloss." The reflection about his particular state leads him to comment about human attitudes and behaviour in general, and the validity of the latter is found in the empirical statements of the former. Titus knows there was nothing he could have said to Plutzerkern to make him realize how utterly stupid such an attitude is, because a frozen language not only breeds, but also is, the result of prejudice and its lack of reasoning. Furthermore, the servant feels smug and secure, not because of his individual strength, but because the large majority of people imitate the same behaviour. Moreover, there seems to be a tacit agreement when quoting a commonplace, that the majority is always right, or at least this is what the majority chooses to believe.

It is the rudeness and the determination of it that forces Titus to admit that he does not know what to say--he is "entwaffnet." It seems that prejudice and rudeness appear together, and in this way, one reinforces the other. However, Titus possesses resilience, and the ironic statement, "Recht freundlich,

recht liebreich kommt man mir entgegen!"(X,393), shows that he is already regaining his equilibrium, his strong sense of self-assuredness. Therefore, he will be able to reflect on this incident, and through language, vent anger and frustration while simultaneously transcending, at least momentarily, part of his misery.

The first two sentences of this monologue indicated his utter helplessness in the face of rude prejudice as they referred to his position, which was caused by the rude attitude of another person toward him. But with the third sentence, Titus is already beginning to attack verbally man's shortcomings in an ironic way. What he really means becomes apparent in the following, "In mir organisiert sich aber auch schon Misanthropisches - ja - ich hass' dich, du inhumane Menschheit, ich will dich fliehen"(X,393). Striking is the fact that he again resorts to single-meaning language when talking to himself. He means what he says--in Puffmann's case, he meant what he did not say. At this point his disgust and anger toward his fellow man reach their zenith. Here is not a blind reaction, rather an action that has grown out of reflection, as the term "organisiert" shows. The phrase, "aber auch schon Misanthropisches," clearly indicates that misanthropy already exists, and at this moment, he wants to counter it with similar behaviour, but that would imply not using reason, and this is against Titus' basic nature. In fact, his thinking about the negative experience with Plutzerkern, and his comments on it, show him to use reason even

now; so he does not react blindly nor curse at Plutzerkern. Because he feels that he cannot say anything that would have meaning for the prejudicial servant, Titus shows that he is always reasoning, even in times of great stress. Nevertheless, at this moment, he does say, " . . . ich hass' dich, du inhumane Menschheit," yet he refers not to a particular individual, namely, Plutzerkern, but to humanity. It is, after all, the combined attitude and strength of many individuals that must be held responsible. This Titus clearly recognizes when he uses the term "Menschheit." In this manner, he draws valid conclusions about man in general from his personal experiences with particular individuals. Again, the value statement, "inhumane," has meaning and can be verified, and is, therefore, a true statement. Previously, Titus' most serious charge had been that others had treated him with prejudice, and that such behaviour is stupid. Now, he accuses humanity of no longer being human. Thus, the term "humanity," and its basic implications no longer seem valid. Its very existence is threatened, at least indirectly, since it attempts to destroy one of its basic components, Titus. It has become self-destructive.

For a moment, it seems that Titus wants to turn his back on humanity, ". . . ich will dich fliehen, eine Einöde nehme mich auf"(X,393). This would indeed be an admission that humanity has lost all redeeming qualities. Furthermore, such action certainly would indicate pessimism. However, this is only a fleeting thought. Previously, Titus had left his home, and immediately found himself "mitten drin in der weiten Welt"(X,392),

but now he would like to exchange it for total isolation. There seems to be nowhere to turn except to forsake the company of man entirely. For as long as he will be in contact with people, he will necessarily face prejudice, since, as experience has shown him, neither individual human nature nor society as a whole seem to undergo any basic change. Still, he quickly notes something else, "Halt, kühner Geist, solcher Entschluss ziemt den Gesättigten, der Hungrige führt ihn nicht aus"(X,393-94). Reason continues to guide him; he does not act foolishly. Even his sense of humour becomes apparent again in the self-irony conveyed through the expression "kühner Geist." It is this ability to detach himself from himself, and see his own behaviour as humorous, even though matters are indeed grim, that gives him strength and resilience to rebound from situations like the one he just experienced with Plutzerkern. So the "Einöde," a more extreme form of "weite Welt," is a further example where the previous image is expanded. The image of "Einöde" works backwards and forwards in a way which shows that Titus' situation remains the same, and is not forgotten but pushed to the background, because it would be illogical to become a hermit. One of Titus' strengths is his ability to be honest with himself. He certainly would not posssess this if he did not use reason. Now he is able to assess a situation carefully, which helps him to start anew and plan a fresh course whenever necessary. To escape would not be a practical solution since it would result in further and greater problems--his

situation will remain problematic. If he withdraws entirely, he is almost certain to starve. Yet, if he remains, he will be subjected to further treatment that led to the outburst, "inhumane Menschheit." There are no definite solutions to the difficulties he must contend with from day to day. The superiority of his intelligence in comparison to those around him, only permits him to recognize far more clearly man's shortcomings and the resultant problems. But Titus is condemned to see this without being able to take corrective measures, not for himself nor for others.

This meeting with Plutzerkern, which ended as a confrontation, has been an endorsement of his negative experiences mentioned in the song and monologue. The second person he meets is Salome, whom Titus greets with,"Grüss' dich Gott, wahlverwandtes Wesen!"(X,394). When he met Plutzerkern, the latter started with a question, now Titus begins the dialogue with a friendly greeting. He calls Salome "ein wahlverwandtes Wesen," as he senses that she has an elective affinity for him, even though she has not expressed this view so far. The fact that she too has red hair does not indicate her choice in this matter, since this is congenitally determined. By using the term "Wesen," Titus introduces an element of the mysterious because the word can refer to a variety of intelligent beings. When Salome responds with, "Gerhorsamste Dienerin, schöner Herr!" (X,394), he is surprised, "Die find't, dass ich schön bin, das ist die erste unter allen -," is true not only in the sense

implied by him, but particularly in reference to her nobility of character in relation to the other women, as will become evident in future developments. Salome, however, notes, "O, hören S' auf, ich bin die letzte hier im Ort, ich bin die Ganselhüterin, die arme Salome"(X,394). Undoubtedly, Titus meant to say, "die erste unter allen, die mich schön findet." She, however, represents the only figure in the play who both understands and uses only single-meaning words. All her interpretations of Titus' words are concrete, and all her answers use language honestly.

Titus' next comment, an example of *periphrasis*, expresses his satirical vein. Nevertheless, it still contains a serious element:

> Arm? Ich bedaure dich, sorgsame Erzieherin junger Gänse; deine Kolleginnen in der Stadt sind viel besser daran, und doch erteilen sie häufig ihren Zöglingen in einer Reihe von Jahren eine nur mangelhafte Bildung, während du die deinigen alle Martini vollkommen ausgebildet für ihren schönen Beruf der Menschheit überlieferst. (X,394-95)

He calls her "sorgsame Erzieherin junger Gänse," elevating her in a humorous manner from her lowly position, because he sees her as "Erzieherin," not as "Ganselhüterin." The term "Gänse" is related by association to "Zöglinge," the young ladies in the city, who are thus given a silly and foolish quality. Salome's colleagues, who are the teachers of the city girls, are depicted as failing in their duty, because they provide only a "mangelhafte Bildung." Thus, a segment of city population is shown in a critical light. It must also be noted that at

this moment he is very hungry, and the concluding sentence intimates his wish, expressed at the end of the preceding monologue, "O Hüterin, warum treibst du diese Ganseln nicht also 'brat'ner vor dir her, ich hätt' mir eines als Zwangsdarlehen zugeeignet"(X,394).

Titus' use of elaborate language to express something quite ordinary is his hallmark, but it is also the mainspring of his future problems. This particular skill in the use of perphrasis is noted and partially appreciated by Salome, even though she admits she does not understand him, "Ich versteh' Ihnen nit, aber Sie reden so schön daher - wer is denn Ihr Vater?" (X,395). His language beguiles and dazzles and his answer continues in the same vein, "Er ist gegenwärtig ein verstorbener Schulmeister"(X,395). The predicate adjective,"gegenwärtig," implies on the one hand, a temporary state, whereas death is final. On the other hand, it indicates the present moment, but the father will of course always be dead at the present, the only time a statement can be made. It seems that the use of "gegenwärtig" is redundant, yet it does convey, very subtly, Titus' reluctance to accept the finality of death. He could undoubtedly be much more concise and terse when making a factual statement, and he does indeed intimate more than the mere answer sought by the questioner. This also was seen in his replies to Plutzerkern. His use of circumlocution not only provides him with a means of humour, but also facilitates the expression of his attitude toward the topic under consideration,

e.g., his critical view of Salome's couterparts in the city and his reluctance to accept the finality of death.

However, Titus himself intends to play with the language, but Salome continues to comment, "das ist schön." Thus, after having commented about his mother in a circumlocutory manner, "War vor ihrem Tod längere Zeit verehelichte Gattin ihres angetrauten Gemahls"(X,395), to which Salome replies, "Ah, das is schön!"(X,395), he notes to himself, "Die find't alles schön, ich kann so dumm daherreden, als ich will"(X,395). It is the same discovery he has made with Plutzerkern--he cannot deceive people who do not claim to understand his circumlocution. It is not what he states, but how this is done that charms Salome, just as the three women in the future will be charmed by his language. Most significant is the statement, "Ich kann so dumm daherreden, als ich will," because he realizes that circumlocution is "dumm" and, therefore, dangerous. It is the continuation and increase of such verbal behaviour with a society which claims to understand and admire such deceptive language that ultimately entraps him.

Inevitably, the aspect of prejudice comes to the fore when Salome inquires whether he has any living relatives, to which he answers that he has a cousin. When she points out that the cousin might be poor, Titus indignantly retorts, "Kind, frevele nicht, er ist Bierversilberer, die haben alle was; das sein gar fleissige Leut'; die versilbern nicht nur das Bier, sie vergolden auch ihre Kassa"(X,396). His seriousness is indicated

partly by the verb "frevele," a term that usually implies outrageous and blasphemous behaviour, something that Salome certainly does not intend to do. Titus, however, is criticizing her attitude, which is partly to blame for brooking a climate where it is possible for such conduct as the cousin's to flourish. Without a serious effort, his cousin has acquired wealth. The predicate adjective "fleissig," which usually carries a positive denotation, here implies the opposite. Spund himself, foolishly and unwittingly, admits this later to Salome. Its positive meaning is used as a facade to hide the true circumstance. The cousin is indeed "fleissig" at acquiring money without a genuine exertion; one might even postulate at cheating his customers, which the statement, "sie vergolden auch ihre Kassa" implies. In this manner, Nestroy demonstrates the growing weakness of language. Society is rotten, so the former word-values can mean their opposite, which is also funny. In using the term "fleissig" in connection with "versilbern" and "vergolden," Titus levels his criticism not only at the cousin, but simultaneously attacks, indirectly, the careless use or misuse of words, when they are no longer used to communicate, but to confuse, forcing the listener to examine each in relation to its syntactical and pragmatic meaning, including those of Titus.

Salome continues to seek excuses for the cousin, "Haben Sie ihm vielleicht was getan, dass er Ihnen nit mag?"(x,396). She betrays a certain measure of naiveté, and passively accepts

her lot, whereas Titus sees through deception and facade, making it abundantly clear that prejudice is the sole reason for the cousin's refusal to help him; "Sehr viel, ich hab' ihn auf der empfindlichsten Seite angegriffen; das Aug' ist der heiklichste Teil am Menschen, und ich beleidige sein Aug', so oft er mich anschaut, denn er kann die roten Haar' nit leiden" (X,396). The "sehr viel" ultimately means nothing at all, except when there is a prejudiced attitude which becomes apparent at the end of the quotation. The past participle "angegriffen" might lead one to conclude, at first glance, that Titus intentionally offended his cousin. Later it becomes obvious that this is how the cousin views Titus. But this too is entirely incorrect, since the so-called offence is caused by an aspect of Titus' physical appearance, over which he has absolutely no control. In the final analysis, it is the cousin and others like him that are guilty of an unprovoked "Angriff." Indirectly this answer is an accusation and "Angriff" aimed at Spund and those like him. In fact, Titus' entire use of language when speaking about or to those that are prejudiced, is an "Angriff" on prejudice, and an intensification of this is his use of periphrasis and circumlocution that boomerang on him in the end.

Titus continues his argument with; ". . . das Aug' ist der heiklichste Teil am Menschen"(X,396). Certainly, the eye is extremely sensitive, not only because it is physically very fragile, but also since it is the instrument through which an individual perceives his physical environment. Aesthetic

considerations are a facet of the latter, and it appears at first that Titus is referring to his cousin's aesthetic sensitivity which caused him to reject and renounce Titus. But when Titus notes, "er kann die roten Haar' nit leiden," it becomes evident that not aesthetic values, but prejudice, i.e., ignorance and adherence to traditional modes of thought, are responsible for rejecting him. Titus remarks that he has insulted his cousin, when it is obvious that he is the one who has been insulted. "Beleidigt," like "angegriffen," has its source in the cousin, not in Titus. Ultimately, the cousin's eye is not so much "heiklich" as blind, because it leads him to an erroneous conclusion in judging Titus to be an outcast. Titus has used sarcasm in this particular thrust at bias.

Salome calls the cousin "Der garstige Ding," and she describes him as "abscheulich." Titus, however, insists, "Mehr dumm als abscheulich"(X,396), and he goes on:

> Die Natur gibt uns hierüber die zarteste Andeutung. Werfen wir einen Blick auf das liebe Tierreich, so werden wir finden, dass die Ochsen einen Abscheu vor der roten Farb' haben, und unter diesen wieder zeigen die totalen Büffeln die heftigste Antipathie - welch ungeheuere Blösse also gibt sich der Mensch, wenn er rote Vorurteile gegen die rote Farb' zeigt.(X,396)

Foolishness, a destructive yet permanent force, as already noted in the foregoing chapter, is also responsible for prejudice. "Dumm" echoes Titus' previous assertions about prejudice, "So kopflos urteilt die Welt uber die Köpf'"(X,391), and a statement from the song which insists, "'s is 's Dümmste, wann d' Leut' nach die Haar' urteil'n woll'n"(X,390). The first quotation is

of particular interest. Titus uses concrete words, "Kopf," and later, "Wand," which is mentioned in a previous quotation, to comment on an abstraction, referring thus to man's foolish behaviour. The abverb "kopflos" means not only foolish, but also alludes to death. One may argue that the result of "kopfloses Urteilen," prejudicial evaluations, can lead to the "death" of the recipient of such an attitude, because he is treated as an outcast. This is what has been happening to Titus and Salome. Also, such behaviour has ultimately a very deleterious effect on the speaker, since it erodes and undermines, generally speaking, relationships between people. The futility of confronting "kopfloses Urteilen" is expressed in another idiom that uses the word "Kopf," namely, "sich den Kopf aufsetzen," which implies a stubborn and determined attitude. Titus ultimately posits that headless behaviour cannot be overcome with reason, irrespective of how determined such reason may be.

He reiterates how foolish bias is by pointing out that "Ochsen," and especially "die totalen Büffeln," possess also an extreme antipathy against the colour red. These animals are not only noted for their stupidity, but also for their stubbornness, a trait that in people leads to an ingraining of bias. The terms "Ochsen" and "Büffeln" allude inevitably to Plutzerkern and Spund, Titus' cousin, as well as to the young people who ridicule Salome.

Titus' denunciation of prejudice in his last answer reverberates Salome's monologue, but, whereas he is very caustic, she

points out the great beauty of the many things that are red, and concludes that those people who are against red do not know beauty. They are ignorant and foolish. She cites specific and concrete examples, ". . . die schönsten Blumen sein die Rosen, und die Rosen sein rot . . . die Wolken sein schön, wann s' in der Abendsonn' brennrot dastehn . . ."(X,397). The terms "Blumen," "Rosen," "Wolken" and "Abendsonn'" reflect serenity, while the decision at the end of the monologue to return to the geese marks her passivity. This latter decision anticipates Titus' thought, "du inhumane Menschheit, ich will dich fliehen, eine Einöde nehme mich auf"(X,393). In sharp contrast are the expressions Titus uses: "Mehr dumm als abscheulich," "Ochsen," "Abscheu," "Büffeln," "Antipathie," "Blösse" and "Vorurteile." These mark disgust and anger, as well as a determination not to avoid confrontation, even though he has no hope of changing the attitude of those who are biased and are ruled by fatuity. It is this determined attitude which is at the basis of his use of languge as a defense and offensive against prejudice. The incorrigibility of fatuity was expressed most succinctly by Richard in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel, in his reference to Simplicius, "Gegen Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens"(VI,599). It might well be in vain; nevertheless, Titus will not acquiesce nor submit to the attacks by ignorance and foolishness.

In Titus' first monologue he referred to his past as the "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," and now, in his conversation

with Salome, he expands on that expression as he cites specific examples, but does so in a way that shows self-irony and humour. After his denunciation of prejudice, Salome noted, "Nein, wie Sie g'scheit daherreden! Das sähet man Ihnen gar nit an"(X,396). Her comment is significant, because it refers directly to his mode of verbal expression. Although it is very doubtful that she perceived the various connotations of his remarks, she still recognizes his facility with language. On the other hand, the audience is beginning to detect in Titus' flamboyant language his subtle intent to overwhelm and thus manipulate those to whom he is speaking. In reference to the latter point, the adverb "gescheit" takes on a perjorative meaning which is underlined by "daherreden," a word that may be used to point out inane verbosity. Here, too, is apparent the potential danger of Titus' use of language. He continues:

> Schmeichlerin! Dass ich dir also weiter erzähl' über mein Schicksal! Die Zurückstossung meines Herrn Vetters war nicht das einzige Bittere, was ich hab' schlucken müssen; ich hab' in dem Heiligtum der Lieb' mein Glück suchen wollen, aber die Grazien haben mich für geschmackswidrig erklärt; ich hab' in den Tempel der Freundschaft geguckt, aber die Freund' sind alle so witzig, da hat's Bonmots g'regnet auf mein' Kopf, bis ich ihn auf ewige Zeiten zurückgezogen hab'. So ist mir ohne Geld, ohne Lieb', ohne Freundschaft meine Umgebung unerträglich 'worden'; da hab' ich alle Verhältnisse abg'streift, wie man einen engen Kaput auszieht in der Hitz', und jetzt steh' ich in den Hemdärmeln der Freiheit da. (X,396-97)

He refers to his rejection by Spund as "nicht das einzige Bittere, was ich hab' schlucken müssen." The modal "müssen" underscores the inescapability of those attacked by prejudice. But whereas Salome has resigned herself to this situation, Titus is determined

to assert himself, and never to retreat from the battle in which language is his weapon. His use of the verb "schlucken" evokes the idiom "armer Schlucker," which is a pauper. In fact, the idiom is a suitable description of his precarious position at this moment, as he has neither food nor money, but is very hungry and needs to "schlucken Brot." However, he receives only "Bitteres," namely, prejudice.

The image created by 'schlucken müssen" is extended and expanded upon with "geschmackswidrig." Although he had been forced to swallow something bitter, he himself is declared as "geschmackswidrig." Perhaps this is so because he himself has become bitter from swallowing so much that is bitter. Due to common consensus, namely, bias, he is seen as "geschmackswidrig." Love no longer is a personal matter between two individuals. Instead, bias decides whom one should or should not love. His use of "Heiligtum der Liebe" becomes a sarcastic statement in view of the foregoing interpretation, since the "Heiligtum" has been invaded by prejudice.

He had similar experiences in his endeavour to win friendships, ". . . aber die Freund' sind alle so witzig, da hat's Bonmots g'regnet auf mein' Kopf." The use of "Freund'" only underlines that these individuals were in fact not true friends, they were "witzig" but not in a humorous, jocular manner; rather they were facetious. He was showered with jokes. The phrase "auf mein' Kopf" indicates that those were not only directed at him in a general sense, but aimed at his head, specifically his

his red hair. His references to love and friendship show that he basically respects both, calling them "Heiligtum der Liebe" and "Tempel der Freundschaft" respectively. The terms "Heiligtum" and "Tempel" not only reinforce each other, but also show that he thinks of these relationships as transcendental forces that act like strong pillars which make society viable. Prejudice, however, is seen as a corroding agent that seeks to destroy these pillars.

Thus, bias has excluded Titus from a meaningful relationship with his relatives and with men and women in general. "Geld," "Liebe," and "Freundschaft" are withheld from him, and therefore, he has been restricted and confined to a position in which life in unbearable, and where any form of development is impossible. But he refused to submit; ". . . da hab' ich alle Verhältnisse abg'streift, wie man einen engen Kaput auszieht in der Hitz', und jetzt steh' ich in den Hemdärmeln der Freiheit da"(X,397). The verb "abg'streift" likens the "Verhältnisse" to external elements. Nevertheless, they are responsible for inner peace or misery. "Abg'streift" also shows him to act independently in order to gain his freedom, which the prejudicial attitude of others had taken from him. It is this prejudice that, on the one hand, may be likened to the "Kaput," a long heavy jacket, which will hinder free and easy movement, and, on the other hand, is seen as "Hitz'," particularly in situations where he is showered with "Bonmots." Both "Kaput" and "Hitz'" and the associations they evoke elucidate further Titus' "unerträgliche Umgebung."

But already the articulation of this new freedom, "und jetzt steh' ich in den Hemdärmeln der Freiheit da," intimates an ambiguity. Titus may well be free; however, he lacks protection, and ultimately still depends on others for some of the basic necessities. Whereas before, he suffered from the "Hitz'," he now seems to suffer cold. To Salome's question how he likes it, he answers, "Wenn ich einen Versorgungsmantel hätt', der mich vor dem Sturm der Nahrungssorgen schützte -"(X,397). He does not merely note that he is hungry, but again uses periphrasis as he extends the clothes image. Titus has rid himself of the "Kaput" because the prejudicial comments levelled at him resulted in an unbearable "Hitze." Now, he needs another coat, a "Versorgungsmantel," to protect himself against the "Sturm der Nahrungssorgen." This last expression is much more forceful than the word "Hunger." Firstly, a storm is an awesome natural power that can be utterly destructive, depending upon its force and duration. Similarly, hunger not only disrupts normal functioning, but inevitably leads to death. Secondly, the compound "Nahrungssorgen" contains the word "Sorgen," which is descriptive of a very deleterious emotional or mental state. The mere uncertainty about sufficient food for the future will result in worry and anxiety, that in itself, even though there is food for the present, has a very detrimental effect on an individual's well being.

Salome, who so far has only asked questions, or made insignificant comments, now contributes more substantially to the

conversation. Like Plutzerkern, she draws concrete conclusions from Titus' elaborate metaphors. Her language is simple but direct, and reflects her sincerity; "Also handelt es sich um ein Brot? Na, wenn der Herr arbeiten will, da lasst sich Rat schaffen. Mein Bruder is Jodel hier, sein Herr, der Bäck, hat eine grosse Wirtschaft, und da brauchen s' einen Knecht -"(X,397). Her opening sentence states; "What you are saying is that you are looking for bread, namely a job," and by expressing it as Salome does, she indirectly points out that he has been periphrasing. Nevertheless, she will be succinct. Where her brother is working, a "Knecht" is needed. Titus' answer in view of his past use of language, is not surprising; "Was? Ich soll Knecht werden? Ich? Der ich bereits Subjekt gewesen bin?" (X,397). His reply consists of four questions, each expressing indignation at the thought of being a "Knecht." This indignation exposes an element of pride, which seems to be out of place at this moment, since he is destitute. Nevertheless, it is fully consonant with his past behaviour. In a sense, he has been an unwilling "Knecht" of prejudice and suffered considerably, but he has never submitted meekly. Instead, he has retained an inner freedom and his self-respect. To become a "Knecht" would be tantamount to voluntary forfeiture of his freedom, which he believes to have achieved by seeking a new life here. A further indication of why he would refuse to become a "Knecht," may be seen in his eloquent use of the language, and in his commentaries about prejudice and about his cousin, as well as in

recounting several of his past experiences. All of the foregoing reflect an irrefutable element of pride, without which, self-assurance, and the determination to be his own master would hardly be possible. Consequently, he would have submitted to his past environment which he called "unerträglich." It must also be noted that his linguistic skill reflects, on the one hand, his desire to be in a controlling position, and on the other, his aversion to be controlled by others. But it is also precisely this linguistic skill, which will cause an increasing number of difficulties for him, even though it may seem that for the moment, he is controlling matters.

Salome's response, although not accusing him of arrogance outright, is, nevertheless, critical of him, "Subjekt? Da hab'n wir auch ein' g'habt, der das war, der is aber auf'm Schub fort'kommen"(X,397). She too replies with a question, and by pointing out that the former "Subjekt" was a criminal, she strikes a blow at his pride. The term "Subjekt" is interesting, because it means a barber's assistant, and in this sense Titus uses it. Salome, however, uses it to convey a different meaning, namely, a dissolute individual. She repeats what a judge remarked, "Weil er ein schlechtes Subjekt war, hat der Richter g'sagt"(X,397). Titus uses the word "Subjekt" in an effort to assert himself, and simultaneously betrays arrogance. Salome, it seems, understands only the meaning conveyed in her use of the word, but it was Titus who introduced it in the dialogue. Here is a foreshadowing of words turning against him.

All this time, Titus is very hungry, and he now guides the conversation to the bread Salome is carrying, "Ich möcht' doch sehen, wie weit es dein Bruder in dem Studium der Brotwissenschaft gebracht hat"(X,397-98). His pride prevents him from asking directly for a slice of bread. Instead, he hides his hunger behind macrological language, which is also in an elevated style dealing with a base topic. "Studium" in reference to "Brotwissenschaft" is of course ridiculous. Yet at this particular moment, "Brot" is of crucial importance for Titus. Salome suggests that he will not like the bread, and continues, unwittingly, using an adianoete, "Meinen Ganseln schmeckt's wohl, natürlich, 's Vieh hat keine Vernunft"(X,398). Titus, who is very hungry, also likes it, and although Salome does not intend to be sarcastic--this would be incongruent with her nature and with what she has said so far--she nevertheless conveys sarcasm. Titus notes to himself, "Der Stich tut weh; mir schmeckt's auch"(X,398). Since much of his language has a plurisignation quality, with the result that one connotation may well be insulting, he projects the same element into Salome's remarks, but even though that element does exist in this particular comment, the audience will certainly discern that she does not intend it as such. Still, she is critical of his pride and would designate it as "keine Vernunft."

In Titus' conversation with Salome, there has been a fuller explanation of the problem he constantly faces, but even more important, particularly in view of future events, has been the

fact that he uses language more and more as a sword and shield in the continuous battle with bias. Although he made no attempt to use his skill with language to create a smoke screen in order to manipulate Salome, this potential was always obvious as a latent force that could spring to life at any time. It does come to full life only moments later when he meets Marquis.

Titus' conversation with Salome comes to an abrupt end when he rushes off to save a stranger, whose life is threatened because his horse is out of control. Marquis, the stranger, although badly frightened, has not been hurt, and Titus' suggestion, "Belieben sich da ein wenig niederzusetzen!"(X,399), seems quite sensible in view of Marquis' shocking experience, although the verb "belieben" is rather formal, since it means, "is it your pleasure." Similarly out of place is the adverb "wenig," because the emphasis should be on "niedersitzen" itself, without a qualifier. Instead of inquiring whether or not he has been injured, Titus asks, "Belieben vielleicht eine Verrenkung zu empfinden?"(X,399). He seems to be asking if it would be his pleasure to feel a sprain or dislocation. This time, the verb "belieben" is definitely out of place, and elicits humour. There is the subtle intimation that Titus is actually hoping that Marquis has suffered an injury. The second usage of "belieben" also begins to betray Titus' effort to use language in a way that will impress the other--he is using it as a smoke screen for manipulative purposes. When Marquis again notes that he is fine, Titus continues, "Oder belieben vielleicht

sich einen Arm gebrochen zu haben?"(X,399). Again, his language is overly formal, and this third use of "belieben" is even more ridiculous, because breaking one's arm would certainly not be one's pleasure. Since Marquis notes that this is not the case either, Titus tries one more time, "Oder belieben vielleicht eine kleine Zerschmetterung der Hirnschale?" (X,399). Here is a prime example of "daherreden," a word used by Salome without being aware of its pejorative connotation, although the audience obviously discerns it. If the latter had indeed been the case, Marquis would not only have been unconscious, but in all probability dead. Titus is obviously using circumlocution. A particular example is the adjective "kleine," which is ridiculous, because a "Zerschmetterung" of the skull means a shattering, which, irrespective of whether large or small, could only have one outcome, namely, a fatal one.

At this time, Titus is destitute--he lacks food, money and a job. Therefore, it would seem that he is hoping for a reward. His unique line of questioning seeks to force Marquis into giving him a reward. On the one hand, such questioning, had there been an injury, could lead Marquis to believe that Titus is extremely concerned, and that he, Marquis, could have suffered an even greater injury had Titus not intervened so courageously. On the other hand, these questions vividly point out the injuries Marquis might have suffered, had Titus not shown courage. Either or both of the foregoing approaches could be intended by Titus to compel Marquis to give him a reward.

Although Titus certainly needs assistance, and even though his courageous action prevented a potentially serious accident, his cunning use of language, which seeks to manipulate Marquis, is hardly a laudable act.

In Marquis, Titus has met someone else who also is extremely adroit in using language as a smoke screen.[2] When that happens the fragility and vulnerability of such linguistic behaviour, in this particular case, as far as Titus is concerned becomes apparent. In answer to Titus' last question, Marquis answers, ". . . und nichts bleibt mir übrig, als Ihnen Beweise meines Dankes -"(X,399). Marquis seems to be offering a reward, but the statement, "und nichts bleibt mir übrig," is interesting, in that is inadvertently betrays his unwillingness to reward his saviour. These words project a double meaning. Firstly, they can be interpreted that all that is left for him to do is to express his thanks, which he of course intends to do. Secondly, the statement also carries the meaning that although he does not want to, all that he can do is express his thanks. He feels forced to offer a reward. This second denotation gains strength when it becomes clear that Marquis has no intention of rewarding Titus. Marquis is a definite double-dealer in language, and the first Titus has met.

Titus interrupts Marquis before the latter can finish, saying, "O, ich bitte!"(X,400). He breaks in, because he believes he can anticipate correctly what the other will say. This is precisely what Puffmann did when Thomas spoke, and it

was partly because of this, that the secretary foolishly believed Thomas possessed information that would be incriminating to him. Titus' brief interjection is to convey that he expects no reward, when in reality the opposite is the case. He reiterates this false stance when he refers to his actions as "Allgemeine Menschenpflicht," and "Besonderer Zufall"(X,400). Thus, both use language cunningly to deceive the other. Titus, however, is definitely the loser.

Marquis' true intentions are first noted openly in the following statement, "Ihr Edelmut setzt mich in Verlegenheit; ich weiss nicht, wie ich meinen Dank - mit Geld lässt sich so eine Tat nicht lohnen -"(X,400). The first word that deserves attention is the compound "Edelmut." Titus has proven that he has "Mut" when he stopped the runaway horse, and he has given the impression of also possessing "Edelmut." However, financially, his position is such that he cannot afford being "edelmütig," but then he was hoping, and still is, to receive a reward, in spite of his magnanimous comments such as "allgemeine Menschenpflicht." Thus, these comments fail to have the desired effect, and Marquis prefers to accept them at face value.

Another word that also betrays Marquis' manipulative use of language is "Verlegenheit," with which he seeks to convey a feeling of embarrassment that does not exist. "Verlegenheit" is definitely not one of his problems, otherwise he would be at a loss for words, but as this dialogue so far has shown, and will in the following, he is extremely cunning in his use of

words as he seeks to manipulate Titus. Nevertheless, Marquis still is "verlegen," but not in the sense he seeks to project, rather in his aim to rid himself of Titus as quickly as possible without having to pay a reward. Both Titus and the audience will recognize the latter very quickly. Marquis' concluding sentence seeks to elucidate why he is genuinely "verlegen", ". . . mit Geld lässt sich so eine Tat nicht lohnen." There is an element of truth in the assertion, but Marquis uses the truth as a smoke screen. This is reminiscent of Puffmann's advice to Thomas, "Was denn, guter Zimmermann? Teil' dich mir mit, ich werd' dir statt dem Geld einen guten Rat geben, der mehr wert is. Red'!"(VII,81). Also noted must be the element of humour that is apparent throughout this dialogue, which, as is usual in Nestroy, constitutes the sugar coating on a truth too bitter if told without the sweetener.

Titus realizes more and more Marquis' true intentions, even though he erroneously believes him to be a noble, and attempts to indicate that he would not reject money. He interrupts Marquis with, "O, ich bitt', Geld ist eine Sache, die -"(X,400). However, the other is fully aware of Titus' aim, and in turn interrupts him, completing Titus' sentence by turning its meaning against what Titus sought to express, "Die einen Mann von solcher Denkungsart nur beleidigen würde!"(X,400). This clause, although seemingly praising Titus' previous remarks which Marquis interpreted as "edelmütig," really seeks to prevent him from stating that he would indeed accept money. Marquis professes that he does not

want to insult Titus by giving him money. Yet, in actual fact, he does just that by saying these words and not giving him a monetary reward, which would be of great help to him at this time.

Again, Titus tries to state what he really thinks, "Na, jetzt, sehen Sie - das heisst -"(X,400). He does not use direct language, and thus does not come to the point immediately. This permits Marquis to break in and again use Titus' words as a springboard from which he launches his retorts, which continue to convey meanings that are the extreme opposite to what Titus sought to express. Marquis unmasks his own insincere and deceptive nature, as he literally does a "snow job" on Titus. In order to silence Titus' pressing for a reward, Marquis quickly invents a story that sounds as if it has its facts in history, but obviously exists only for this moment:

> Wer eine solche Tat vollführt! Es hat einmal einer - ich weiss nicht, wie er geheissen hat - einem Prinzen - ich weiss nicht, wie er geheissen hat - das Leben gerettet; der wollte ihn mit Diamanten lohnen; da entgegnete der Retter: „Ich finde in meinem Bewusstsein den schönsten Lohn!" Ich bin überzeugt, dass Sie nicht weniger edel denken als der, wo ich nicht weiss, wie er geheissen hat. (X, 400-01)

The admission, "ich weiss nicht, wie er geheissen hat," which occurs three times, clearly indicates the fictitious nature of this exposition.

As already indicated previously, Marquis refuses to give Titus money, but does give him a black wig. Initially, Titus feels insulted, but then notes to himself:

> Wenn ich diese Tour aufsetz', so sinkt der Adonis zum Rastelbinderbub'n herab und der Narziss wird ausg'strichen aus der Mythologie. Meine Karriere gehn an, die Glückspforte öffnet sich -! . . . Schau', die Tür' steht grad offen da; wer weiss -? Ich reskier's; ein' schönen Kerl schlagt's nirgends fehl. (X,402-03)

Whereas he was unable to express himself successfully when facing Marquis, he is now very extravagant with language. As he wears the black wig, he sees himself more handsome than either Adonis or Narcissus, and with this, echoes his pride already noticeable when telling Salome that he could never be a "Knecht." By saying this, Titus also shows that he is placing an undue emphasis on external appearances. This external aspect, which is used to influence others, consists of two elements, the visual part and the audio part. He already mentioned the visual part when he spoke about Spund, "das Aug' ist der heiklichste Teil am Menschen"(X,396), even though he obviously does not agree with Spund's judgement. Marquis, when giving him the black wig, has just endorsed Titus' observation, "Die gefällige äussere Form macht viel - beinahe alles"(X,402). In order to influence the eye positively, those clothes are worn that enhance one's physical appearance, and in Titus' case, the wig is a further enhancement attempt.

At this time, three points about the wig might be considered, firstly, its colour. The black colour is frequently seen as symbolic of the dark and undesirable side of human thought and action. When Titus wears it, he certainly is meaner than when he does not. Thus, one might argue that it is symbolic of his

manipulative use of language. Black also echoes Titus' reference to the "G'schwufen . . . mit ein' kohlrab'nschwarzen Haupt / Und jede is ang'schmiert, die ihnen was glaubt"(X,390), which is anticipatory of his own future behaviour. Secondly, the giver of the wig must be noted--he is Marquis, also a barber. He has talked very cleverly and cunningly, and avoided paying a reward. Thus, he has been an example to Titus of how to misuse language, and how to circumvent the full acknowledgement of a good deed. Both points about the wig must be viewed as a deleterious influence on Titus. Thirdly, the wig must be seen as a catalyst, because it is especially when he wears it that his manipulation of language is most blatant, as his dealings with Flora, Constantia and Frau von Cypressenburg attest to most vividly.

The first element about the external aspect is the visual, and the other element deals with the audio, which is the language. As already observed, this is a strong point with Titus, in the sense that he uses it in a way that can dazzle the other person. Like one's clothes, so one's language is used to flatter and deceive. However, the language, aside from defining the speaker's nature, may also reflect on him. It was shown in reference to Titus in his meeting with Marquis when the former began the dialogue in a manner that appeared to help him acquire a reward, but this action proved to be in vain. The occurence foreshadows, in nucleus form, Titus' débâcle later, just when he seems to be most successful. The black wig must be commented

upon once more. If one sees it as symbolic of his deceptive use of language, then it is interesting to note that it was given to him as a reward for a commendable action. Marquis, whom he saved, gives it to him because he too thinks Titus' hair is offensive. Therefore, he should wear a wig in order to deceive others, because they want to be deceived. Only if they do not see his red hair, will they deal with him fairly. Similarly, Titus' language, like his use of the wig, is employed as a smoke screen. Firstly, it is a weapon against prejudice, and secondly, specifically in reference to the three women, it conveys flatteries, which they want to hear, and ambiguities. Thus, the false hair, as well as his equivocations, are to a large extent forced upon him. Nevertheless, the latter one is always very dangerous, and leads to self-entanglement, as Titus, like Puffmann, must experience. Only when he finally casts aside the grey wig, does Titus show that he has, at least this time, withstood the temptations of the seductress, language.

B. Titus Overcomes a Prejudicial World (II)

Titus' first meeting with a female member of Frau von Cypressenburg's household is with Flora, who at the start finds herself in an embarrassing and disadvantageous position, one that Titus immediately exploits with his clever use of language. Throughout the dialogue, he dazzles and flatters Flora with such success, that she considers marrying him, which is a result that goes far beyond his wishes. Once again, his linguistic games begin to trap him.

Just prior to Titus' appearance, Flora is reflecting about the difficulties in reference to her "Geschäftsacker," and voices her disagreement with her late husband's wish that she remain a widow after his death. She continues, "Wann er mir etwan gar als Geist erscheinet, wann's auf einmal so klopfet bei der Nacht -"(X,407). At that moment Titus knocks, to which she responds with a scream. He rushes in and wonders, "Is ein Unglück g'schehn? Oder kirren Sie vielleicht jedesmal so statt'n Hereinsagen?"(X,407). His appearance will prove to be an "Unglück" to a certain extent for her. In fact, he too will consider himself rather unlucky when his wig is discovered. His words will come back to haunt him. His second question underscores the humour of the situation, while ridiculing her reaction. The verb "kirren" merits special attention, since it means, aside from screaming, to allure and bait, although it is obvious that

her scream must have the opposite effect. Nevertheless, immediately before he knocked she noted, indirectly, that she would like to marry. Therefore, she is potentially in an emotional frame where she would like to attract a husband, i.e., by alluring, which "kirren" conveys. Furthermore, Titus' careful choice of words also has an alluring effect, as he seeks to convince Flora to employ him, and thereby end his destitute condition. His use of "kirren" elicits not only ironic humour, but it is also a succinct depiction of Flora's psychological state, as well as a description of Titus' deployment of the language, not only at this precise moment, but also in his future dealings with all three women. In this manner, "kirren" illustrates Titus' subtle verbal snares with which he seeks to entrap.

Titus aims to beguile from the start, and his answer and comment that follow reiterate this intention. Understandably, Flora is embarrassed about her uncalled-for shriek, and she says, "Der Herr wird sich drüber wundern, dass ich so schwache Nerven hab'?(X,408). But Titus has no intention of further embarrassing her, since this would only diminish his chances. Instead, he replies, "Wundern über das Allgemeine" O nein! Die Nerven von Spinnengeweb', d'Herzen von Wachs und d'Köpferl von Eisen, das is ja der Grundriss der weiblichen Struktur"(X,408). He assures Flora that her actions are common, and then presents a brief description of the female psyche which is hardly flattering. Nevertheless, it has the desired effect, because he

seems to sound knowledgeable and authoritative. A woman's nerves consist of "Spinnengeweb'" which are extremely fragile. This her action has just attested to. But the word "Spinnengeweb'" evokes several connotations: it traps the unwary, and therefore echoes, in part, the word "kirren," which was seen to imply alluring. Thus, a woman's weakness, namely, her delicate nerves, are also her strength in her relationship with the opposite sex. However, there is also a pernicious allusion, in that a spider not only traps, but also destroys its victims, which can also be the case in the relationship between man and woman, particularly in view of Nestroy's frequent allusions to the general deleterious nature of this relationship as has been referred to in Chapter II of this dissertation. But the entrapment aspect of "Spinnengeweb'" in this particular case, also relates to Titus, because he uses language, in fact, his above quote is an example, also to ensnare the opposite sex by impressing Flora and have her provide him with work. Ultimately, Titus must learn that he himself is the victim of the "Spinnengeweb'" created by his language.

In reference to the latter, several further connotations of the verb "spinnen" must be introduced, especially since they relate directly to the use of language. Firstly, "spinnen," in the figurative sense, means to tell lies or create ficticious stories; an example would be the Marquis' tale about the man who refused diamonds for saving the prince's life. Titus is also an expert at "spinnen," not in the sense that he tells blatant

lies, but he does insinuate them as may be seen later when he seeks to have Flora and Constantia dismissed. Secondly, "spinnen" is also used in the idiom, "Es ist nichts so fein gesponnen, es kommt doch ans Licht der Sonne," which relates directly to the web Titus is beginning to spin at this very moment. In this latter sense, Flora is spinning a web in order to acquire a husband.

Flora's reply signals just how successful Titus' "spinnen" really is, "(beiseite). Recht ein angenehmer Mensch - und die rabenschwarzen Haar' - ich muss aber doch - (laut und in etwas strengem Ton), wer is der Herr und was will der Herr?"(X,408). She has found his language "angenehm," which echoes Salome's earlier comment, "Sie reden so schön daher"(X,395). But a distinction must be made. Salome admits she does not understand him, whereas Flora, who is vulnerable, tries to play his game. After having noted that she finds him pleasant, she remarks on his hair. Therefore, what impressed her first was the way he talked, or, expressing it differently, "sein Spinnen." The black wig alone is not decisive. It is only an aid, which allows Titus to make the fullest use of his language. Her question, ". . . 'wer is der Herr und was will der Herr?"(X,408), emphasizes further just how impressive Titus' bearing, as reflected by his language, has been. She uses the word "Herr" twice, indicating that she sees more in him than he supposedly is.

Titus' answer is cleverly devious, "Ich bin Ihr untertänigster Knecht und empfehl' mich"(X,408). His calculatingly

humble "Ihr untertänigster Knecht" is an indirect flattery with which he attempts to ingratiate himself further. Certainly his remarks so far did not indicate that he was a "Knecht." Yet, at this moment he even recommends himself as one. Of course, he does not really think of himself as a "Knecht," which he made clear when telling Salome, "Ich soll Knecht werden?" (X,397). But his answer above to Flora is a ruse to help him gain a foothold in the "Gutshof." Titus' answer, just as his first entrance and first statement, throws Flora slightly off balance. Firstly, she is surprised that he would be a "Knecht," and secondly, she misunderstands his "empfehl' mich," believing him to say good-bye, when he had no intention of leaving. Titus' fancy language is immediately misunderstood, and leads to the opposite result of what is desired. He reiterates, "Sie brauchen einen Knecht, und als solchen empfehl' ich mich" (X,408). Only now does Flora understand that he is presenting himself as a menial labourer. She makes no attempt to contain her surprise, "Was? Der Herr is ein Knecht?"(X,408). This is precisely the attitude that Titus hopes for, because it shows her believing him to be much more than a mere "Knecht." In fact, her surprise expressed by, "Was? Der Herr is ein Knecht?" echoes his indignation before to Salome, "Was? Ich soll Knecht werden?" (X,397).

When she asks him if he considers himself a "Gehilfe" in the nursery, he replies:

> Ob Sie mich Gehilfe nennen oder Gärtner oder - das is alles eins; selbst - ich setz' nur den Fall - wenn

> es mir als Gärtner gelingen sollte, Gefühle in Ihr Herz zu pflanzen - ich setz' nur den Fall - und Sie mich zum unbeschränkten Besitzer dieser Plantage ernennen sollten - ich setz' nur den Fall - selbst dann würde ich immer nur Ihr Knecht sein. (X,408-09)

This is a key statement. He reiterates his adaptability already noted when telling Plutzerkern, "Ich qualifiziere mich zu allem"(X,393). A significant fact of this adaptability is his skill in using those kinds of words and phrases that the person he is speaking to understands clearly. This particular aspect of his adaptability, which is reflective of his general chameleon-like quality, will be dealt with in detail later. His answer also conveys flattery--the words, "Ob Sie mich Gehilfe nennen . . . und Sie mich zum unbeschränkten Besitzer dieser Plantage ernennen sollten"(X,408-09), intend to convey that he fully trusts and agrees with whatever she should decide. But at the same time, this is another verbal maneuver, because it not only seems to take for granted that he already has been accepted, but also presupposes that she is open for an emotional involvement with him. By saying these things to her, Titus is suggestive, hoping he will strike a responsive chord. Furthermore, his answer projects humility and courage simultaneously as he attempts to sound imposing, and seeks to impress her. The professed humility is seen in the statements, "das is mir alles eins," and "selbst dann würde ich immer nur Ihr Knecht sein." The first remark is to have Flora believe that he would never question her judgement, and that he would be entirely satisfied if she were to call him "Gehilfe" or

"Gärtner." His courage is apparent in expressing the hope that she might come to love him.

The aspects discussed in the above paragraph have their basis in Titus' language adaptability, which, chameleon-like, readily blends into any language environment. In this particular case, it is that of the gardener. Therefore, words like "Pflanzen" and "Gärtner" are basic components of Flora's daily usage that do not seem threatening to her. Still, the audience recognizes them as a part of Titus' ploy, his "Spinnengeweb'," to lull her into a false sense of security, which will enable him to take full advantage of her. The first example is seen in, "wenn es mir als Gärtner gelingen sollte, Gefühle in Ihr Herz zu pflanzen.. . ." It should be noted here that he molds his images to the character of the one he is addressing. He knows Flora likes gardening, and he actually gets through to her with this hilarious image, which she fails to recognize, just because she has such a love for greenery. He has gone far beyond his position of gardener, for which he is supposedly applying, seeing himself not only as her gardener in the physical and concrete sense, but already in the metaphorical sense, as one wooing for her love. As a matter of fact, he is doing that just now by claiming that he might do it in the future. As before with "kirren," his statement above anticipates and simultaneously does what it anticipates.

He reiterates and expands on the above image of the "Gärtner," where he is just starting to woo her, by planting

"Gefühle" in her heart, to seeing himself as the "unbeschränkter Besitzer dieser Plantage"(X,409). The "Gärtner," only an employee, has become the owner, not merely of a garden, but of a "Plantage," a word that not only evokes exotic images because it relates to subtropical and tropical latitudes, but also alludes to wealth, since large tracts of land are usually involved. Whereas the clause, "wenn es mir als Gärtner gelingen sollte, Gefühle in Ihr Herz zu pflanzen," refers specifically to her immediate environment, physically as well as psychologically, the latter because she is considering marriage, the statement dealing with the plantation removes her from the home environment, and thereby places her, at least cerebrally, in a position where Titus hopes she is more susceptible to his verbal intrigues.

It is in reference to the latter that the verb "pflanzen" should be analyzed. Its commonly accepted meaning deserves close analysis. It is a particularly interesting term, because it is symbolic of what Titus' language generally attempts to achieve. It is partly synonymous with "spinnen," discussed earlier, and aptly describes his effort to have others think in a way that is expedient to him. He seeks to plant ideas in their minds by using the power of suggestion with the intent to manipulate them. The seven calculated pauses add to this effect by permitting her imagination to work, but simultaneously they are to intimate that he knows it is not proper to be too forward, thus, giving her a chance to interrupt should she desire

to do so. In this particular case it is to have Flora be more receptive to his advances. Again, as noted several times previously, the language used by Nestroy's characters frequently has a plurisignation quality, which, amongst other things, exposes one or more components of the speakers' own natures.

Although being very forward, he attempts not to give this impression, and, aside from the pauses, he also employs the statement, "ich setz' nur den Fall," used three times, as well as the concluding sentence, "selbst dann würde ich immer nur Ihr Knecht sein," to achieve the desired effect. The former quotation, aside from the humour it elicits, instead of cloaking or excusing his forwardness, only underscores it. He insists, " . . . wenn man sagt: 'ich setz' nur den Fall', da darf man alles sagen." This provides a key insight into his attitude toward language that goes far beyond this particular situation--depending upon the situation, language may be manipulated to serve the speaker's expediency, as long as he adheres to certain formalities. These are irrelevant to the substance of the topic and have, in fact, a detracting effect, as in this case where "ich setz' nur den Fall" is used. By using this phrase, he shows that he does not mean what he says, and the words therefore emphasize what he is <u>not</u> saying.

The second quotation in the previous paragraph also seeks to mitigate his obvious forwardness by attempting to give the impression that he is in full agreement with his position as a

"Knecht," and would always be just that. However, by stating it like this, Titus obviously intimates that he would be a "Knecht" of her love. He tries to plant certain ideas into her mind. Ultimately, though it must be noted that his apparent measures not to appear forward are particularly clever ruses, in which he is especially presumptuous.

To ingratiate himself further with Flora, he describes himself as:

> Ein exotisches Gewächs, nicht auf diesen Boden gepflanzt, durch die Umstände ausgerissen und durch den Zufall in das freundliche Gartengeschirr Ihres Hauses versetzt, und hier, von der Sonne Ihrer Huld beschienen, hofft die zarte Pflanze, Nahrung zu finden. (X,409)

He continues to use metaphors and images relating to plants and gardens. The exotic aspect introduced indirectly with "Plantage" is now noted specifically in "ein exotisches Gewächs," and she, being a gardener, will feel compelled to nurse it. The adjective "exotisch" is very suitable, firstly, because of his red hair which is rather exotic. Secondly, because of his skillful use of language, he is able to exude a charm to which women are very susceptible. Thirdly, he is not a native of the area, but a foreigner. Lastly, the word itself seeks to arouse further in Flora an attraction to him, since the exotic is often more sought after than the usual everday appearance.

After having depicted himself as interestingly as possible, he appeals to Flora's sense of compassion. The verb "ausgerissen" implies that he was removed forcibly from what he previously called the "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," yet he

told Salome that he left voluntarily. In this manner Titus mixes truth and falsity depending upon the situation, and on what is more expedient for him. He misuses language to the extent that it misinforms when it is presumed to inform. This aspect of misinforming through the calculated interfusing of honesty and dishonesty, continues to increase from this point until he is discovered.

By referring to himself as "eine zarte Pflanze," Titus not only repeats the plant image in reference to himself, but again appeals to Flora's compassion, since being "zart" is valid in the sense that he is a ready target for insults, and can thus be easily hurt. On the other hand, he is also quite robust as well as devious, and because of his forceful approach is definitely in command of the situation when talking to Flora. One must also recognize that he is not nearly as fragile and delicate as he wants to indicate. In fact, he seems to be resilient and tenacious. Here, it becomes evident that when explaining the human situation in general or that of an individual, definitive elucidations are impossible. They appear possible only when they deal with minute facets of an individual's point of view, discernable through his language. Still, there is always a measure of ambiguity due to the falsity of language. It it this falsity with which Titus battles prejudice, which is also his undoing, in spite of the fact that he is basically a decent individual.

When Flora asks specifically whether he understands anything

about gardening, Titus again answers in a way that is to impress Flora, even though he is not definite as to his knowledge about plants:

> Sehr gut; wer Menschen kennt, der kennt auch die Vegetabilien, weil nur sehr wenig Menschen leben - und viele, unzählige aber nur vegetieren. Wer in der Fruh aufsteht, in die Kanzlei geht, nacher essen geht, nacher präferanzeln geht und nacher schlafen geht, der vegetiert; wer in der Fruh ins G'wölb' geht und nacher auf die Maut geht und nacher essen geht und nacher wieder ins G'wölb' geht, der vegetiert; wer in der Fruh aufsteht, nacher a Roll' durchgeht, nacher in die Prob' geht, nacher essen geht, nacher ins Kaffeehaus geht, nacher Komödie spielen geht, und wenn das alle Tag' so fortgeht, der vegetiert. Zum Leben gehört sich, billig berechnet, eine Million, und das is nicht genug; auch ein geistiger Aufschwung g'hört dazu, und das find't man höchst selten beisammen; wenigstens, was ich von die Millionär' weiss, so führen fast alle aus millionärischer Gewinnvermehrungspassion ein so fades, trockenes Geschäftsleben, was kaum den blühenden Namen „Vegetation" verdient. (X,409-10)

This reply is similar to those directed at Plutzerkern in the sense that it avoids a clear answer. He claims to know people and, therefore, also, "Vegetabilien." Usually the argument is made that one may understand some aspect about people by first understanding something about a plant or an animal, but Titus reverses this in his argument. However, instead of explaining about plants, which is her question, he elucidates about people. Thus, his argument, as seen from Flora's point of view, is illogical. Nevertheless, he continues to dazzle her with his language, and she accepts him.

The term "vegetieren" describes Titus' view of how most people live, in fact, there is an indirect comparison of "Menschen" and "Vegetabilien." Judging from his past experiences

with people, Titus' evaluation has considerable validity. He is having a running battle with prejudice, which he saw as the result of "Dummheit," or, expressing it differently, a lack of critical thought. This seems partly due to a mere "vegetieren" because such existence furthers the ingraining of traditional modes of thought by a constant repetition of the same behavioural patterns. This makes it increasingly difficult, in fact outright impossible, to modify one's thinking. Thus, prejudice remains. Titus underscores his argument by listing several representative life styles that include most people, and concludes each time with the condemnation, "der vegetiert." A particular example: " . . . wer in der Fruh aufsteht, in die Kanzlei geht, nacher essen geht . . . und nacher schlafen geht, der vegetiert," echoes the following assertion by Zwirn in Lumpazivagabundus, "Da tuns s' nix als arbeiten, essen, trinken und schlafen - is das eine Ordnung? Da wird nicht an'geign't, nicht aufg'haut, nicht Zither g'schlag'n"(II,72). Although Zwirn was seen as a dissolute character, his words, nevertheless, show a keen insight into human existence. He, as well as Titus, deplore such a life, but whereas Zwirn never submits to one like that, Titus seeks the comfort and security that is part of it. In each of the three examples, the routine and its repetitiveness are what result in "vegetieren." Titus underscores the routine aspect by describing each in a way which implies that these particular activities are fixed, and will be repeated day after day. The

repetitiveness of the activities is shown by listing three different sets, when it is obvious that one would have been sufficient.

The second part of Titus' lengthy answer begins with, "Zum Leben gehört sich, billig gerechnet.. . ." It too avoids Flora's question, because he wants to control and direct the conversation. This is part of Titus' strategy to manipulate the person with whom he is speaking. He then notes the two things which are necessary to destroy dull routine and to live a meaningful life: "eine Million und geistiger Aufschwung." The first prerequisite is entirely beyond Titus' grasp, because it is indeed a "Schatz," something, as he already indicated to Plutzerkern, he would be most willing to look for, if only someone were to indicate the location of one. By stipulating a million, he admits to himself the impossibility of his living a truly satisfactory life.

He does, however, possess the "geistigen Aufschwung," which is attested to most vividly by his choice of words and their topics. In fact, this answer to Flora's question how "Menschenkenntnis" also implies "Pflanzenkenntnis," is one specific example of that. It is precisely the fact that he possesses the second prerequisite which precludes him from also having the first, because the first necessitates at least a certain measure of luck. This was already noted by Peter in Der Unbedeutende; ". . . mir haben die Lehrer in der Schul' schon's Glück abg'sprochen. ‚Das is a g'scheiter Bub!' haben s'

gesagt, und da is 's schon vorbei. Schau' s' nur an beim Gipsmann, so a Fortuna; die hohle Kugel, über der sie schwebt, is das Sinnbild von ihre Favoritköpf'"(VII,28). Spund, who is fatuity personified, also proves Peter's argument, because he is both very foolish and very wealthy.

Noteworthy is also the term "Gewinnvermehrungspassion," which Titus coins in order to explain why millionaires lead a life that is "fad und trocken." This is descriptive of Spund, whom Titus depicted as one, "der seine Kassa vergoldet." At the same time "Gewinnvermehrungspassion" is also a microcosmic example of that aspect of Nestroy's language skill where form and meaning coincide. The largeness of the word reflects the immense and insatiable desire for more wealth on the part of the millionaire. It is physically a large compound word consisting of three parts, of which the first two evoke similar images, thereby reinforcing each other, while the third, "Passion," ascribes a pejorative meaning to the whole. This latter point is endorsed by the words "fades," "trockenes," which, although modifying "Geschäftsleben," nevertheless also allude to the long compound. One further facet of "Gewinnvermehrungspassion" must also be noted, the one that reflects Titus' passion for using periphrasis and at times circumlocution, which he deploys in order to influence others. Here is a shortcoming that is unmasked at the moment of its occurrence.

Just how successful he is in his aim to influence Flora through the use of circumlocution is apparent in her answer, "Er

will also hier einen Dienst? Gut, Er is aufgenommen; aber nicht als Knecht; Er zeigt Kenntnisse, Eigenschaften, besitzt ein vorteilhaftes Äusseres -"(X,410). Although Titus did not answer Flora's question, not even a part of it, he nevertheless convinced her to hire him not as "Knecht," but, as she noted moments later, to be in charge of the "Gartenpersonal." He has skillfully proved to Flora that he is not a "Knecht," even though he seemingly insisted to her that he was one. Instead, Titus has succeeded in asserting himself, particularly his attitude as reflected by the statement to Salome, "Was? Ich soll Knecht werden?"(X,397).

Titus continues to control the conversation, seeking to impress Flora even more than he already has. However, as the following two quotations will indicate, it seems as if the language itself enchants or seduces Titus to the extent that he becomes not only increasingly loquacious, but that his language simultaneously grows more metaphorical and flowery. It is this proclivity which will inevitably cause serious problems for him. When Flora advises him that she cannot present him in his present clothes to the lady of the "Gutshof," he retorts:

> Also gilt bei Ihnen das Sprichwort: „Das Kleid macht den Mann", das Sprichwort, durch welches wir uns selbst so sehr vor die Schneider herabsetzen und welches doch so unwahr ist; denn wie viele ganze Kerls gehn mit zerrissene Röck' herum. (X,411)

He is rather sensitive about his physical appearance, not merely because of his clothes, but also because of his red hair, which at this time is hidden under the black wig. Firstly, the proverb

echoes his critical comments about Spund,who found his physical appearance, specifically his hair, disgusting. Secondly, it reverberates Marquis' remark, "die gefallige äussere Form macht viel"(X,402). Both Spund and Marquis remind him vividly of the numerous prejudicial barbs aimed at him, and it is because of this that he resorts to cunning language, in order to be able to manipulate others, as is happening at this moment. It also points out that Flora is very concerned about his external appearance, and it is this, as well as her comments about his black hair, that underscores the fragility of his situation.

Titus then sets about undermining the proverb. The purpose is to question and mark the ambiguities of traditional thought patterns which often result in prejudice. Furthermore, it also draws attention to the ambiguities in language itself which are exploited by those who use it as a smoke screen. Titus himself is guilty of the latter at this moment as he talks to Flora. His statement, "das Sprichwort, durch welches wir uns selbst so sehr vor die Schneider herabsetzten und welches doch so unwahr ist . . .," draws attention to the fact that the tailor's skill is enlisted to help the individual project that image which he finds suitable. The implication, of course, is that such a made to measure image is obviously a facade, just as his wig is one. In the play Umsonst (1857), Finster endorses this when she says to Sali, "Das Aussehn täuscht"(XIV,424). On the other hand, Titus' assertion still applies, ". . . wie viele

ganze Kerls gehn mit zerrissene Röck' herum"(X,411). Here, Titus refers specifically to himself as "ein ganzer Kerl," in spite of his "zerrissenen Rock." However, he is not completely honest by asserting that he is himself as he stands in front of her, because he is wearing the black wig. As far as the latter point is concerned, he is neither entirely "ganz," nor entirely honest. Ultimately, not only his "Rock," but he himself is to a certain extent "zerrissen," and this his language reflects.

Flora, however, is only concerned with the physical appearance of his dress; "Aber der Anzug hat so gar nix, was einem Gartner - "(X,411), but Titus interrupts, and this is the second of the two quotations which show how language is seducing him:

> O, der Anzug hat nur zuviel Gärtnerartiges, er is übersä't mit Fleck', er is aufgegangen bei die Ellbögen und an verschiedenen Orten; weil ich nie ein Paraplü trag', wird er auch häufig begossen, und wie er noch in der Blüte war, hab' ich ihn oft wie eine Pflanze versetzt. (X,411)

On the one hand, this quotation is a poetic description of his suit, couched in the language of a gardener because he is speaking to Flora. On the other hand, he is intimating, in a general sense, the difficulties he has experienced, and thereby, expands and adds to his previous remarks about his past. When he referred to the "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," and his misfortunes "im Heiligtum der Liebe" and "im Tempel der Freundschaft," there was an underlying tone of grave seriousness, whereas the comment to Flora has a veneer of humour that is obvious, even though the basic considerations are just as serious as before.

Now, however, Titus has a job given to him by a woman who also seems to be interested in him as a person. Therefore, his innate optimism is coming to the fore, reflected in part by the humour.

He begins his answer by insisting that his suit does indeed possess much "Gärtnerartiges," although the "-artiges" already intimates that it is not wholly like that of a "Gärtner." He then lists specific aspects which are to support this assertion. Even though each of the gardening terms carries a positive connotation when used in its regular context, one that refers to garden and plants, they intimate a deleterious aspect as used by Titus in reference to his suit. He plays with the literal and figurative meanings of several words.

The first key expression is "übersä't mit Fleck'." The verb "übersä't" means covered, but "sä't" itself is also significant, because it specifically relates to the sowing of seeds. Titus, however, uses it in reference to patches, not useful plants, indicating thereby that his suit has been mended numerous times. This, in turn, draws attention to the fact that he has been experiencing financial difficulties, which result in further problems. There is logical expansion of the "übersä't" image as Titus continues with, "er is aufgegangen bei die Ellbögen und an verschiedenen Orten." When something has been "gesä't," it is only natural for it to come up, i.e., "aufgegangen." However, in this case, what comes up are more holes. Thus, "aufgegangen" has two different meanings, which nevertheless buttress each other, and, beyond that, have another

connotation, namely, pointing out Titus' economic problems.

When a plant comes up, it must be "begossen" in order for it to grow. Titus uses the verb "begossen" to build again on the previous image. Whereas "begiessen" is necessary for the well-being of the plant, the "Begiessen" of the holes and his suit only weakens the latter. Added to this is the harmful effect on Titus' health because he is subjected to the rain with little protection. Such is the case since he lacks a "Paraplü," which in turn underlines his lack of money. Titus completes the plant image by explaining that when his suit was in its "Blüte," i.e., still new, it had often been "versetzt." "Versetzen" might well be the proper treatment for a plant, but hardly for a suit, since it indicates it had been pawned. This ingeminates that Titus has been, and still is, in financial difficulties, something that was obvious from the start of this quotation.

Titus' description of his suit is symbolic of the general difficulties which have their source in the prejudicial behaviour of other towards him. These have been mentioned by him in the past. This time, however, he succeeds in distancing himself from these problems by talking about them through metaphors that evoke plant and garden images, and, beyond that, refer to his situation. But it must also be noted that this particular quotation is one specific example of that quality in Nestroy's language that led Kraus to posit, "Er erlöst die Sprache vom Starrkrampf, und sie wirft ihm für jede Redensart einen Gedanken

ab."[3] One might even add that Nestroy's unique use of language "wirft ihm für jede Redensart mehrere Gedanken ab." This is possible because once the language has been freed from the "Starrkrampf," it seems to elicit in the mind of the spectator denotations and connotations not necessarily thought of by the speaker. Furthermore, as soon as words are thought of or spoken, they provide assistance to the speaker, and lead to new thoughts. This is noted by Kraus when he argues, "Denn aus dem Wort springt mir der junge Gedanke entgegen und formt rückwirkend die Sprache, die ihn schuf."[4] Therefore, the language one uses helps in the creation of new thoughts, and reflects and forms one's basic nature. But it may also seduce one, as happens to Titus, because he uses it as a smoke screen to manipulate others, which, as the play develops, will expose the extent of his temporary seduction to a kind of evil.

In fact, the latter becomes quite apparent after Titus, whom Flora has sent out to change into the wedding suit of her late husband, returns. During his absence, Constantia, Frau von Cypressenburg's chamber maid, has arrived, and a latent hostility between Flora and Constantia is immediately apparent. Only after he has been in the room for a few moments does Titus realize that Constantia, whom he has not yet met, is present, and his following quotation signals the second stage of his attempt to secure a position in the "Gutshof":

> (sich umwendend). Gut - (Constantia erblickend) ah! - Jetzt gäbet ich kein' Tropfen Blut, wann mir eins aderlasset. (Sich tief vor Constantia verneigend.) Ich bitte untertänig - (zu Flora) warum haben Sie mir nicht gesagt - (zu Constantia, mit tiefer Verbeugung) mir nicht zuzürnen, dass ich - (zu Flora)

> dass die gnädige Frau da ist - (zu Constantia, mit tiefer Verbeugung) nicht gleich die pflichtschuldigste Reverenz - (zu Flora) 's is wirklich schrecklich, in was Sie ein' für eine Lag' bringen! (X,414)

His success so far has been in no small measure due to his skill, as manifested in his language, to understand a particular situation, and adapt at a moment's notice to another person's attitude. In this particular quotation, he succeeds through a cunning choice of words to manipulate the two women simultaneously, making Flora seem naive and foolish, while flattering Constantia as he builds her up to a position superior to her real status.

He starts by professing to be extremely surprised, and then addresses Constantia and Flora alternately in one long sentence, not giving either of the women a chance to answer or interrupt him until he has been able to establish his position. This is a smoke screen which will permit him to manipulate the two even further in the ensuing conversation. He starts with "Ich bitte untertänig," directed at Constantia, thereby conveying humility and his realization that she is superior to him. The term "untertänig" reverberates the word "Knecht," with which he introduced himself to Flora, and which proved to be a successful ruse. However, it must be noted that already in "untertänig," Titus changes to a higher language style, because he has perceived, and correctly so, that Constantia is in a higher social position than Flora.

His first words to Flora are a gentle reprimand, but nevertheless a reprimand; ". . . warum haben Sie mir nicht gesagt -."

Again he seeks to emphasize to Constantia his submissiveness and her superior position. Flora is no longer of importance to him. Therefore, he uses her as a stepping stone to ingratiate himself with Constantia. Titus continues his address to the latter with, ". . . mir nicht zu zürnen, dass ich-," intimating that someone in her station has good reason to scold him for his apparent lack of etiquette. The verb "zürnen," like "untertänig," is a further indicator marking a change in Titus' use of language, which he believes to be more suitable for Constantia.

But instead of completing his thought toward Constantia, which he began with "dass ich," Titus finds it more useful to complete his thought toward Flora, ". . . dass die gnädige Frau da is -." This is really directed at the chamber maid, because it flatters her by calling her "gnädige Frau." Simultaneously, this flattery arouses jealousy and anger in Flora. He continues with the flattery toward Constantia by completing his address toward her with, ". . . nicht gleich die pflichtschuldigste Reverenz -." The adjective "pflichtschuldigste" is coined by Titus to emphasize his deep respect. However, its two components are very similar in meaning, and the whole seems rather ridiculous, particularly in view of the fact that she is not the "gnädige Frau," but merely her chamber maid. He concludes his skillful address by again reprimanding Flora, and thus pleasing Constantia, with,". . .'s wirklich schrecklich, in was Sie ein' für eine Lag' bringen!" There is, of course,

no problem, only the one Titus has created not for himself, but for Flora, by having her appear rather naive.

His simultaneous address to Flora and Constantia consists of six parts, with three directed at each woman. By alternating yet meshing them, he is able to create an antithetical relationship between the two that elevates Constantia at the expense of Flora. This in turn brings the hostility between the two into focus, from which Titus seeks to benefit. He then directs his attention only at Constantia, and totally ignores Flora. He refuses to accept that Constantia is not the lady. Even after Flora insists, "Es ist die Kammerfrau der Gnädigen" (X,414), he argues, "Hören Sie auf! - Diese Hoheit in der Stirnhaltung, diese herablassende Blickflimmerung, dieser edle Ellbogenschwung -"(X,414). Titus uses specific words that aim to underline her poise and nobility of bearing and appearance, but because his expressions do not actually say anything, there is also an undercurrent of sarcasm. "Hoheit in der Stirnhaltung" does not mean anything definite, because the forehead itself cannot be held or moved separately in relation to the rest of the head. Furthermore, "Hoheit" is also meaningless in this particular context. The same lack of meaning is seen in "diese herablassende Blickflimmerung," a phrase that sounds impressive, but does not designate anything specifically, since the word "Blickflimmerung" is coined by Titus for the express purpose of flattering and impressing Constantia, but it is not informative. The last phrase, "dieser edle Ellbogenschwung," is

fully consonant with the other two, since it also fails to be meaningful. Titus has cleverly used three words, namely, "Hoheit," "herablassende," and "edle," which in a proper context may well describe certain facets of a noble individual. However, he pairs them off with words that are ludicrous, a term which best describes the whole quotation. Titus, while professing to flatter, is ultimately sarcastically using language as a smoke screen to such a degree that the meaning cannot be defined.

His successs is visible in both women. Constantia notes to herself, "Wirklich ein interessanter, gebildeter Mensch!" (X,415). The aspect of "gebildet" becomes more important as he rises in social class. Presumably she calls him "gebildet" because she wants to ascribe validity to his flattery. Constantia's reaction to Titus echoes Flora's "Recht ein angenehmer Mensch." Both women succumb to his words as soon as they meet him. In fact, one might go back as far as Salome, who referred specifically to his language: "Sie reden so schön daher . . ." (X,395). Flora is understandably angry, but not at Titus, as she should be. Instead, she notes to herself about Constantia, "Wie sie kokettiert auf ihn, die aufdringliche Person"(X,415). In spite of his comments and actions such as, "T i t u s (immer auf Constantia zurückblickend) . . ." Flora sees Constantia as "kokettierend" and "aufdringlich." Both words best describe Titus in this scene, particularly "aufdringlich." Flora's behaviour here presents a concrete example of Titus' earlier

description of women, especially the phrase, "und d' Köpferl von Eisen"(X,408), if one sees this as stubbornness and foolishness.

As already noted, Titus sees a better future for himself with Constantia, but in order to effect a complete break with Flora, whose late husband's suit he has just put on, he must be even more manipulative and deceiving than he has been. He recognizes his opportunity when Constantia decides that he, as the new gardener, should bring a basket of fruit to Frau von Cypressenburg, at which time he would be presented to her. Flora, though, is indignant, "Vorstellen? Wie finden Sie es denn auf einmal nötig, ihn der Gnädigen vorzustellen? Sie haben ja grad vorher g'sagt, er is ganz unstatthaft, so einen Bengel der gnädigen Frau vor Augen zu bringen"(X,417). At this point, Titus sets another one of his verbal machinations in motion that will point to Flora as a fool and liar, making her his enemy, who will later contribute toward his unmasking.

Constantia is understandably embarrassed, because Flora's accusation it true. Titus quickly interjects, "Bengel?"(X,417). It is a one word question, which seems to indicate that he is incensed at Constantia. Flora gloats, "Ja,ja!"(X,417). Titus' surprise and apparent anger continues, "Das ist arg!"(X,417). The two women, as well as the audience, must of course think he is directing his words at Constantia, whose embarrassment increases. Once more, Titus seems to show indignation. "Das is enorm -," and Flora senses victory, "Na, ich glaub's - es is ja -"(X,418). Each of Titus' three brief statements cunningly

led Flora to believe that he was angry at Constantia, whose growing distress betrayed her guilt. But at the moment when Flora believes herself to be victorious, and Constantia feels that she cannot do anything to extricate herself, Titus, through a masterful use of words, directs the conversation and its topic in a direction that is expedient for him; "Mir unbegreiflich, (zu Flora) wie Sie das Wort ‚Bengel' auf mich beziehen können!" (X,418). This turn is totally unexpected for Flora. Titus does not question Flora's statement about what Constantia said. From the latter's reaction, he knew that Flora was correct. It would, therefore, have been futile to argue along this line. Still, he is determined to better his position by rejecting Flora's offer. He achieves it by feigning utter surprise as to how Flora could possibly relate the word "Bengel" to him. Thus, he begins to extricate Constantia, but to be successful, he must necessarily undermine Flora's veracity, which he has just started to do. To achieve this, Titus misuses language even more deviously than Puffmann, as he twists the meaning of Flora's words to the extent that they strike back at her. With this misuse of language, he proves himself to be just what Constantia had called him, namely, a "Bengel." Again, language unmasks the speaker as it reflects a particular facet of his basic nature. He brazenly accuses Flora of misinterpreting Constantia's comment, when in actual fact his accusation is a blatant misinterpretation. To support his reasoning, Titus states; "(zu Flora). Erlauben Sie mir, es gibt ausser mir noch

Bengeln genug, und ich bin kein solcher Egoist, dass ich alles gleich auf mich beziehe"(X,418). This is a carefully calculated admittance that he is a "Bengel." It indirectly recognizes and subtly communicates to Constantia, that he fully believes she called him this. He thereby places Constantia in a slightly disadvantageous position as far as her relationship with him is concerned. Furthermore, he claims not to be an egotist, because he does not relate everything to himself, specifically Constantia's controversial statement. But in actual fact, he is just that at this very moment as he strives to better his position, even though this means using Flora as a stepping stone and slandering her in the process. For Titus, language has become a powerful and offensive weapon which he uses without consideration against anyone standing in his way.

Titus continues his argument, which seeks to justify Constantia fully:

> (auf Constantia deutend). Wenn diese Dame wirklich ihre Lippen zu dem Wort „Bengel" hergegeben, so hat sie wahrscheinlich einen Knecht, vielleicht einen von diesen beiden Herren (auf die Gartenknechte zeigend) gemeint, denn mich hat sie ja noch gar nicht gekannt und kennt mich selbst jetzt noch viel zu wenig, um über meine Bengelhaftigkeit das gehörige Urteil zu fällen. (Zu Constantia.) Hab' ich nicht recht? (X,418)

He reiterates Constantia's superiority, flattering her and angering Flora with the word "Dame." In fact, the entire opening statement is couched in words that aim to reflect her higher status, particularly the words, "wirklich ihre Lippen . . . hergeben." The "wirklich" is another effort to undermine Flora, while simultaneously strengthening Constantia's position, because

it seeks to create a measure of doubt as to the authenticity of her statement. Then he attacks Flora's interpretation, suggesting that if Constantia indeed had used the word "Bengel," she probably referred to a "Knecht," because she did not know him, not then, nor now. The terms "gekannt" and "kennt" in reference to "Bengelhaftigkeit" are interesting, since they convey not just one meaning. It is true that Constantia does not know him. However, Flora is beginning to recognize his "Bengelhaftigkeit" very definitely, but Titus has already undermined her judgement. Therefore, Constantia will not pay attention to her. Nevertheless, Constantia must recognize his mean treatment of Flora, but since she expects to benefit from it, ignores it. Only when he comes to treat her like Flora is being dealt with now, will she admit his "Bengelhaftigkeit" openly.

Flora's apparent victory was only shortlived. She is now furious, "(sehr aufgeregt und ärgerlich). Also will man mich zur Lügnerin machen?"(X,418). Titus, however, answers, "Nein, nur zur Verleumderin"(X,418). The "Nein, nur zu," appears to indicate that he seeks to mollify her, but instead, he accuses her of slander, which is worse than accusing her of a lie. In reality, Flora is completely innocent and he is guilty of slander. Again, his words unmask him. Here, his verbal attack on Flora echoes to a certain extent the earlier analysis of "spinnen" in reference to lying and to being found out in the final analysis.

Titus is relentless in his attack on Flora. Constantia

argues with Flora that Titus, as the new gardener, should go immediately to the "Schloss" to be introduced to Frau von Cypressenburg, even though the latter may not yet have returned. It would be better that he wait for her than vice versa, and Titus agrees, "Das is klar. (Zu Constantia.) Sie weiss nichts von Etikette! Das Schicklichste auf jeden Fall is, dass ich bei Ihnen wart', bis der günstige Moment erscheint"(X,418-19). Firstly, he accuses Flora of lacking etiquette, yet only moments later he pulls her flowers out of their pots to use as a bouquet which he holds together with a new satin ribbon Flora had just bought. The bouquet he intends to present to Frau von Cypressenburg. Such behaviour obviously shows a lack of etiquette. He is guilty of that of which he accuses Flora.

Secondly, Titus makes a definite break with Flora, even though she is not aware of it yet, by going with Constantia and waiting in her home for Frau von Cypressenburg. He recognizes this to be the "günstige Moment," a phrase that he uses in reference to meeting Frau von Cypressenburg. He is always keenly aware of the propitious moment--when it is best for him to make important decisions such as undermining Flora, and turning to Constantia.

Initially, Titus is seen as suffering considerably, due to the bias of others, and in his opening song, part one of stanza two, he threatened:

> Mir soll einer trau'n,
> Der wird sich verschau'n,
> Auf Ehr', dem geht's schlecht,
> Denn ich beutl' ihn recht. (X,391)

He makes good this threat, at least verbally, toward Flora, even though she has been very helpful. Simultaneously, he is dishonest toward Constantia, by professing not to believe she could have called him a "Bengel," because he knows he can still use her to his advantage. It would seem that his slander of Flora, and deception of Constantia, which has been affected through a cunning use of language, is equally malicious and deleterious, as is the prejudice he suffers. His attack on Flora began with a reproach for not introducing him immediately to Constantia. Next, he accused her of slander, and finally ridiculed her for supposedly lacking etiquette. But at the very moment he unjustly accused her of slander and lacking in etiquette, he proved himself to be guilty of moral wrongs, as well as lacking in social graces. Therefore, he is the unjust accuser, and the justly accused. Ultimately, the web his language has spun around Flora will entrap him, and she will still be biased against people with red hair. Still, at the end, Titus appears to be in a secure position, which has been achieved partly by the wig, and, to a greater extent, by his cunning use of language. Yet both of these contain the nucleus of a catastrophe: the wig, in that it might come off or be lost, and his language, because of its tendency to manipulate others. The language trickery is understandable because of the constant prejudice directed at him. Still, it must be noted that his words unmask him, and ultimately contribute significantly toward a serious crisis.

Titus has proven himself to be very successful with Constantia. His flattery and apparent submissiveness have dazzled her. She did not seem to mind that Flora was dealt with unjustly. Constantia, like Flora, insisted that he change into the clothes of her late husband, a hunter by profession. She compliments him; "Ah, das lass' ich mir gefallen. Die Gärtnerkleidung hat so etwas Bauernhaftes und Ihr Exterieur ist ja ganz für das edle Jagdkostüm geschaffen"(X,426-27). The second change, like the first, is also symbolic of his change in language, which is to compliment and to be consonant with his new position as "Jäger." The change in clothes is also symbolic of the refusal by people like Flora and Constantia to accept Titus as he is, and thus forces him to present a facade. Constantia's comment above stressed his "Exterieur." Firstly, this is a foreign word, and its use, as well as the longer and more formal sentence structure, reflects, in part, Constantia's higher social class in comparison to Flora. Secondly, it stresses his facade, and not the real Titus. Because she is so concerned about this, she has difficulty in knowing the man himself: "Sie erkennt nicht seine Bengelhaftigkeit." The "Bengelhaftigkeit" Titus cleverly hides as he compliments the change in clothes by adapting his language to the new environment.

Titus' adroitness in adapting his language to the new environment may be seen in his first reply to Constantia; "Wenn nur mein Exterieur in der gnädigen Frau dieselben gnädigen

Ansichten erzeugt; ich fürchte sehr, dass ein ungnädiger Blick von ihr mir den Hirschfänger entreisst und mir Krampen und Schaufel in die Hände spielt"(X,427). He repeats her use of "Exterieur." This, as well as expressions like "in der gnädigen Frau," "dieselben gnädigen Ansichten," "ich fürchte sehr," and "dass ein ungnädiger Blick von ihr," are language patterns which are generally more formal and measured than those he used when speaking directly to Plutzerkern, Salome or Flora. Related to this is his use of symbolic language such as "Hirschfänger," representing "Jäger," and "Krampen und Schaufel," signifying "Knecht." However, it must be noted that when speaking to the latter three, and recounting his past experiences, or commenting about an aspect of human behaviour, his language was always highly sophisticated. Another significant difference may also be seen in Titus' use of ellipsis. In Act I, Scene xvii, where he is talking with Flora, are numerous ellipses, e.g., "g'schehn," "statt'n," "sag'," whereas in Act II, Scene vii, he uses only two, and these occur in a commonplace. It is noteworthy that in this scene Titus' last words are to himself. The stage directions indicate "beiseite." Therefore, the words will not be heard by Constantia, but in these two short sentences are three ellipses. There is also a slight preponderance of complex sentences in his conversation with Constantia. All of the above noted differences in the use of language are part of Titus' attempt to manipulate Constantia in a higher social language, just as he manipulated Flora before in the language of gardeners.

The previous paragraph dealt primarily with grammatical differences. However, there is also a difference in Titus' guidance of the conversation, because he permits Constantia to talk more than he. This is very different from his meeting with Flora, where he spoke far more than she. Further differences will become apparent in the ensuing analysis of specific parts of Titus' dialogue with Constantia. But it must not be forgotten that, throughout, Titus is using language as a smoke screen in order to serve his own expediency.

In his first answer to Constantia, which has already been quoted above, Titus does not appear to be in command of the situation, which he was with Flora, Salome and Plutzerkern. But this only appears to be so. Each of his words is carefully calculated to influence Constantia's thinking, and elicit from her comments that will result in a continued improvement of his position. His opening statement, a dependent clause, conveys uncertainty as to how Frau von Cypressenburg might receive him, and the tacit admission of his dependence on Constantia for his future well-being. However, in his concern for Frau von Cypressenburg's favour is a subtle intimation of Titus' future plans: he is still aiming for a higher position, which is above anything Constantia will be able to offer. The repeated use of the adjective "gnädigen" underscores concern for the good-will, not only of Frau von Cypressenburg, but also of Constantia. He reiterates his feelings with, "ich fürchte sehr, dass ein ungnädiger Blick von ihr . . .", again emphasizing that he believes

he is in a fragile position. The fragility is, of course, very real, firstly, because of his red hair which Marquis, Plutzerkern and Salome are aware of. The unexpected appearance of any one of these could have extremely serious consequences for him, because, as Constantia later says to Salome, ". . . ich und die gnädige Frau würden einen solchen nicht dulden, wir haben beide Antipathie gegen rote Haare"(X,429). Therefore, Constantia's protection, if indeed she is influential, is very important. Secondly, he has just made himself an enemy in Flora, who undoubtedly will seize the first opportunity for revenge.

Titus' whole answer is a cleverly masked challenge, intended to have her use her position and influence in assisting him. Constantia, who possesses a strong sense of (foolish) pride, which she betrayed when succumbing to his flattery, is credulous enough to swallow the bait, "Sie trauen mir sehr wenig Einfluss im Hause zu. Mein verstorbener Mann war hier Jäger, und meine Gebieterin wird gewiss nicht glauben, dass ich immer Witwe bleiben soll"(X,427). Her first sentence seeks to assure him of the influence she wields. Thus, she will be able to protect him. The second sentence takes a new course in positing that the lady cannot expect her to remain a widow forever. Here is the beginning of a marked difference to Titus' dialogue with Flora. There, he introduced the topic of an intimate relationship, and was indeed quite forward, but here, Constantia, the woman, imports the subject.

Although Titus' foremost concern is to acquire the good will

of Frau von Cypressenburg, he immediately recognizes Constantia's intentions, and replies appropriately, "Gewiss nicht, solche Züge sind nicht für lebenslänglichen Schleier geformt" (X,427). He not only agrees, but also flatters, continuing where he left off in the scene in which he and Constantia made Flora appear a liar and a fool. His first two words, "Gewiss nicht," are taken directly from Constantia's last sentence, which is a tactic that vividly strengthens his endorsement of her statement. Yet in this endorsement is also one further contributor toward his future problems, because the more he beguiles and impresses her now, the more hostile she will become once he turns his attention to Frau von Cypressenburg. This will result in another enemy besides Flora.

The words "solche Züge" refer, on the one hand, to her facial appearance, but since they are not specific, they permit Constantia to believe what she chooses, which is a clever move on Titus' part. She may be led to think that he believes her to have an exceptionally beautiful face. On the other hand, "Züge" can also allude to her character traits, which, like those of Titus, would be flawed, particularly in view of her treatment of Flora. In this context, "solche Züge" is certainly not flattery. Thus, its use is an example of irony.

Titus concludes the apparent flattery as related to "solche Züge," noting, ". . . sind nicht für lebenslänglichen Schleier geformt." The term "Schleier" has a definite plurisignation quality, and its different denotations and connotations all

contribute toward a more meaningful understanding. Firstly, it relates--figuratively--to her mourning veil, which is there because of her dead husband. Closely related is the idiom, "den Schleier nehmen," where the implication is to go into a convent. Therefore, marriage is out of the question. Secondly, "Schleier" can also refer to a "Brautschleier." Thus, Titus is alluding to marriage by confirming her hope that he might be the right man. But there is one further meaning that "Schleier" can evoke, in that it prevents one from seeing clearly. In a sense, Titus' language has cast a "Schleier," which obstructs her view. This he has achieved primarily through flattery. But what Titus himself does not realize, is that the "Schleier" his words create for others inevitably impedes his own sight, because he thinks and verbalizes them and is seduced by them too. This precludes him from recognizing the future difficulties he is now creating for himself.

Constantia's next remark, although emphasizing her influence on the lady, thereby assuring Titus that she can and will aid him, simultaneously reiterates her interest in marriage; "Gesetzt nun, ich würde mich wieder verheiraten, zweifeln Sie, dass die gnädige Frau meinem Mann einen Platz in ihrem Dienste verleihen würde?"(X,427). Her "Gesetzt nun" is reminiscent of Titus' phrase "ich setz' nur den Fall," with which he wooed Flora, but insisted he was only hypothesizing. Only now he is being wooed by one in a higher social position than Flora, which is an indication that his position has improved.

In order not to jeopardize this, his answer is succinct and agreeable, "Das wäre Frevel"(X,427). He need not assert himself, nor seek to direct Constantia's thinking, since she is already behaving in a manner expedient to him. He uses the subjunctive to stress the remoteness of such an attitude. Indeed, it would be a sacrilege for him, because it could well result in the frustration of his plans for acquiring a good position. Therefore, it would be a willful undermining of his potential financial security, which certainly would be a sacrilege. The term "Frevel" was used by Titus once before, also in reference to money. By repeating it, he reiterates the great importance he attributes to money, which, as he also has posited in the past, is necessary for a meaningful life.

There follows an interchange between the two, which betrays a carefully calculated misuse of language, where the opposite of what is said is meant. Still, they understand one another, since both are selfishly motivated. They simultaneously interrupt and compliment each other, as they complete sentences started by the other. However, it must always be noted that irrespective of whether Titus is verbally aggressive or compliant, as is the case here, he is inevitably pursuing a goal expedient to him. Constantia continues with, "Ich sage das nicht, als ob ich auf Sie Absichten hätte -"(X,427), implying, of course, the opposite. Titus gallantly agrees as he has from the beginning of this scene, "Natürlich, da haben Sie keine Idee -"(X,427), and he too means the opposite. There is, however,

a further dimension to his answer: Constantia is not aware of his true physical appearance, i.e., his red hair, nor of his machinations, even though she witnessed how deviously his verbal thrusts disposed of Flora. His answer reverberates the meanings evoked by his previous comment about Constantia, ". . . und kennt mich selbst jetzt noch viel zu wenig"(X,418). Thus, Titus' answer, as is the case with many of his statements, is firstly partly true and partly false, and secondly, projects several levels of meaning. In this manner, Nestroy seems to reiterate that whatever is spoken has several meanings.

Since Constantia is a widow, and since her thoughts are turned to marriage, it seems only natural that she does mention her deceased husband, "Mein seliger Mann-"(X,427), but Titus immediately interrupts:

> Hören Sie auf, nennen Sie nicht den Mann selig, den der Taschenspieler „Tod" aus Ihren Armen in das Jenseits hinüberchangiert hat; nein, der ist es, der sich des Lebens in solcher Umschlingung erfreut. O Constantia! - Man macht dadurch überhaupt dem Ehestand ein sehr schlechtes Kompliment, dass man nur immer die verstorbenen Männer, die ihn schon überstanden haben, „die Seligen" heisst. (X,427-28)

At this point, Titus seeks to impress and flatter. So far he has only had a chance to argue with what Constantia has stated, but here comes into his own again. He seriously questions the traditional use of "selig" as used in reference to one deceased. It seems to be a prejudicial use of "selig," because it equates the state after death with "Seligkeit." By calling death a "Taschenspieler," traditional beliefs are held as trickery and deception. Titus is reluctant to accept the finality of death--

here is an absolute, but he has difficulty in believing in absolutes. The word "Taschenspieler" needs further attention, because Titus also can be called a juggler of language, whose words conjure up meanings that help to manipulate others.

In order to compliment Constantia further, he even obliquely praises the institution of marriage. However, because of the content, this praise elicits an uncomfortable feeling in the audience. But he does have an ulterior motive, because he concurs with her thinly veiled wish to marry him. Yet while seemingly praising marriage, he uses a term, namely, "überstanden haben," that evokes a negative connotation. This word, aside from meaning "to have died," also implies "to have overcome a trying and difficult experience." In this particular case it is marriage. Titus is undoubtedly aware of the fact that marriage to Constantia, although alleviating his financial difficulties, would certainly raise others. One example would be the problem of his red hair, which would lead to further difficulties. Ultimately, the ambiguous nature of marriage is again noted, even though it appears at first glance that Titus is praising this institution.

Titus' brief comment in praise of marriage has impressed Constantia, and leads her to assert, "Also sind Sie der Meinung, dass man an meiner Seite -"(X,428), but again he interrupts her in order to flatter once more, "Stolz in die unbekannten Welten blicken kann und sich denken, überall kann's gut sein, aber hier ist's am besten"(X,428). He begins with "Stolz," a basic trait

of Constantia, which makes it possible for Titus to use flattery so effectively with her. But he too possesses this characteristic to a certain extent. It is partly responsible for his striving for a better position, which the refusal to be a "Knecht," as well as his discarding of Flora, underscore. Since both are arrogant, it is highly unlikely that theirs would be a successful marriage. Thus, the word "Stolz," which seeks to emphasize that a marriage with Constantia would be marvellous, really intimates, at least in reference to Titus, that it would be an undesirable union. The commonplace, "überall kann's gut sein, aber hier ists' am besten," would seem to corroborate this in view of the fact that when Nestroy deals with a commonplace, he nearly always debunks it, particularly since the interpretation of the word "Stolz" already noted the potential difficulty of a proposed marriage with Constantia.

A further comment must be made about Titus' breaking into several of Constantia's sentences and completing them, as it were, for her. By doing this, he forces an opportunity for him to say whatever he finds most expedient. He flatters and impresses her, so he may manipulate her. He also creates the impression that he is able to anticipate her thoughts, intimating thereby that they truly complement each other.

As already mentioned, Titus' position, even though he has gained the favour of Constantia, is still fraught with danger--one example would be the discovery of his red hair. Moments after his last flattering attempt directed at Constantia, Salome

enters to warn Titus of strangers who have asked for him. Her sudden and unexpected appearance catches Titus unprepared. First he avoids her, but then, forgetting himself, suddenly faces her to ask a question. She is so surprised and shocked that she faints. After regaining consciousness, she explains:

> Nicht wahr, 's is a Schand', solche Stadtnerven für a Bauerndirn'? (Zu Titus, der verblüfft dasteht.) Sei'n S' nit bös, und wenn S' vielleicht den sehen mit die roten Haar', so sagen S' ihm, ich hab's gut g'meint, ich hab' ihn nur warnen wollen ich werd' ihn g'wiss nit verraten an die Leut', die um ihn fragen, und sagen S' ihm, ich werd' auch g'wiss sein' Glück nicht mehr in Weg treten . . . Sagen S' ihm das, wann S' den sehen mit die roten Haar' . . . Und jetzt bitt' ich nochmal um Verzeihung, dass ich umg'fallen bin in Zimmern, die nicht meinesgleichen sind, und b'hüt' Ihnen Gott alle zwei und-. . . jetzt fang' ich gar zum weinen an - das g'hört sich schon gar net - nix für ungut, ich bin halt schon so a dalket's Ding. (X, 430-31)

Salome's language is in marked contrast to that of Titus and Constantia, who communicate by using relatively formal, though deceptive language. The comments of Salome in the above quotation consist of one simple sentence, one compound sentence, and two complex sentences. However, even the complex sentences are easily understood. Her language is entirely on the colloquial level, and contains numerous ellipses. Whereas the language of the others definitely is intended as a smoke screen, Salome's is direct, sincere and uncomplicated, projecting only one level of meaning, and dealing primarily with the immediate and concrete situation at hand. The opening sentences express her embarrassment because she fainted, and she excuses herself once more, "Und jetzt bitt' ich nochmal um Verzeihung, dass ich umg'fallen bin in Zimmern, die nicht meinesgleichen sind.. . ." This apology,

because it is an incorrect use of a commonplace, elicits humour. She uses the social term "meinesgleichen," which has been imposed on her by society, and confuses it with the object, "Zimmer." The effect is obviously very humorous. But on the other hand, it is an unwitting assertion that she is definitely not a part of the people that live here, that her attitude and behaviour are different. She may well be naive, but she is also honest, sincere and unselfish, which is seen in various other parts of the whole quotation. Her fainting spell was physical and only momentary, whereas, figuratively speaking, Flora, as well as Constantia and Frau von Cypressenburg, in due course also lose their balance, not due to an unexpected and sudden appearance by Titus, but as a result of his cunning use of language. Their loss of balance is on the psychological level, and lasts much longer than a few moments, because they are arrogant, selfish, and thus easy targets for flattery. Due to the prejudicial nature of these women, Titus' language is able to act like a veil in front of their eyes, causing them to be unable to recognize his machinations. Salome, however, knows the true Titus and loves him, as the following words reveal:

> Sei'n S' nit bös, und wenn S' vielleicht den sehen mit die roten Haar', so sagen S' ihm, ich hab's gut g'meint, ich hab' ihn nur warnen wollen ich werd' ihn g'wiss nit verraten an die Leut', die um ihn fragen, und sagen S' ihm, ich werd' auch g'wiss sein' Glück nicht mehr in Weg treten -. (X,430-31)

The above quotation not only expresses her love, it is also a warning to Titus that people have been looking for him and it assures him that she will not betray him. Constantia, who does

not truly know Titus, is unable to understand Salome's simple and direct language, although it must be noted that just prior to her remarks, she lied when she denied knowing Titus. One might argue, of course, that she knows only the red-haired Titus, not the one wearing the black wig, since the black-haired one is dishonest and manipulative. It seems--in view of Salome's denial of knowing Titus--that even a completely honest person like Salome, when in the company of manipulators and deceivers like Titus and Constantia, is also compelled to misuse language, in spite of the fact that her motives are entirely unselfish and honest. At the start of this scene, Salome noted about the room, ". . . mir verschlagt's die Red', wenn ich so in der Pracht drinnen steh!"(X,428). The admission,"mir verschlagt's die Red'," is significant, because it indicates her inability to speak effectively when surrounded by so much "Pracht," which is really a facade. This detracts from what is essential, namely, sincere and honest communication between people. It also suggests that complex language flourishes in societies which demand its use. Thus, the danger in misusing language, in being deceptive, seems to be present everywhere, ready to lead the unwary astray.

The web of deception so cunningly spun by Titus' language has almost been torn by Salome, who, in order to protect him, becomes deceptive herself, at least towards Constantia. Nevertheless, Titus' position from now on becomes increasingly more tenuous until it collapses, even though there are times when

he seems very secure. Constantia is rather suspicious because of Salome's agitated state, and confronts Titus with, "Sie werden mir doch nicht abstreiten wollen, dass sie in heftigster Bewegung war?"(X,431). Titus' retort is similar to his destructive argument against Flora, in that he does not disagree directly with Constantia's statement, but twists it to the extent that it looks ridiculous, "Was geht denn aber das mich an? Zuerst haben S' mich völlig ausg'macht, weil sie bewegungslos war, und jetzt fahren S' über mich, weil sie eine Bewegung hat; ich begreif' gar nicht -"(X,432). His opening statement, a question, seeks to disavow his acquaintance with Salome, and is, therefore, an outright lie. "Was geht denn aber das mich an?" is a comment that wants to reject the fact that it indeed concerns him. Yet it was his sudden question to Salome, "Und was haben Sie den Leuten g'sagt?"(X,429), that betrayed his concern, and caused her momentary fainting spell.

He then deflects Constantia's attack by assailing her: "Zuerst haben S' mich völlig ausg'macht weil sie bewegungslos war . . .," which, of course, is true, because she saw him as directly responsible for Salome's fainting. Thus, Constantia had a valid point. This Titus refuses to admit, pointing out only her suspicion, not its cause. He goes on to argue that she is now scolding him because Salome was so agitated, which certainly was the case, but again, he ignores the cause, namely, his presence. He uses the words "bewegungslos" and "Bewegung" as the key terms in his argument in a way that cunningly avoids

the "Beweggrund" for both, thus, attempting to have Constantia appear ridiculous, which is always an effective way of undermining the opposition. Titus' defence is concluded with, "ich begreif' gar nicht -," a lie. He opens and concludes with a blatant lie. Another noteworthy aspect is Titus' return to colloquial usage, of which the numerous ellipses are one example. The reason for this seems to be that he is still in the process of recuperating from his fright caused by Salome's appearance and fainting, as well as from the worry of being discovered by Constantia. Nevertheless, he has been circumspect enough literally to talk himself out of a potentially serious situation.

To allay Constantia's suspicions further and reiterate his aims, he states, "Ich bin ein Jüngling, der Karriere machen muss! (mit Beziehung.) Meine Ideen schweifen ins Höhere -" (X,432). This is a return to more formal language, which is a stratagem used to deceive others in order to achieve a particular goal. The quotation is intended specifically to assure Constantia that he is interested only in her. Still, the word "Karriere" has a selfish ring, particularly in view of Titus' treatment of Flora, and, to a lesser extent, as seen in his attitude towards Salome. The imperative, "Karriere machen muss," intimates that he will not permit anyone to stand in his way, and that he feels compelled to improve his position, irrespective of the cost to others.

"Meine Ideen schweifen ins Höhere -" ingeminates the above

thought. It should be a warning to Constantia that he will discard her too. The verb "schweifen" betrays that he has no definite plan. He is, though, very adaptable, and will seize any opportunity to climb. The fact that he is never really satisfied with his present position, is shown by his use of "Höhere," i.e., he is constantly aiming for that which is higher. This drive will inevitably lead to Frau von Cypressenburg, and when Constantia expresses a mild concern because he will have to possess at least a rudimentary knowledge about "Schriftstellerei" in order to impress Frau von Cypressenburg, Titus nimbly replies, referring specifically to flattery as a major facet of his modus operandi, "Kinderei! Wenn ich auch nichts von der Schriftstellerei weiss, von die Schriftsteller weiss ich desto mehr. Ich darf nur ihre Sachen göttlich finden, so sagt sie gewiss, ‚Ah, der Mann versteht's - tiefe Einsicht - gründliche Bildung!'" (X,432). Again, he expresses his knowledge of basic human nature. He has done so earlier when insisting that he understood "Vegetabilien" because he understood people, and before that in comments about prejudice to Salome. He is convinced that flattery will also be successful with Frau von Cypressenburg because it appeals directly to a person's vanity.

His successful use of flattery is supportive of his belief that he understands human nature, particularly weaknesses which he exploits whenever expedient. Although Titus has been flattering Constantia from the moment they first met, and even though he just told her that this is how he maniuplates people,

she remains blind to his insincerity, in fact, she is impressed by his craftiness, noting to herself that Titus is certainly superior to Marquis, her lover. This is ironic, because it was Marquis who gave Titus the black wig. In order for flattery to be successful, it seems that a certain blindness is necessary in the person at whom it is aimed--it is accepted without critical thought. This is similar to the attitude which not only permits, but also furthers prejudicial behaviour. Both modes of thought, or lack of thought, are usually found in a person like Flora and Constantia. Prejudicial behaviour and receptivity to flattery are both rooted in the same thought pattern--the former relates to the object, the latter to the subject.

Titus has not only been successful in disposing of Flora, but he has also reinforced his position with Constantia, and weathered a near catastrophe due to the unexpected appearance of Salome. In fact, Constantia has even prepared him for his first meeting with Frau von Cypressenburg. But before this happens, Titus experiences a severe setback, which nearly terminates his welcome here. The jealousy of Marquis is partly responsible for a situation that almost ends in disaster. As a result, Titus' manipulative use of language will increase, accompanied by a commensurate increase in meanness towards anyone who might be a potential threat.

Just as Titus was in dread when Salome came to warn him, so the unexpected appearance of Marquis elicits new fear in him.

In their past encounter, Marquis had proven to be a formidable opponent whose verbal attacks Titus was unable to parry successfully. Marquis, even more so than Titus, used language effectively as a smoke screen, and Titus discovered what it felt like to be manipulated by another linguistic trickster. As they meet for the second time, Marquis is at a decided advantage because he knows about Titus' red hair. It is because of people like Marquis that Titus feels he must treat others harshly if he is to survive. The negative experiences Titus relates in his song and recounts to Salome are partly repeated in Marquis' behaviour toward him. Originally, the latter refused to accept Titus as he is, in spite of the fact that he had saved his life. Marquis presented Titus with a wig, suggesting, thereby, that he should hide his true self, and be dishonest. But when Titus does this, he is in constant danger of being discovered. This danger he seeks to fend off with a crafty use of language. Ultimately, it is Marquis who takes back the black wig, leaving Titus in an extremely precarious position. The latter feels driven to an increasingly greater use of deceptive language.

When the two meet for the second time, Constantia is at first present, but as she leaves, Titus calls out, "Adieu, reizende Kammeralistin!"(X,436). Marquis forbids Titus "diese Galanterien." The latter retorts, "Was? Sie drohen mir?", showing surprise that Marquis would threaten him, even though he had saved his life. But the latter replies, ". . . vergessen Sie ja nicht, dass Ihr Schicksal am Haare hängt, und -"(X,436).

His skillful use of language comes to the fore immediately. Titus knows only too well that his hair seems to control his fate. Firstly, his own red hair has resulted in prejudicial behaviour toward him, causing him, as he told Salome, to be without money, friends, and a girl to love. As a result of such a harsh fate, he left home, and is not seeking to establish himself here. Secondly, his new well-being or fate is also dependent to a certain extent on his hair, only now it is the black wig which was forced onto him also by fate. Thus, Marquis' words strike Titus where he is most vulnerable.

Titus attempts to appeal to the other's sense of gratitude, "Und dass Sie so undankbar sein könnten, das Perucken-Verhältnis zu verraten"(X,437). He is surprised Marquis could be so "undankbar," but this word also describes its speaker, certainly Flora would say so. Here is a further example of Titus being the accuser as well as the accused. Of particular concern to Titus is the "Perucken-Verhältnis." This term could refer to several critical relationships. Firstly, it represents the connection between Titus and Marquis, two adroit manipulators of language. Although Titus has saved the other's life, the latter is not filled with gratitude, and even though he has been of assistance to Titus, he also contributes significantly to his unmasking in the future. Thus, Titus' relationship with Marquis is a problematic one. Secondly, "Perucken-Verhältnis" is also representative of his connection with Flora and Constantia, who consider him to have black hair, and, one might say, have a

relationship, not with Titus, but with his wig, in as far as they are influenced by it. Thirdly, because of his black wig, and that which it also symbolizes, namely, deception, the only meaningful relationship with a member of the opposite sex, namely Salome, is not possible, because the two communicate with each other and relate to each other directly and honestly. Lastly, "Perucken-Verhältnis" is suggestive of the relationship with his total environment, one where he feels he must be deceptive and manipulative in order to retain his false position in the "Schloss" of Frau von Cypressenburg. This position Titus sees threatened with the appearance of Marquis, and his present dialogue with this individual will seek to prevent its collapse.

Marquis, however, remains determined, "Und dass ich so klug sein könnte, mich auf diese Weise eines Nebenbuhlers zu entledigen"(X,437). He takes Titus' first clause almost verbatim, but one of the two words that he changes is of key significance, in that "undankbar" becomes "klug." Thus, Marquis rejects the emotional element, and emphasizes the cerebral one. However, at the same time he betrays his egoistic qualities. Titus' surprise increases, "Was? So spricht der Mann? Der Mann zu dem Mann, ohne den dieser Mann ein Mann des Todes wäre? Ohne welchen Mann diesen Mann jetzt die Karpfen fresseten?"(X,437). The first "Mann" refers to Marquis, and registers Titus' utter amazement at the other's attitude. The amazement is strongly reiterated by the second use of "Mann," actually "der Mann," an exact and immediate repetition, which also designates Marquis, and conveys

Titus' professed surprise. The third use of "Mann" follows closely on the heels of the second, but it pertains to Titus. So far, the term "Mann" has been used three times, yet nothing specific about it has been said. The fourth "Mann" relates back to Marquis, as does the fifth usage, which is part of a common expression, "ein Mann des Todes," and, thus, underscores his deep indebtedness to Titus. This indebtedness Titus has sought to emphasize to Marquis through the repetition of the term "Mann," seeking, thereby, to appeal to his honour as a man, and also by using interrogative statements through which Titus attempts to express his professed disbelief of Marquis' intentions. The final statement, also an interrogative one, uses "Mann" two more times, as it reiterates Titus' surprise and Marquis' potential fate, had Titus not intervened. Here, Titus uses drastic terms, such as "Karpfen fresseten," which not only elicits images of a watery death, but also depicts vividly the potential fate of Marquis' potential corpse. The latter, so it seems, would have died twice, once by drowning, and once "von Karpfen gefressen." Titus tries to tell Marquis by his frequent use of "Mann" that he should recognize Titus' manly deed and act appropriately. He uses the term "Mann" in a way which not only questions Marquis' manliness, but also casts doubt on the ostensible qualities that man in general supposedly has. Thereby, he points to the inherent ambiguities of the term "man," and words in general, as it relates to his non-physical part. In order to underline his surprise, Titus uses only interrogative phrases and

sentences, challenging Marquis to explain himself--perhaps he might become less adamant. But Marquis reiterates his determination, "Ich bin Ihnen zu grossem Dank, aber keinesweges zur Abtretung meiner Braut verpflichtet"(X,437). This leads Titus to incorporate in his reply a stratagem Marquis used in his last reply, namely, "Abtretung," but he changes it to the verb form, "Wer sagt denn, dass Sie abgetreten werden soll?"(X,437). Thereby, he emphasizes a further meaning, a particularly negative one, since "abtreten" means not only "to withdraw or retire," but also refers to cleaning the dirt off one's shoes. This indirectly associates Constantia with dirt, i.e., supposedly he is not at all interested in her. However, a few moments later, in a dream, Titus does indeed show that he likes her.

Titus' incorporation of "Abtretung" discussed above, is one example of his skill to use an opponent's words with the effect of a boomerang, not only turning it back on the original user, but simultaneously infusing it with a further meaning that either ridicules the opponent, or seriously undermines his assertions. In reference to Marquis' use of "Abtretung meiner Braut," the term "Abtretung" is certainly a strong word in his line of argument. Therefore, it would be preposterous of anyone to suggest that he should surrender Constantia to Titus, even though the latter did save his life. Titus does not demand that, at least not in his argument. Instead, he changes "Abtretung" to "abtreten," thus, not only allaying Marquis' suspicion, but also referring to Constantia in a derogatory manner, and, thereby,

indirectly striking a blow at Marquis, her lover. Another example of such a stratagem was Titus' use of "Bengel," with which he destroyed the unsuspecting Flora.

When Marquis leaves, he is apparently satisfied by Titus' insistence, "Ich buhle ja nicht um die Liebe, nur um die Protektion der Kammerfrau"(X,437). But it must be obvious to Titus, especially in view of his original conversation with Constantia, that a prerequisite for her "Protektion" will be his love. Therefore, his statement, whether or not sincere, is not consonant with the relationship between him and Constantia. Again, Titus' words are true to a certain extent, but beyond that, there is a further meaning that negates the more superficial one, which is specifically for the benefit of Marquis.

Since first entering Frau von Cypressenburg's "Gutshof," Titus has had to be extremely alert and wary in the pursuit of a position. After the latest crisis with Marquis, he is understandably tired as he reflects about his situation:

> Verfluchte G'schicht'! Heut' kommt viel über mein' Kopf; wenn ich nur nicht auch so viel drin hätt'; aber der Tokayerdunst - und das - dass die Madame Kammerfrau dem Friseur seine Jungfer Braut is, geht mir auch - (auf den Kopf deutend) da herum . . . Das wär' eigentlich Herzenssache, aber so ein Herz is dalket und indiskret zugleich; wie's a bissl ein' kritischen Fall hat, so schickt's ihn gleich dem Kopf über'n Hals, wenn's auch sieht, dass der Kopf ohnedies den Kopf voll hat. Ich bin ordentlich matt. (X,437-38)

His concern, "Heut' kommt viel über mein' Kopf," is stated in the present tense, which indicates not only that much has already happened, but that more is to be expected. "Kopf" is a key term, because since his opening song, he has made frequent

references to it, reiterating not only his red hair, and his uniqueness, but also the importance of reason, which at this time, because of fatigue and the "Tokayer," has become somewhat clouded.

A further unsettling factor is his realization that Constantia is Marquis' fiancée, at least according to Marquis. For Titus, a firm believer in reason, such thoughts, because they have a strong emotional aspect, are a matter for the heart. It, however, is not competent to deal with such an aspect that is both delicate and explosive, for as soon as complexities arise, it acts precipitately, as shown by the words, "dem Kopf über'n Hals." Titus uses a commonplace, but alternates the two nouns, and achieves, thereby, not only the usual meaning by association, but also stresses that in the final analysis reason must deal with problems. It should be the guiding force, since actions which have their mainspring in emotions can be very foolish, as the statement, "aber so ein Herz is dalket und indiskret zugleich," clearly notes.

But at this critical moment, critical because the jealous Marquis is still near, Titus' power of reasoning is weakened considerably. He is slightly inebriated, and as a result of this, his emotions, particularly in reference to Constantia, have a freer reign than is usually the case. He falls asleep for a short time; thus, his emotions are entirely free without having to fear any intervention by reason. His vulnerability is now obvious. The result is an indiscretion which Marquis

hears. Promptly, he removes the black wig from Titus' head, and leaves with it. Titus' brief nap is one instance where his guard was down, and he was unable to use his reason to assert himself through a clever use of language. Instead, he muttered several words in total abandon. This resulted in an immediate crisis. In order for Titus to survive, at least in this environment, he cannot be honest and direct, but must be manipulative and deceptive. However, such action will inevitably result in further difficulties, because the more he uses language as a smoke screen, the more tenuous his position becomes. His present situation clearly attests to this--he used his "Kopf" to fool Flora and Constantia, but without the wig, he may--in a sense--lose his head, certainly as far as his position in this household is concerned. Thus, the feeling of imminent danger intimated in the statement, "Heut' kommt viel über mein' Kopf," has proven to be valid.

Only seconds after awakening, Titus becomes aware of the loss of his wig. It seems that he has at least three alternatives. Firstly, he could decide to present himself to the lady as is, but in all probability, he would be dismissed forthwith. Secondly, he could just leave the "Gutshof" without any attempt to retain his position. Or thirdly, he could make an attempt to hide his red hair, continue to be deceptive and manipulative, and seek to retain his position, no matter how precarious and vulnerable it might be. Titus opts for the latter. This is most significant, because it clearly indicates that he alone, without

prompting from anyone, as was the case when Marquis gave him the black wig, consciously chooses to continue on a dubious and perilous course, where only trickery and deception, irrespective of how cunningly and subtly they are couched, carry the seed of self-destruction, as has been shown in the last encounter with Marquis. Titus' stay at the "Gutshof" will inevitably conclude in embarrassment for him.

Titus promptly realizes that someone has robbed him of his "Talisman":

> Wer hat diese Bosheit - da ist Eifersucht im Spiel! Othellischer Friseur! Pomadiges Ungeheuer! Das hast du getan! Du hast den grässlichen Perückenraub begangen! Jetzt, in dem enscheidendsten, hoffnungsvollsten Moment stehe ich da als Windlicht an der Totenbahr' meiner jungen Karriere! Halt - er is da drin und frisiert die Tour der Gnädigen - der kommt mir nicht aus; du gibst mir meine Perücken wieder, oder zittere, Kampelritter, ich beutl' dir die Haarpuderseel' bis aufs letzte Stäuberl aus'm Leib! (X,440)

He soon knows who is responsible, "Othellischer Friseur! Pomadiges Ungeheuer!" As Titus has often shown in the past when being very emphatic, he does not use ready language, but creates special words, which are reflective not only of his intense reaction, but also of his adroitness with language. In the four words above that refer to Marquis, the first and last, as well as the middle two, not only reinforce each other, but also give the whole quotation more penetrating power. Aside from the obvious humour, these words also underline the seriousness of the situation as far as Titus is concerned. The jealousy of Marquis, as expressed by "Othellischer," seems to have terminated all

further chances Titus had. As far as he is concerned, only a monster could commit such a deed. Fully consonant with his general treatment of the language, Titus uses and creates words that relate specifically to the sphere of Marquis' activity and to his milieu in general. His language dealt in a corresponding manner with the figures discussed previously. Thus, the words are congruent with the person and his environment, i.e., the meaning is expressed in the words themselves, in their structure, not in the sense that the meaning is separate from its sign, the word. This always lends pertinency and frequently humour.

Titus even creates a word specifically for the stealing of the wig, namely, "Perückenraub," and to emphasize that this is extremely serious, which of course it is for him, he uses the adjective "grässlich," a word that also elicits humour, since it seems more appropriate in describing a heinous crime, but not the stealing of a wig. "Perückenraub" itself relates back to a previously coined word, namely, "Perucken-Verhältnis," which Marquis has now betrayed. Thus, key words in Nestroy are again shown to relate back to former key words, reiterating and strengthening individual themes, as well as corresponding with similar themes. In this case, Titus' personal neologism, "Perückenraub," pertains to the black wig and its numerous related aspects, and through its connection with "Perucken-Verhältnis," it is also associated with his relationship to Constantia and its various ramifications.

After venting his anger in a verbal outburst, Titus laments

momentarily his situation, "Jetzt, in dem entscheidendsten, hoffnungsvollsten Moment stehe ich da als Windlicht an der Totenbahr' meiner jungen Karriere!"(X,440). The words "entscheidensten, hoffnungsvollsten Moment" echo his former statement to Constantia, ". . . bis der günstige Moment erscheint" (X,419), which was in reference to his presentation to Frau von Cypressenburg. It is one of his skills to recognize a propitious moment and use it to his fullest advantage. What could well have been the most propitious moment of all, seems to have been destroyed by Marquis, who, to a minor extent, was also responsible for making it possible in the first place. Just as Titus used language to give vent to his angry feelings toward Marquis, so he now verbalizes, as it were, the obituary of his "Karriere" and, in the process, is able to collect himself. Thus, it may be posited that for Titus, language also has a therapeutic, a self-healing effect.

In the first quotation of the above paragraph, Titus depicts himself as a "Windlicht" at the bier of his young career. Indirectly, the term also refers to the environment, which is a hostile one, as "Wind" intimates by itself, but the whole implies this too, because it designates a device used in adverse conditions. Ultimately, it reinforces what has already been brought out by an analysis of the terms "weite Welt" and "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen." Each of these terms is a further description of the hostilities confronting Titus. But "Windlicht" contains also "Licht," a word frequently used to represent reason.

This, as manifested in language, is Titus' most potent instrument in dealing with his environment. Just as a "Windlicht" continues to cast its beam, even though blown and buffeted about, so Titus, because of reason, has the resilience to persist. Thus, the one term depicts the negative environment, buttressing previous references to this theme. Simultaneously, it represents not only Titus in the physical sense, but also his awareness of the difficult surroundings, as well as that quality in him which helps him to master the difficulties. In a nutshell: the compound noun "Windlicht" is pregnant with meaning, as it stands for and elucidates Titus and his hostile environment. Individual words evoke images that frequently can be realized only after close analysis, particularly in connection with previous key words.

In a very short span of time, Titus has collected himself and no longer bemoans his misfortune, but instead threatens the one responsible, "Halt - er ist da drin und frisiert die Tour der Gnädigen - der kommt mir nicht aus; du gibst mir meine Perücken wieder, oder zittere, Kampelritter, ich beutl' dir die Haarpuderseel' bis aufs letzte Stäuberl aus'm Leib!"(X,440). Titus is especially aroused by Marquis' behaviour, and instead of calling him by his name, he coins one. In this manner, he not only designates a particular person, but also conveys his attitude toward that individual. In his opening song, he referred to someone as a "Spitzbub'," and now he calls Marquis a "Kampelritter." Here too, he uses a compound noun, one that

involves opposites. Thus, he contrasts and ridicules "Kampel" and "Ritter." The former designates a common, ordinary person, whereas the latter stands for one considerably higher in the social hierarchy. Titus depicts Marquis as a would-be knight seemingly attempting to protect a would-be lady from would-be distress. Thereby, he ridicules Marquis, and destroys his viability in the eyes of the audience, and, simultaneously, he criticizes, in an oblique manner, pretence.

In further describing Marquis, Titus threatens to "beutl" or pull Marquis' "Haarpudersee1'" in such a way that the last "Stäuberl" will leave his body. By using these terms Titus again, and in a derogatory manner, draws attention to his opponent's occupation, and aims ridicule at Marquis' soul, which he sees composed of "Haarpuder," something that is easily removed or lost if subjected to the slightest amount of violence. Just as hair powder loses its substances when exposed to even a light force, so Marquis' soul, his essence, lacks substance and perpetuity. The nullity of Marquis, already seen in "Kampelritter," is reiterated in "Haarpuderseel'," two terms created by Titus to depict several facets of the other's basic nature, with an emphasis on his insignificance.

When Titus voices these threats directed at Marquis, no-one is present, no-one hears him. This is symbolic of Titus' situation in general. No-one, with the exception of Salome, is willing to listen and to understand. The prejudicial attitude of others has successfully effected his isolation, which could

easily lead to despair were it not for his resilience. His sharp insight into human nature allows him to anticipate the behaviour of those around him, and his resilience provides him with the necessary strength to follow through with appropriate plans. His angry outbursts, aside from acting as a safety valve, also convey his frustrations and feeling of futility he experiences repeatedly. They are also one manifestation of his ability, as reflected in his command of the language, to maintain a precarious balance in dealing with the problems that continuously assail him.

As Titus leaves, he is determined to regain the black wig. It has already been mentioned that he decides to stay, and this choice is crucial. Whereas before, the black wig was presented to him, he now seeks it himself, intimating, thereby, that he freely choses to continue deceiving and manipulating people.

When Frau von Cypressenburg calls Titus, her intentions are to dismiss him. She is annoyed with Constantia for having hired him without specific orders from her. It seems that Titus senses her intentions, because he enters with his language guns blazing. Even though he is only a servant, he begins the conversation, and makes certain that he will have at least one chance at flattery, "Hier bin ich und beuge mich im Staube vor der hohen Gebieterin, der ich in Zukunft dienen soll"(X,441). His language is measured and appropriate, but the four statements must be examined for their veracity. The first one, "Hier bin ich," is introductory. It is true, however, that the second one, "und

beuge mich im Staube," is already a lie. There is, of course, no "Staub," unless one considers it in the sense of his calculated use of words, which seek to stir up dust in order to act as a screen, thereby making it impossible for Frau von Cypressenburg to recognize his cunning. In fact, his complete opening statement seeks to do just that. Untrue is also his professed "und beuge mich." Titus never bows before anyone, because submissiveness is decidedly not one of his traits. This he states most emphatically to Salome, "Was? Ich soll Knecht werden?"(X,397). On the other hand, with his clever use of language, as manifested in flattery and deception, he usually is able to bend the other person in a way expedient to him. This will again become apparent in a few moments in reference to Frau von Cypressenburg. His third comment, in which he calls her "die hohe Gebieterin," is the most obvious attempt at flattery--it also is not true. "Hohe Gebieterin" may be a proper title for the ruler of a country, or a part thereof, but hardly the suitable address for the owner of a "Gutshof." The concluding words, "der ich in Zukunft dienen soll," although seemingly true at this moment, will, nevertheless, soon be proven incorrect. For Titus, the above considerations are totally insignificant. Important only is the projection of humility and recognition of her superiority as related to his lowly position.

Again, his carefully chosen words have been successful, as may be seen in Frau von Cypressenburg's remark, "Recht ein artiger Blondin!"(X,441). But the word "Blondin" shocks Titus.

Obviously, she is "nicht abgeneigt" as she states in her next comment. Still, Titus believes he has black hair, but this is not the case. Like Titus, her words also are not true, yet she is unaware of this. Firstly, he is not "artig," at least not in terms of his treatment of others. Secondly, he is not a "Blondin." Thus, the opening statements of both Titus and Frau von Cypressenburg do not contain truth. They are anticipatory of the lack of veracity that will mark their remaining dialogue.

Titus is stunned because he has been called a "Blondin," and he seeks to explain it to himself with, "Ich hab' da drin aus lauter Dunkelheit a lichte Perücken erwischt"(X,442). The word "Dunkelheit" refers not only to the physical and specific, but is symbolic of his general situation. Figuratively speaking, there is darkness around him, manifested by prejudice which is actually "Dummheit," as Titus has told Salome. It is prejudice that forces him to wear a wig and use deceptive language. But the fact that he now wears a "lichte Perücken," reiterates his use of reason. He stands in sharp contrast to his environment. The touch of humour in this particular situation partly masks the seriousness. As is usually the case in Nestroy, when one feels compelled to laugh, one must suspect a particularly serious aspect, be it obvious or hidden.

Immediately after the introduction, and just prior to a serious dialogue between Titus and the lady, he reminds himself, "Ich stehe jetzt einer Schriftstellerin gegenüber, da tun's die

Alletagsworte nicht, da heisst's jeder Red' ein Feiertags-g'wandel anziehn"(X,442). This shows Titus being keenly aware of the importance of appropriate or expedient language. His use of the term "Feiertagsg'wandel" reiterates the idea that language, like clothing, can be, and is, used as a facade in assisting a particular individual to project an image of himself, one that is, as it were, custom made, therefore not natural. It does not project the true nature of a person whose intention is to deceive and manipulate. This is precisely Titus' aim, as several representative comments by him in this scene will verify. Frau von Cypressenburg has momentarily been occupied with instructions to Emma, her daughter, after which she turns to Titus, "Also jetzt zu Ihm, mein Freund!"(X,442). Her words "mein Freund" reiterate that she is favourably disposed toward him. He sees this as a good omen, replying, "Das ist der Augenblick, den ich im gleichen Grade gewünscht und gefürchtet habe, dem ich sozusagen mit zaghafter Kühnheit, mit mutvollem Zittern entgegengesehen"(X,442). Firstly, it must be noted that he is using formal language even more so than when he spoke with Constantia. In this scene with Frau von Cypressenburg, Act II, Scene xvii, Titus speaks thirteen times, three times to himself, and ten times to the lady. Each of the ten answers consists of one sentence, which is either compound or complex. The use of ellipses when addressing Frau von Cypressenburg is very infrequent: once when he is happily surprised, and the other time when referring to his "Livree der Armut," which

he describes as, "ein g'flickter Rock mit z'rissene Aufschläg'" (X,445). In the last example, the form is indeed congruent with the meaning. Whenever he makes notes to himself, there is a marked difference in the language style, e.g., Frau von Cypressenburg comments about "Genialität", "Charmant! Er hat sehr viel, aber nichts gründlich gelernt, darin besteht die Genialität"(X,444), and Titus remarks under his breath, "(für sich). Das is 's erste, was ich hör'; jetzt kann ich mir's erklären, warum's so viele Genies gibt"(X,444). Here, he uses relatively short statements that contain numerous ellipses and that are not measured. Measured language is always part of a scheme, which intends to manipulate the addressee.

In Titus' quotation cited at the start of the foregoing paragraph, he evokes the feeling that this is an auspicious moment, in fact, so much so, that he seems to liken it indirectly to an audience with royalty, reiterating, thereby, the images he thought to elicit with "Hohe Gebieterin." Again, his aim is to flatter and impress, while in actual fact he deceives. Beyond that, the quotation, through its structure and specific choice of words, underscores his precarious and problematic situation, not only at this particular moment, but in general. The opposites, "gewünscht" and "gefürchtet", do create a balance, or, one might say, reflect his insecure position, one that could easily deteriorate and make his stay untenable. He most certainly cannot hope for Constantia's aid because of the blond wig, and Flora's help is, for obvious reasons, not to be expected.

This uncertainty is reiterated by the two oxymorons "zaghafter Kühnheit" and "mutvollem Zittern," where the noun and its adjective create an antithesis, one seemingly controlling the other, thus, again, intimating a delicate balance. This balance is seen not only between the adjective and the noun in either oxymoron, but also between the two together, which, to a certain extent, form one large oxymoron. Furthermore, since each individual oxymoron, or the two together, form a balance, or cancel each other, Titus has not communicated anything definite about his feelings, in spite of the fact that he has just used twenty-three words. In order to overcome his particular precarious existence, caused in part by the prejudicial behaviour of others, Titus must attempt a balancing act, but, thereby, he is prevented from making any significant progress, because a definite movement in any direction will be precipitous. In this manner, the choice of words and structure of a sentence intimate and convey meanings in themselves, just as much as when seen only as signs for particular units of meaning, where the latter is seen separately from the signs. The signs, that is the words, are the meaning, while simultaneously designating a meaning.

Frau von Cypressenburg, like Flora and Constantia, succumbs to Titus' flattery and dazzling use of language, as may be seen in her reply, "Er hat keine Ursache, sich zu fürchten, Er hat eine gute Tournüre, einen agreable Fasson, und wenn Er sich gut anlässt - wo hat Er denn früher gedient?(X,443). An answer

consisting of one word or a brief statement would be sufficient, but Titus wants to impress further. Therefore, he must say more, "Nirgends; es ist die erste Blüte meiner Jägerschaft, die ich zu Ihren Füssen niederlege, und die Livree, die ich jetzt bewohne, umschliesst eine zwar dienstergebene, aber bis jetzt noch ungediente Individualität"(X,443). He has not served anywhere as a "Jäger." This seems to be a definite disadvantage. However, he turns it to look like a marked advantage for her. The clause following "Nirgends" immediately starts to convince Frau von Cypressenburg that she will benefit by hiring him, giving the impression that he is sacrificing what he calls "die erste Blüte meiner Jägerschaft." The term "Blüte" is used generally to describe the prime of something, such as, "die Blüte der Ritterschaft fiel im Kampfe," but Titus has never been a "Jäger," and therefore, he can hardly sacrifice the prime of it to her. The use of the modifier "erste," with which he seeks to convey the uniqueness of this "Blüte," really underscores his inexperience, which he aims to negate. Furthermore, "erste Blüte," which intimates the beginning of the prime of life, when used in reference to "Jägerschaft," is absurd, since a hunter's work consists of destroying life. Thus, Titus ridicules, but does not praise nor esteem his "Jägerschaft" as he has Frau von Cypressenburg believe.

The phrase, "zu Ihren Füssen niederlege," expands on the expression "hohe Gebieterin," because only one in her position would be worthy of such treatment. However, "hohe Gebieterin"

was seen as an address entirely unsuitable for Frau von Cypressenburg. Similarly, "zu Ihren Füssen niederlege," which is to convey submissive devotion, is an inappropriate phrase in this context. The question then arises whether Titus indeed has to offer anything as a hunter to Frau von Cypressenburg. So far, he is inexperienced, for he still has to prove himself. When he starts as a hunter, he might well be a failure. Even if he were to become very successful in his new profession, he would still not possess anything so valuable that it should be referred to as "erste Blüte meiner Jägerschaft." Aside from indirectly satirizing that which he supposedly esteems highly, namely his virginal "Jägerschaft," Titus also ridicules pompous and turgid language, and obliquely scoffs at Frau von Cypressenburg, who, as will become increasingly more obvious, subscribes wholly to such a preposterous use of language. Because of this, she is the gullible victim of Titus' deceptive loquacity.

It is this attitude of Frau von Cypressenburg which ascribes an undue value, firstly, to a person's external appearance as previously exposed by Titus' use of the commonplace "das Kleid macht den Mann," and secondly, to a fancy and flashy use of language, which prevents direct and honest communication, of which Titus can be accused with his answer. Titus is keenly aware of Frau von Cypressenburg's susceptibility, and expressed his intention to assail her weak point when stating, "da heisst's jeder Red' ein Feiertagsg'wandel anziehen"(X,442). In noting this, he seems to distinguish between communicating as succinctly as

possible, and using language in such a way that it does not impart information, rather it only appears to do so, i.e., it is a smoke screen that serves the speaker. It is the latter usage that Titus nearly always employs.

So far, Titus has conveyed his intent. Now, he carefully projects an attitude when he refers to his "Livree" and his "dienstergebene Individualität." The clause, "und die Livree, die ich jetzt bewohne"(X,443), aside from alluding to the several changes he has already made today, also indicates his determination to maintain his present position. This is marked by the adverb "jetzt." The use of "dienstergeben" is to convince the lady of his devout attitude, which he already sought to project in his first words to her, which began with, "Hier bin ich und beuge mich . . ."(X,441). However, the concluding phrase begins with "aber," and its juxtaposition to "dienstergeben" weakens the latter. Also, it seems to be further undermined by the adjective "ungediente," which in turn, is buttressed by the first word, "Nirgends." Finally, the noun "Individualität" also weakens "dienstergeben," because it stresses uniqueness, a quality hardly suitable for a servant, because the governing factor in his life is not his own wishes, but those of his master. By the juxtaposition of specific words, through the use of antithetical words--"dienstergeben" and "ungediente"--and by coining words to describe specific situations, as well as by reiterating key thoughts, Titus projects an attitude that Frau von Cypressenburg welcomes, but that is non-existent. Whatever else he might be, "dienstergeben" or a "Knecht" he is not.

Even though Titus has replied to Frau von Cypressenburg's question, she still does not know anything specific about his past experiences. This is a repetition of his stratagem aimed at Plutzerkern, Salome, and the two women in the employ of Frau von Cypressenburg. She then asks about his father's occupation, but instead of a specific answer, Titus replies, "Nein, er betreibt ein stilles, abgeschiedenes Geschäft, bei dem die Ruhe das einzige Geschäft ist; er liegt von höherer Macht gefesselt, und doch ist er frei und unabhängig, denn er ist Verweser seiner selbst - er ist tot"(X,443). He uses thirty-seven words to tell her that his father is dead, but does not answer her question. The immediate overall impression the audience receives is of his father busily engaged in being dead. Here too, the humour is obvious, but so is the grave condition. Titus begins by periphrasing death as "ein stilles, abgeschiedenes Geschäft." The adjective "abgeschiedenes" is interesting, since it conveys two meanings, both pertinent and buttressing each other. Here is a further example of the virility of Nestroy's words that are full of life, even when describing death. On the one hand, "abgeschieden" denotes separated and isolated; on the other hand, it means "has died." The term "Geschäft," by definition, implies some type of activity and interaction between people, but Titus insists the business or activity of this "Geschäft" is no activity. As in his previous answer, he again is paradoxical, this time in reference to death, but by describing it in paradoxical language, it seems that Titus--a living, conscious being--expresses one of

man's greatest difficulties, namely, of having to come to terms with death.

The paradox is continued when Titus points out that his father is "gefesselt," yet "frei und unabhängig." In the physical sense, as related to space, the father has no freedom at all. In fact, it is only a matter of time before his physical part ceases to exist, as it is combined with the immediate earthly environment, at which time the word "gefesselt" is totally irrelevant. Simultaneously, however, he is independent of all physical influences, which is a decided advantage over life, where physical aspects, e.g., food, are crucial, as Titus himself experienced only several hours prior to the time of this statement.

A further pithy paradox, and one that contains an element of morbidity, is the clause, "denn er ist Verweser seiner selbst." "Verweser" must be seen in direct enmity with "seiner selbst," because the self, in order to be that, will instinctively oppose its "Verwesung," which means its destruction. Yet in death this indeed occurs. During life, it is most difficult to think of "Verweser" and "seiner selbst" as belonging together and forming a unity that actively strives for its extinction. Still, it is obvious that the process of life and decay occur simultaneously. According to Nestroy, who had an excessive and morbid fear of death, it seems to require a statement like the above, a very oblique reference to the termination of life, in order to confront an individual with this inevitability.

Titus concludes his reply with a terse, "er ist tot." By this time, "tot" is not in the least shocking. Indeed, it seems to be a rather pleasant business. The fact that the body was depicted as calmly decaying, has softened the full impact of this morbid thought. When talking with Constantia, Titus referred to death as a "Taschenspieler," a trickster, who cheats man of life. Here, it seems Titus too is a trickster with language, who depicts calmly and pleasantly the total destruction of the physical part of man.

Frau von Cypressenburg is duly impressed with the "Feiertagsg'wandel" of Titus' language. In fact, she is concerned only with this aspect, and is, therfore, like Flora and Constantia before her, seduced by his language. Flora, after hearing Titus elucidate about human nature and "Vegetabilien," remarked, "(beiseite). Der Mensch muss die höhere Gärtnerei studiert haben! (Laut.) So dunkel Sein Kopf auswendig is, so hell scheint er inwendig zu sein"(X,410). After listening for only a few moments to him, Constantia notes to herself, "Wirklich ein interessanter, gebildeter Mensch!"(X,415). Now, Frau von Cypressenburg says, "(für sich). Wie verschwenderisch er mit zwanzig erhabenen Worten das sagt, was man mit einer Silbe sagen kann! Der Mensch hat offerbare Anlagen zum Literaten. (Laut.) Wer war also Sein Vater?"(X,443). Even though Titus has been "verschwenderisch" with his words, he did not answer her question. Yet she is still impressed, therefore very gullible. Because of this, his words have the same effect on her

as heat on wax. Accordingly, he will be able to manipulate her with his words.

Now, however, Titus is forced to answer about his father's profession, "Er war schülerischer Meister . . ."(X,443). This too, is a paradoxical statement. One cannot be a student if one is the master, but his father was a master of students, so in this particular context it is possible. The sentence also contains ridicule levelled at the school master, in that the adjective "schülerischer," another one of Titus' word creations, places the master on the same level as the student. On the other hand, if the master is unable to communicate on the level of the student, he would hardly create an optimum learning environment.

One further exchange between the two will show very lucidly Titus' smoke screen use of language and Frau von Cypressenburg's foolish susceptibility. In answer to her question about his "literarische Bildung," he states:

> Eine Art Mille-fleurs-Bildung; ich besitze einen Anflug von Geographie, einen Schimmer von Geschichte, eine Ahndung von Philosophie, einen Schein von Jurisprudenz, einen Anstrich von Chirurgie und einen Vorgeschmack von Medizin. (X,443)

He professes to have some education in a number of disciplines, but not in the literary sphere. This is reminiscent of his experience as a "Jäger," and, as intimated by the words "Anflug," "Schimmer," "Ahndung," "Schein," "Anstrich" and "Vorgeschmack," he also has no experience in the above mentioned disciplines. However, his language still wears its "Feiertagsg'wandel," which

she finds irresistable, and her reply betrays an extremely shallow understanding, "Charmant! Er hat sehr viel, aber nichts gründlich gelernt, darin besteht die Genialität"(X,444). She again exposes her ignorance by noting that his blond looks indicate "ein apollverwandtes Gemüt"(X,444). Firstly, the blond looks are a wig. It, therefore, is a facade, and not representative of the real Titus. Secondly, his facility with language is used to deceive her. Therefore, the term "apollverwandt" also has a negative implication for her. It is especially ironic that Frau von Cypressenburg, although purporting to understand language, since she claims to be a "Schriftstellerin," and even though Titus was rather honest about his education, is still unable to recognize his method and aim. Her attitude is very similar to that of Constantia, even after Titus had explained to her his <u>modus operandi</u>. It is this posture that is largely responsible for Titus' frequent smoke screen use of language, of which his following statement, in reference to the reason for his blond hair, is a further example. He tells Frau von Cypressenburg, ". . . es ist reiner Zufall, dass ich blond bin"(X,444). This is true in the sense that in the darkness he just happened to pick the blond wig when searching for the black one. Still, Titus' answer is not true on the level that she understands it. Here also, are two spheres of understanding, and even though his answer is technically honest in reference to the colour of the wig, it is dishonest when seen as a communication. Clearly, his intent is to deceive.

As this scene concludes, Titus has for the third time convinced a woman to hire him. His latest job offer is that of secretary and consultant to Frau von Cypressenburg, or, as he satirizes is, "ein intellektueller Zuseitensteher"(X444). Thus, his position seems secure. Nevertheless, he is keenly aware of the potential danger that faces him in Flora, Constantia and Marquis. In order to consolidate his position, these three must be removed from his immediate environment.

C. Titus' "Glück und Ende" (III)

So far, Titus' smoke screen use of language has primarily sought to help him acquire a position in the "Gutshof" of Frau von Cypressenburg. Only once did his language become an instrument of outright slander and defamation. This occurred when he disposed of Flora in favour of Constantia. But with his improvement in position comes also an increasing precariousness as already mentioned. In the following quote, he succinctly expresses his situation, "Meine Stellung hier im Hause gleicht dem Brett des Schiffbrüchigen; ich muss die andern hinunterstossen, oder selbst untergehn"(X,448). These words show an awareness and understanding of himself and his environment, one in which the law of the jungle seems to apply. In the previous analysis, Titus was likened to a "Jäger," whose weapon is his language. This certainly holds true now that he is the secretary of Frau von Cypressenburg. Although having definitely improved his material-financial status, the improvement has been costly to Titus, because it seems to have compelled him to treat others just as meanly as their prejudicial behaviour has dealt with him.

He likens his position to that of a "Schiffbrüchiger und sein Brett," who can survive only if he knocks others off his board; hence, have those dangerous to him dismissed. But this

metaphor elicits other images, not only in reference to him, but to all those in his immediate environment. Firstly, they are all "schiffbrüchig," because their existence is a perilous one, with destruction always imminent. So far, he has kept afloat and asserted himself through his cunning use of language, which has been assisted, first by the black, and now by the blond wig. It might be argued that Marquis originally provided the hapless Titus, who found himslf shipwrecked by the shoals of prejudice, with a "Brett," the black wig, but later he took it back, and abandoned Titus anew to prejudice. However, Titus has been able to find another "Brett," namely a blond wig. The others, particularly Flora, Constantia and Marquis, due to Titus' cunning and self-preserving use of language, are themselves about to be shipwrecked, and, thus, join his perilous condition, which he can maintain only by destroying the others through slander.

Constantia is the first one to constitute a definite threat, because she is extremely perplexed when she sees his blond wig, and when Frau von Cypressenburg explains to him that Constantia insists his hair is black, Titus retorts, "Das ist schwarze Verleumdung"(X,447). The term "Verleumdung" is especially pertinent for Constantia, because this is the same word, i.e. "Verleumderin," with which he disposed of Flora. Again, Titus is the slanderer, but this time he has the assistance of Frau von Cypressenburg, who refuses to allow Constantia to explain herself, treating Constantia just as arrogantly as the latter

treated Flora. Just as Flora was not lying, so Constantia is now telling the truth, at least as far as she understands it. On the other hand, it must be noted that Titus' hair is neither black nor blond, as Frau von Cypressenburg believes, but red. However, only he and the audience are aware of this. The important consideration for Titus is that Constantia is not believed. Instead, she is told to attend to her work. Once more, he has been able to manipulate two women simultaneously, as he uses the truth to tell a lie.

Constantia, however, has not yet been dismissed and is, therefore, more dangerous than ever, and when Frau von Cypressenburg asks him, "War sie etwa unhöflich gegen Sie?"(X,448), he completes the character assassination of Constantia, as he insinuates without stating specific and concrete charges, claiming sensitivity, which makes it impossible for him to name Constantia's shortcomings. He answers:

> O, das nicht, sie war nur zu höflich; es sieht kurios aus, dass ich darüber red', aber ich mag das nicht; diese Person macht immer Augen auf mich, als wenn - und red't immer, als ob - und tut immer, als wie - und - ich mag das nicht. (X,448)

His first complaint is that she is "zu höflich." It is true, she has been polite, but not overly so. He, however, has been extremely polite, in fact outright flattering. This was obvious when he spoke to Constantia and Flora simultaneously, and admonished the latter for not having introduced him to Constantia. Another example of being overly polite followed on the heels of the above example, when he refused to believe that Constantia

was only the chamber maid. In accusing Constantia of being too polite, he intimates that she had an ulterior motive, and Frau von Cypressenburg, because she is foolish, is receptive to innuendoes. It is this attitude that thoughtlessly furthers prejudice, because it is susceptible to derogatory insinuations about others, even though they are just insinuations which lack substance.

Even more vague and alluding, but also more corrosive are the following expressions: "als wenn," "als ob," and "als wie." Each is followed by a pause, which Frau von Cypressenburg may fill with whatever her imagination invents. Titus himself, more so than any of the three women, has been doing just that; this is shown especially by "und red't immer, als ob -." In fact, this very commentary about Constantia exemplifies the shortcoming in Titus. Thus, he unmasks himself again as far as the audience is concerned. Titus concludes his defamatory remarks with "ich mag das nicht." But he did not specify what "das" actually consists of. This is one of Titus' most used stratagems, and one that has been apparent in many of his answers, starting with those to Plutzerkern. Frau von Cypressenburg, however, believes she knows what Constantia has done, even though she has not been given any definite facts. She believes she has understood Titus, when in reality, she is totally ignorant of his deceptions. That is, at the moment when he slandered Constantia, he simultaneously made a fool of the lady, because she insists that the chamber maid be dismissed the same day.

Titus is similarly successful in having Marquis and Flora dismissed, insinuating that their behaviour has been improper. About the latter he makes only two brief statements, "Und dann is noch die Gärtnerin - na, da will ich gar nichts sagen"(X,449), and, "Sie hat mir einen halbeten Heiratsantrag gemacht"(X,449). Neither of those remarks states anything definite, but both use the power of suggestion as they plant ideas in Frau von Cypressenburg's mind, and because of her susceptibility in believing evil about others, Titus succeeds. At first, it seems that the second quotation above is a specific accusation. However, the adjective "halbeten" disposes of this assumption. Frau von Cypressenburg seems to hear only the word "Heiratsantrag," which futhers a thought already growing in her, one that is attested to when she gives Titus the clothes of her deceased husband.

In accusing Flora of a "halbeten Heiratsantrag," Titus seems to imply, probably unwittingly, that he is responsible for the other half. Frau von Cypressenburg is, of course, unable to discern this implication, because she appears far more interested in hearing about the improper behaviour of her servants, especially since the other two women are potential rivals. The lady's only comment about Flora is, "Impertinent," but to the audience, this word has true meaning only in reference to Titus, because it aptly describes his attitude and behaviour, not only toward Flora and Constantia, but also towards the lady at this moment. Ultimately, Titus' accusation of "ein halbeten Heiratsantrag" not only seeks to destroy Flora's position, but also

aims to further the thought of marriage in the lady. Therefore, Titus is dishonest toward Flora, which, as already noted, is a guise to slander her. Titus hides his ulterior motive of furthering in the lady thoughts of marriage, possibly even considering him as her husband. Thus, as frequently has occurred in the past, Titus commits that of which he accuses someone else, only he is much more cunning and devious in the execution of the particular shortcoming. At the conclusion of this Act, Titus has realized his goal. Flora, Marquis and Constantia are to be dismissed immediately. However, soon it will become apparent that Titus' machinations prove to be disastrous for him, and not for those they were aimed at. Consequently, the boomerang effect frequently noted in the past in reference to individual words and phrases, will now include all of Titus' scheming, and be similar to Puffmann's final experiences. There is, nevertheless, a crucial difference between the two which will become obvious later.

Immediately after Titus' apparent victory over his adversaries, he recognizes one more chance to flatter Frau von Cypressenburg. Again, his intention is to consolidate his position as much as possible. He is, after all, just at the start of his "Karriere." He starts by feigning great surprise, in fact outright disbelief that Frau von Cypressenburg could possibly have a daughter as old as Emma. The stage directions are the first indication of his duplicity, "(sich erstaunt stellend). Mama?(X,450)." He begins his deception with a question consisting

of a single word, "Mama?" This is precisely the way he started another one of his stratagems, the one that destroyed Flora in front of Constantia. There, his opening gambit had been the one word "Bengel?" When Frau von Cypressenburg affirms that Emma is indeed her daughter, Titus feigns even greater surprise, which is so profound that he starts his reply not with a regular word, but with an interjection, "Ah! - Nein! - Nein! - Hören Sie auf! - Nein, das ist nicht möglich!"(X,450). The three "Nein," as well as the four pauses, reiterate his professed bewilderment.

But it is contrary to Titus' basic nature to be in want of words, and, therefore, he feels he must explain his position:

> So eine junge Dame - und diese grosse Tochter? Nein, das machen Sie wem andern weis; das ist eine weitschichtige Schwester oder sonst eine himmelweit entfernte Verwandte des Hauses. Wenn ich Euer Gnaden schon eine Tochter zutrauen soll, so kann sie höchstens - das is aber schon das Höchste - so gross sein - (zeigt die Grösse eines neugeborenen Kindes).(X,450)

Here too, he is manipulating two women simultaneously. Only this time, his goal is not ill will between the two, but flattery for both. If he succeeds in acquiring the daughter's good will, he will have a strong ally, one who has a greater influence on the lady than any of the three whose dismissal he is responsible for, and whose enmity is a certainty. He carefully avoids words that could in any way be interpreted as derogatory or belittling toward Emma, by referring to her as "grosse Tochter." Thus, Titus intimates that she is mature, a remark that adolescents usually approve of, and Emma does not seem to be an exception.

Frau von Cypressenburg, already described in the stage directions with, "(sich sehr geschmeichelt fühlend)" (X,450), notes, "man hat sich konserviert," to which Titus replies: "O, ich weiss, was Konservierung macht; aber so weit geht das Konservatorium nicht." He picks out the verb "konserviert," and incorporates it in his answer, changing it to the noun form. The term "Konservierung" still carries the same basic meaning as the verb. However, "Konservatorium" designates an academy of music. One implication of "konservieren" should be noted, since it is also descriptive of Frau von Cypressenburg. "Konservieren" is frequently used in reference to preparing food so it will last. To achieve this, it must be made sterile, and it is this word which is a poignant description of Frau von Cypressenburg's basic nature as reflected in, and manifested by, her language, e.g., "man hat sich konserviert." Titus' mixture of "Konservierung" and "Konservatorium" may be seen as an example of his smoke screen and manipulative use of language in general. Furthermore, he uses a wrong word for the sheer sound effect, and it works!

Frau von Cypressenburg's reply, "Närrischer Mensch, ich muss jetzt zur Toilette eilen, sonst überraschen mich die Gäste" (X,451), shows that she continues to succumb to his flattery. The first word has special poignancy, because it reflects back on her. She, not Titus, is the foolish one. The verb "überraschen" also will be seen by the audience as conveying a meaning beyond the one she intends. She has already been "überrascht,"

namely by Titus' flattery. Thus, two words that she uses, when seen in the whole context, as is possible for the audience, reiterate and describe her behaviour since meeting Titus.

It seems that Titus' position is secure: Flora and Constantia have been informed of their immediate dismissal, and at today's soirée he is introduced as Frau von Cypressenburg's new secretary. But just as he is impressing the guests with his comments about the theater, Flora and Constantia appear in tears, because they have been fired. They insist that Titus' hair is black. Then Marquis enters and sets the record straight, "Er ist rot!"(X,458). Thus, each woman has been wrong about Titus who tersely states, "Ja, ich bin rot!"(X,458). This is one of the few times when he is succinct. He does not embellish his language, nor attempt to excuse his actions. Apparent is a certain amount of resignation, but his spirit is not broken as his choice of words indicates when he seeks to calm Frau von Cypressenburg, who threatens to have him removed physically; he notes, "Wozu? Der Zorn überweibt Sie - ich gehe -"(X,458). The term "überweibt," obviously a modification of "übermannt," shows that Titus still has sufficient fortitude to recognize an element of humour in a situation that is serious only for him, but not for anyone else present. Whereas the term "überweibt" is meant specifically for the lady, Titus also has a humorous adieu for all the guests when he says, "Das ist Ottokars Glück und Ende!"(X,458), which is in keeping with the general topic of discussion prior to his unmasking. The statement which

alludes to Grillparzer's play König Ottokars Glück und Ende (1825) indicates a considerable measure of self-irony. In a sense, Titus too was a king, if only for a few hours. He was, and still is, a king of words through which he ruled three women. It might also be noted that this comparison is entirely wrong, since Ottokar is a royal hero who lost an empire and his life. Titus, however, is no king, and all he has lost is a job. As he leaves, Salome's prophecy, which she spoke prior to his entrance into the "Gutshof," is fulfilled, "Sie gehn so stolz bei der Tür hinein, dass ich immer glaub', ich werd's noch sehn, wie s' Ihnen bei der nämlichen Tür herauswerfen werden" (X,405). Salome, although the most maive of the female characters in the play, is also the most perceptive. She anticipates the result of Titus' pride even before it was fully developed.

All of Titus' verbal stratagems and machinations have been futile, and his image of the "Schiffbrüchige" is even more pertinent than when first noted. The much used proverb, "Wer andern eine Grube gräbt, fällt selbst hinein," seems to be applicable. However, it must be noted that Titus himself was already in a "Grube," one devised by the prejudicial behaviour of others towards him, when he in turn attempted to dig one for those around him. These too are in a "Grube," namely one of "Dummheit." But in the final analysis, it is he who suffers, because he is now in the same position as indicated by him in his opening song and monologue.

It is language that Titus uses in order to take stock of

his situation and simultaneously collect himself after his sudden, though perhaps not entirely unexpected, catastrophe. It seems that by verbalizing problematic and difficult situsations, he gains some measure of control over them, at least cerebrally, and to a lesser extent emotionally. Thus, language has a self-healing quality for Titus. Language is significant for several reasons: it helps him deal with problems, but also, if misused, or employed as a smoke screen, the evil intentions aimed at others have a boomerang effect and attack the speaker. Titus is fully aware of his shortcomings, and states so specifically in reference to the difficulty he now faces, "Im Grund hab' ich's verdient, ich hab' mich auch nicht sehr liebreich benommen, wie ich obenauf war - lassen wir das!"(X,466). He shows no malice nor desire for revenge. The sincerity of this thought is underlined by the direct language that avoids all periphrasis. It is a succinct expression of self-knowledge. He is again about to enter the "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," and about to be subjected to prejudice and ridicule. But first, he verbalizes his situation:

> Das stolze Gebäude meiner Hoffnungen ist assekuranzlos ab'brennt, meine Glücksaktien sind um hundert Prozent g'fallen und somit belauft sich mein Aktivstand wieder auf die rundeste aller Summen, nämlich auf Null. Kühn kann ich jetzt ausrufen: Welt, schicke deine Wälder über mich, Wälder, lasst eure Räuber los auf mich, und wer mich um einen Kreuzer ärmer macht, den will ich als ein Wesen höherer Natur verehren! (X,459)

The first sentence is stock taking done in financial terms, which is rather suitable, not only because he is referring to his financial state, but also in that terms like "assekuranzlos,"

"Glücksaktien," and "Prozent" help him in creating an emotional distance. They also assist him in achieving an element of detachment, which in turn will aid him in looking objectively at his present status. However, the opening phrase, "Das stolze Gebäude," does relate specifically to his past attitude and intentions, and ought to be analyzed first. The word "stolz" reiterates what had already been obvious in his conversation with Salome. She in fact warned him about it, ". . . den Stolz muss man ablegen wenn man nix hat!"(X,398). But Titus rebelled against this thought, which sounds very much like a platitude. Although pride has certainly been partly responsible for Titus' fate, it is also that quality which helps him against succumbing to depression and the belief that all endeavour on his part is futile. Instead, he takes stock in the literal sense, regarding the whole situation as a game, a roller coaster. Thus, he indirectly indicates an optimism and will to start anew.

"Gebäude," the word modified by "stolz," must be examined next, because it is a metaphorical expression for his schemings and machinations with which he sought to attain a position in the "Gutshof." This "Gebäude" he constructed himself. Therefore, he is entirely responsible for it. Because he built it through a deceptive use of language, which entailed making enemies of Flora, Constantia and Marquis, the "Gebäude" went up in flames. The fact that the others originally were responsible for his behaviour is irrelevant, in as far as his misuse of language is concerned. Even though Titus had strong reasons,

language, if misused, ultimately turns back on its abuser.

The first financial term is the adverb "assekuranzlos," which modifies "ab'brennt." Thus, he has no insurance, and nowhere and no-one to turn to for assistance. As before, his only resources are those within himself, particularly so because prejudice has effectively isolated him. Nevertheless, he possesses an inner strength, which was already apparent in his departing words to Frau von Cypressenburg and her friends, and is also apparent now as he reflects.

Whereas the expression "stolze Gebäude" was seen to allude to Titus' shortcomings as being partly responsible for his fiasco, the statement, "meine Glücksaktien sind um hundert Prozent g'fall'n"(X,459), refers directly to luck, that transcendental force which arbitrarily and capriciously intervenes in the affairs of man. Over its influence Titus has no control. However, he refrains from accusing only luck. Instead, he sees it more as a contributing factor. Thus, it may be posited that he recognizes the complexities that resulted in his present situation, although, in view of such remarks as: "Ich muss die anderen hinunterstossen, oder selbst untergehn" (X,448); "Im Grund hab' ich's verdient"(X,466), and "Das stolze Gëbaude meiner Hoffnungen"(X,459), as well as considering his cunningly deceptive use of language, the conclusion must be drawn that, in the final analysis, Titus himself is primarily responsible for his present state, irrespective of the fact that he is constantly the target of prejudice.

Immediately after he has stated that the "Aktienstand" of his "Glücksaktien ist auf Null," he notes, "Kühn kann ich jetzt ausrufen . . ."(X,459), and even though that which he can call out only reiterates his bankruptcy in more than one way, "Kühn" as well as "ausrufen," intimate courage, which in Titus' case, is based to a large extent on his fundamentally sanguine nature. Courage also provides the impetus and power that helps him look at his environment with a positive attitude, prompting and inspiring him to master it through his skillful command of language.

The various negative images evoked originally by the expression, "Dorngebüsch z'widrer Erfahrungen," and subsequently reiterated, are echoed once more by, "Welt, schicke deine Wälder über mich, Wälder, lasst eure Räuber los auf mich . . ."(X,459). Here too, the term "Welt" evokes associations of enmity, just as it did in his first monologue. There, feelings of loneliness and isolation were elicited, but here, hostility is added to those feelings. In fact, the "Welt," as such, is the enemy, because it is seen as sending its forests to fall upon him. The forests may be seen as bias in general, while the "Räuber," which echoes "Spitzbub'" and its associations in the opening song, represent individuals casting barbs of prejudice at him.

The reflections of Titus discussed in the foregoing paragraphs have helped him in acquiring a proper perspective of his situation, which is basically the same as that noted in his opening song and monologue. Nevertheless, these latter reflections

are necessary for Titus, particularly because of his fall, in order to be able to confront prejudice again, which will certainly not relent either to hunt or haunt him. The question now arises as to how Titus will contine to assert himself in view of the past experiences at the "Gutshof."

It is obvious that Plutzerkern, Flora and Frau von Cypressenburg have certainly not undergone a fundamental change as far as their biased nature is concerned. Another similar figure is Spund, Titus' "Vetter," who has followed him, because, as he says, ". . . ich tu' ja nur das, was mir der Braumeister g'sagt hat, denn das ist der einzige Mann, der auf meinen Geist Einfluss hat"(X,461). He is now going to assist Titus, because the "Braumeister" admonished him. Spund's attitude toward Titus, which is representative of all the other in the play, excepting Salome, is expressed in these words:

> Rote Haar' zeigen immer von ein' fuchsigen Gemüt, von einem hinterlistigen - und dann verschandelt er ja die ganze Freundschaft; es sein freilich schon alle tot, bis auf mich, aber wie sie waren in unserer Familie, haben wir alle braune Haar' g'habt, lauter dunkle Köpf', kein lichter Kopf zu finden, soweit die Freundschaft reicht, und der Bub' untersteht sich und kommt rotschädlet auf d'Welt. (X,461-62)

The opening statement is a succinct expression of prejudice--the assumption is made that red hair is indicative of a cunning and deceptive nature. No reason is given, no argument deemed necessary. Instead, it is accepted as axiomatic. Titus, who is fully aware of this attitude, seeks to assert himself in the only way he knows, by being "fuchsig" and "hinterlistig," because if he is honest to the people at the "Gutshof," and does not hide

his red hair, he will be treated as an outcast. In fact, when his red hair is discovered, he is cast out, because, as the lady stated, ". . . der meine treuesten Diener bei mir verleumdete!"(X,458). But he would certainly not have gained entrance had he not been deceptive at the start. Even if he had been humble, as Salome suggested, and sought to become a "Knecht," he would not have been given even this lowly position. Thus, he was caught in a dilemma, from which extrication seems impossible. His only weapon, defensive and offensive, is what Spund calls "sein lichter Kopf," with which the cousin unwittingly intimates Titus' sharp mind. This makes it possible for him to understand human nature, and to use language in a way that exploits the weaknesses of that nature. However, language does not permit anyone to misuse it without punishing such a person. Here lies Titus' predicament.

All Titus seems to have left from his four of five hours of success is the black suit of Frau von Cypressenburg's late husband. However, this too is a facade. Consequently, it is not representative of his true nature, and, like the wigs, he is forced to return it. Thus, Titus is once more the same as he was at the start. But just as he is about to leave, George informs him that he is to return to the "Schloss." Immediately, Titus seeks to explain to himslef why he is called back, anticipate the manner of his reception, but above all, prepare himself in order to be in an advantageous position. He notes:

> Ich reim' mir das Ding schon zusamm': die Gnädige wird in einem Anfall von Gnad' in sich gegangen sein, eing'sehen haben, dass sie mich als armen Teufel zu hart

> behandelt hat, und ruckt jetzt zum Finale mit einer Wegzehrung heraus. - Halt! (Von einer Idee ergriffen). Um diesen Zweck noch sicherer zu erreichen, erweis' ich ihr jetzt eine zarte Aufmerksamkeit - (in die Tasche greifend) ich hab' ja da noch - sie kann die roten Haar' nit leiden - ich hab' da die graue Perücken vom eh'maligen Gartner im Sack - (zieht sie hervor) mit der mach' ich jetzt meine Abschiedsvisite, dann lasst s' g'wiss was springen. Ich probier's jetzt mit der grauen. Schwarze und blonde Haar' changieren sehr bald die Farb', so hat auch für mich bei beiden nur eine kurze Herrlichkeit herausg'schaut; die grauen Haare ändern sich nicht mehr, vielleicht mach' ich mit die grauen ein dauerhaftes Glück. (X,467)

Most significant is the decision to wear the grey wig of Flora's late husband. This is the second time Titus chooses to wear a wig, and it is again symbolic of his deception. He has lost one, and could therefore, start anew. Thus, he could present himself just as he is, since now all are aware of his red hair. On the one hand, it might be argued that he indeed does not want to offend the eye, which in the past he described as,"der heiklichste Teil am Menschen"(X,396). On the other hand, and in view of his comment about the nature of people that dislike red hair as being "mehr dumm als abscheulich"(X,396), it seems more likely that he is determined to manipulate Frau von Cypressenburg once more. Again, he resorts to cunning and deception as his method of operation. Titus, like all other figures discussed previously in this dissertation, does not undergo a basic change. Moreover, he does not learn from experience.

In one part of this quotation, it becomes apparent that Titus is not only skillful in manipulating others with his language, but also manipulates himself, because he convinces himself to wear the gray wig:

> Um diesen Zweck noch sicherer zu erreichen, erweis' ich ihr jetzt eine zarte Aufmerksamkeit . . . ich hab' ja da noch - sie kann die roten Haar' nit leiden - ich hab' da die graue Perücken vom eh'mahligen Gartner im Sack . . . mit der mach' ich jetzt meine Abschiedsvisite, dann lasst s' g'wiss was springen. (X,467)

The words, "erweis' ich ihr jetzt eine zarte Aufmerksamkeit," are the ruse directed at himself. The true reason for wearing this wig is discernible in the words, "Um diesen Zweck noch sicherer zu erreichen," and, "dann lasst s' g'wiss was springen." Especially illuminating is the statement immediately following the above quotation, when he unwittingly admits, "Ich probier's jetzt mit der grauen." This clearly shows Titus' attitude as having remained constant. The words, "Ich probier's jetzt," betray the fact that he is not only manipulative, but also willing to try different approaches. If the next venture fails, he will not feel that all is lost, but attempt a different avenue of cunning.

At the conclusion of the monologue under discussion, he expresses the hope, "vielleicht mach' ich mit die grauen ein dauerhaftes Glück." Just after he was chased away from the party, Titus noted that his "Glücksaktien" had hit the bottom. Still, at the end of the present monologue, he seems to express a cautious optimism. But even here, the term "vielleicht" already casts a shadow. In the same clause is another word, which, because of its plurisignation quality, has not only a darkening effect, but sounds ominous, and tends to undermine any possibility of future luck. The word is "grauen," which, aside

from grey, also means dread and horror. This latter denotation becomes more apparent when it does directly precede its noun, as is the case in the first quotation of this paragraph. This negative meaning presents an antithesis to "Glück." Thus, one might posit that one cancels the other.

Titus knows full well that he cannot deceive Frau von Cypressenburg outright with the grey wig. Still, it is partly responsible for creating a situation where he can explain why he wears it, and thereby, will be in a position to control the conversation and manipulate her. When she sees him wearing it, she is understandably surprised, "Was ist denn das?"(X,482), to which he answers, ". . . ich benütze sie, um die Ihr Nervensystem verletzende Couleur zu verdecken"(X,482). As always, when speaking to the lady, he uses measured and formal language. His use of the word "Nervensystem," particularly in this context, echoes his comment to Flora about women, "Die Nerven von Spinnengeweb'"(X,407). Flora had screamed, because he knocked unexpectedly, and Frau von Cypressenburg had been "vom Zorn überweibt" when she suddenly realized he had red hair. His description of women's nerves, at least as far as his experiences go, appears to be correct.

Frau von Cypressenburg defends herself with, "Hm, so arg ist es nicht, ich bin nur manchmal so kindisch"(X,482). The insistence, "Hm, so arg ist es nicht," is in direct contrast to her reaction when she became aware of his red hair. Moreover, it is also contrary to the statement about her previous secretary,

whom she fired because he had red hair. The attempted excuse, "ich bin nur manchmal so kindisch," is unwittingly a self-accusation and self-unmasking, because the word "kindisch" might be seen as synonymous with foolish, which as Titus noted to Salome, is a true description of prejudice. The adjective "kindisch" also has connotations of immaturity and irresponsibility, traits that are to be found in those subscribing to prejudices. Immaturity is seen in the blind repetition of traditional thought patterns through which deleterious habits are continued. Irresponsibility shows itself in this context in the indifference to the suffering caused by immature, i.e., prejudicial behaviour. Again, it is ironic that Frau von Cypressenburg expresses herself so inadequately, particularly in view of the fact that she is a "Schriftstellerin," a profession which supposedly necessitates a good command of language.

Titus' reply starts with a question, one of his favourite introductions when he is about to unmask or manipulate the other, or, to use Kraus's words about Nestroy's satire, ". . . wenn's ans Halsabschneiden ging."[5] Titus' retort, "Kindisch? Diese Eigenschaft sieht Ihnen der schärfste Menschenkenner nicht an"(X,482), is a further example of his predilection for using irony. Here too, he appears to flatter, but what he really implies, is that she indeed has this trait. However, no-one will be able to discern it. Frau von Cypressenburg fails to recognize Titus' sarcasm because of her attitude, which is one of "Gemütlichkeit," to use again one of Kraus's descriptions about

the type of people Nestroy sought to disturb and unmask. Thus, while attempting to be manipulative, Titus also draws attention to the shortcomings in his fellow man, or, one might argue that he simultaneously exposes the shortcomings of himself and of those around him.

Just as Titus is asserting himself, and in full command of the conversation, Spund, his uncle, a paradigm of foolishness and prejudice, enters the room. Although Titus is totally unprepared for meeting Spund, he is not at a loss for words. Here too, Titus opens the conversation, "Der Herr Vetter! Wie kommen denn Sie daher?"(X,483). Spund's answer, "Auf eine honettere Art als du. Durchgehen is nicht meine Sach'"(X,483), is an example of his illogical argumentation. He misuses the adjective "honnett," which normally relates to ethical or moral behaviour, or to attitude, in order to describe how Titus travelled. However, it is a clumsy attack on Titus' character, and is totally divorced from the latter's question. Spund brands Titus' leaving as "Durchgehen," a pejorative term, which implies a running away, whereas Titus explained he was forced to leave because he found himself "ohne Geld, ohne Lieb', ohne Freundschaft"(X,397). Added to these was the intense ill will of Spund.

Spund's irrational thought processes were already apparent when he sought to explain to Salome that his fortune was the result of his mental prowess. There, his own words seemed to rebel against the preposterous claim that his sharp intellect

was responsible for his wealth, "Meine Eltern haben mir keinen Kreuzer hinterlassen; ich war bloss auf meinen Verstand beschränkt, das is eine kuriose Beschränkung, das!"(X,462). Particularly self-damaging is the remark, "ich war bloss auf meinen Verstand beschränkt," where the adverb "bloss" intimates that his "Verstand" was all he had. Thus, he was very limited. The term "bloss" has also a different denotation, namely unprotected and deprived, meanings that again have a derogatory implication in reference to his "Verstand." Therefore, he is unprotected, because he is deprived of a "Verstand." Strongly buttressing the above intimations is the predicate adjective "beschränkt," which is frequently used to denote mental retardation. Very thoroughly Spund exposes his stupidity.

Titus is, of course, keenly aware of his cousin's foolishness, and in his retort to Spund's preposterous answer, uses the latter's "Durchgehen" to ridicule him, and at the same time, draw attention to his fortune, "Ja, freilich, wenn man einmal Ihre Dicken hat, dann geht man nicht leicht wo durch!" (X,483). Titus is neither confused nor intimidated by the other's insult. Instead, he cleverly changes Spund's noun "Durchgehen" into the verb form, and uses it in a way that means "to go," or "to fit through an opening." Because Spund has so many "Dicken," wealth, he is unable to pass through certain openings, since it would be a physical impossibility. Consequently, Spund's wealth confines him. On the other hand, there is also the implication that Spund is not searching for a satisfactory place, not because

he thinks it to be unethical, but because he is wealthy, and there is no need for him to do so. In his answer, Titus has deftly unmasked Spund's accusation, and turned it back against him. It is precisely people like Spund whose foolish arrogance and prejudice continue to challenge Titus. Inevitably, he feels compelled to defend himself and simultaneously attack his tormentor as he deceives and manipulates.

Before, it was noted that Titus' decision to wear the grey wig was of crucial importance, since it was symbolic of his decision to continue using cunning and deception. Frau von Cypressenburg is about to ask Titus to take it off, but at that moment, Spund has already entered the room. The latter is very surprised when he takes note of it, "Was is denn das! Graue Haare?"(X,483). Whatever Spund might forget about his cousin, it would not be the colour of his hair. At this point, Titus could decide to take off the grey wig and explain why he was wearing it, namely, not to offend the lady. Instead, he avers that he is now grey. The audience immediately anticipates Titus' next move: he will deceive and attempt to manipulate his cousin. The latter retorts: "Das ist ja nicht möglich -"(X,483). Titus replies, "Wirklichkeit is immer das schönste Zeugnis für die Möglichkeit"(X,483). Again, he uses one of Spund's words, namely, "möglich," to discredit her position. Titus' answer is true when a particular reality can be verified. However, in this specific instance, that is not the case. What he posits may often be true when "Wirklichkeit" is in fact "Wirklichkeit."

True, he does not insist that this is the case here, only that this can be the case generally speaking. Nevertheless, in the context of the conversation, Spund can assume that Titus refers to himself. Titus does not tell a blatant lie with his last answer, at least not technically speaking. Still, the effect is the same. As is frequently the case, Titus has his opponent in a position of surprise and uncertainty, and he is thus able to manipulate him effectively. Titus is treating his present adversary, and it seems that nearly everyone is his adversary because of the prejudicial conspiracy aimed at him, just as he treated the three women in the "Gutshof" before.

However, Spund does not even attempt to respond on Titus' level. Instead, he ignores the abstractions "Wirklichkeit" and "Möglichkeit." Perhaps he senses that Titus is being "fuchsig" and "hinterlistig" as he described him before to Salome, therefore, he adheres to basic facts: "Du bist ja erst sechsundzwanzig Jahr'?"(X,483). Now, Titus' replies begin to be outrageous, but the following one is technically true. Still, it misinforms:

> Ich war es gestern noch; aber der Kummer, die Kränkung, dass ich, verlassen von meinem einzigen leiblichen Herrn Vettern, als hilfloser Durchgänger in die Welt hab' müssen, hat mich um ein Jahrtausend älter gemacht; ich bin über Nacht grau geworden. (X,483)

The first sentence certainly states the truth. However, by not adding that he is still twenty-six today, Titus implies that today he is older. Furthermore, he also imtimates that a decisive occurrence took place since last night. The next sentence,

which is also true, appeals to Spund's sense of compassion, particularly through such words as, "Kummer," "Kränkung," and "hilflos verlassen." Each of the foregoing words is to conjure up images in Spund's mind of Titus' incredibly harsh experience, so harsh in fact, that he aged by a thousand years. Titus obviously feels that since he seeks to convince Spund, an aging of a mere ten or twenty years would not be sufficiently impressive. Therefore, he claims to have aged a millenium. Titus appeals to Spund's sense of compassion in a particular manner, by alluding to the latter's responsibilities as one family member to another, by referring to their blood relationship, ". . . verlassen von meinem einzigen leiblichen Herrn Vettern."(X,483). Titus' language is direct, emphatic and also exaggerating. There are no subtle nuances, for the simple reason that they would be lost on Spund. Still, Titus' aim here is basically motivated by selfishness, just like his verbal assaults on the three women were in the past. The concluding sentence is also true, at least technically. Nevertheless, considering the way Spund is to understand it, it is a lie. Titus cleverly mixes truth and falsity, but the latter predominates. Undoubtedly, he suffers because Spund rejected him. Still, judging from his behaviour as it is manifested in his choice and delivery of language, he is not as helpless as he wants his cousin to believe. In fact, at this moment, Spund seems to be the helpless one. Indeed, all he can say is, "(verblüfft). Über Nacht?"(X,484).

Now that the opponent is flabbergasted, Titus tells a story

that echoes in its authenticity and intent Marquis' tale about the individual who refused a reward consisting of diamonds after saving the life of a prince. Titus recounts the event of the previous night:

> Schlag Sieben bin ich fort von z'Haus, Dreiviertelstund' später schau' ich mich in den Spiegel der Unglücklichen, ins Wasser hinein, da war mir, als wenn meine Haare so g'wiss g'sprenglet wären. Ich schieb' das auf die Dämmerung, wähle den Linigraben zur Untertuchet, deck' mich mit die Nachtnebel zu, schlaf' ein - Schlag Mitternacht wecken mich zwei Frösch' auf, die auf meinem Halstüchel zu disputieren anfangen, da gibt mir ein Anfall von Desperation den klugen Einfall mir einige Hände voll Haare ausz'reissen - sie waren grau - ich schieb' das auf den Silbersichelreflex der Mondscheibe, schlaf' weiter. Auf einmal scheucht mich ein ungeheures Milliweiberg'schnatter auf aus dem tiefsten Linigrabenschlummer - es war heller Morgen, und neben mir macht grad ein Rastelbinder Toilette, er schaut sich in einem Glasscherben, der vielleicht einst ein Spiegel war, ich tu' desgleichen, und ein eisgrauer Kopf, den ich nur an dem beigefügten Gesicht für den meinigen erkenne, starrt mir entgegen. (X,484)

Again, the first statement is probably true. However, it is not relevant. Instead, its purpose is to lull the antagonist into a false sense of trust. All other statements relating directly to his becoming grey are false, for the simple reason that he is not truly grey. Still, it must be noted that all statements, with the exception of the last one, could possibly have occurred. Titus lends the whole story an air of authenticity by referring to particular times such as "Schlag Mitternacht," by naming a specific place, the "Linigraben," and by using predominantly concrete and vivid terms: "Haus," "Spiegel," "Wasser," "Dämmerung," "Milliweiberg'schnatter," "Rastelbinder" and "Glasscherben." Spund can easily relate to these. Titus always attempts to adapt his language to the level of the other person.

He reiterates his poverty, misfortune and the resulting hardships with such phrases as, "Spiegel der Unglücklichen," and "deck mich mit die Nachtnebel zu." The term "Spiegel" is significant. Firstly, it is a reflective device, in that it helps the individual to see himself as others see him. Also, in Nestroy's work as a whole, the individual's language is always reflective of the basic nature, and this is certainly true of Titus. Therefore, it might be posited that language is a mirror that can be particularly useful to those individuals who stand back and reflect about themselves and their situation, as Titus has done several times in the past. In fact, most of the dominant figures discussed in this thesis do this at times. Such verbal reflecting has been shown to be of benefit to Titus. Secondly, this term has an ominous tone, especially when seen as "der Spiegel der Unglücklichen," which is the water. If the individual is desperate when looking into this mirror, and if he believes there are no solutions for his problems--that is, if he sees himself assaulted on all sides by futility--he might simply overcome his "Unglück" by stepping into the mirror and committing suicide. Although Titus never refers to this thought, the term "Unglücklicher" in this context does elicit such morbid images as noted above.

Another key word that contributes toward a further understanding of Titus' situation, and one that buttresses previous comments about his circumstances, is "Dämmerung." It too, has connotations that go beyond the immediate and physical: he has

nowhere to turn except to the "Linigraben," which he hopes will afford protection during the night. Originally, the "Linigraben" was intended as a fortification against marauding Hungarian rebels. In a sense, Titus also is a rebel. He refuses outright to submit to the capriciousness of traditional modes of thought, of which the adherence to prejudices is one facet. Therefore, he too must be kept at bay and away from those whose thinking he does not share. A further negative allusion of the term "Linigraben" may be seen in its indirect reinforcement of "Dämmerung." Firstly, "Graben," which is not only a component of the word "Linigraben," but also a part of the actual fortification consisting of a moat and brickwork, is related to "Grab," both in meaning and its physical configuration. This in turn, underlines Titus' isolation, which has been noted several times in the past. Secondly, in a "Graben," it is darker than on the surface, particularly during evening and night. Thus, it might be seen as symbolic of Titus' situation, which, figuratively speaking, is indeed dark. The negative connotations of "Dämmerung," are also reinforced by the word "Nachtnebel," which denotes a particularly heavy darkness, because both components of this compound indicate a condition where one's vision is severely restricted, if not entirely prevented. Therefore, one cannot function properly. This is precisely the effect prejudice has on Titus.

For Titus, nature is not a place of respite, nor for gaining new strength. Instead, it is symbolic, as already noted in

reference to "Dorngebüsch" and "Wälder," of isolation and alienation. Titus' choice of words simultaneously undermines and strengthens the seriousness of his situation. It undermines by eliciting humour, which is possibly an attempt by the sub-conscious to help him bear the misery by laughing at it, thus relieving the tensions. Consequently, matters appear less dismal. Still, the seriousness he must contend with is emphasized. The clause, "da gibt mir ein Anfall von Desperation den klugen Einfall mir einige Hände voll Haar ausz'reissen"(X,484), is humorous through the clever use of "Anfall" and "Einfall." An "Anfall" is suggestive of a paroxysm due to a serious disorder--as he is suffering the "Anfall," he is not in control of his body, and pulls out some of his hair. But this is a totally involuntary action, and not the result of an "Einfall," which would be due to a sudden brainwave. Syntactically speaking, the quotation is correct. However, it becomes illogical when one analyzes its pragmatic relationship. This in part contributes to the humour.

Yet beneath this humour, such action alludes to an individual suffering great distress, which, to a certain extent, is intimated by the repetition of the word "Fall," a component of both "Anfall" and "Einfall." "Fall" denotes, amongst other meanings, a fall or falling down. This too may be seen as descriptive of his condition, since it reveals that he is down, not only in the physical sense because he is in the "Linigraben," but also in terms of his emotional, financial and social condition,

all due to the hindrances put in his way by prejudice. However, he is not a fallen person in the moral sense. Instead, one might argue that the others, because of their biased behaviour toward him, are fallen people, since they have caused someone else to be isolated and alienated. Here, a component of a word exemplifies, as it explains and comments on the situation under consideration to such an extent, that a comprehensive view of the particular individual is possible.

In order to emphasize his poverty once more, Titus places himself in the company of a "Rastelbinder," a gypsy, who makes a living by repairing broken dishes. He concludes by saying that he looked into a piece of broken glass, and found the following, "Ein eisgrauer Kopf . . . starrt mir entgegen." Face and head are seen separately--ostensibly, he no longer recognized his head. The adjective "eisgrauer" is very descriptive of his feelings at the moment. "Eis," a component of "eisgrauer," alludes to the cold, the isolation and alienation, for which his red hair is responsible because of prejudice against it. The fact that face and head are separate, conveys an alienation, not only in relation to other people, but also the beginning of an alienation from the self. That is, the red hair causes the face and the rest of Titus to be unhappy, because it is the specific target of prejudice. Thus, Titus, the individual, is no longer whole, a position that is underlined by the term "Glasscherben," which, like the "Rastelbinder," he used as a mirror. The "Glasscherbe" reflects not only literally as a surrogate mirror, it

is itself, in the figurative sense, a broken piece of glass, reflective of Titus' general state. It would be highly unlikely that Spund perceives any of the above connotations, but the audience will. It is ironic that the facts of this story are pure invention. Nevertheless, they are believed by Spund, whereas the truth about Titus' position, which they intimate, is not discerned by the cousin.

Titus' deception has been successful. So, for the moment at least, he is safe from having Spund discover the truth about his grey hair. Yet only moments after the tale, Titus is in serious danger of being discovered, because his story and the choice of words has been too effective. Spund is overwhelmed, and feels compelled to embrace him in order to express his emotions, which Titus' story has aroused. But this would result in Spund discovering Titus' pigtail, and the latter therefore admits to himself, ". . . denn das glaubet er mir doch nicht, dass mir aus Kränkung ein Zopfen g'wachsen is"(X,486). Here is a prime example that his language, although seemingly helping him as it deceives others, is directly responsible for creating further difficulties. Titus is able to cut off his pigtail without Spund being aware of it. Still, his position remains precarious as long as he remains dishonest.

At the same time, it must be heavily underscored that the prejudicial attitude in the others, especially in Spund, remains the same. Immediately after Titus has succeeded in secretly cutting off his pigtail, Spund states:

> Schau', Titus, du bist a guter Kerl, du hast dich 'kränkt um einen hartherzigen Vettern, und warum war ich hartherzig? Weil du rote Haar' hast g'habt; die hast aber jetzt nicht mehr, es is also kein Grund mehr vorhanden, ich kann jetzt nit anders, ich muss weichherzig wer'n. Du bist mein einziger Verwandter, du bist - mit einem Wort, du bist so viel als mein Sohn, du bist mein Universalerb'! (X,488)

He admits that Titus is "ein guter Kerl." Nevertheless, he had been "hartherzig" because Titus had had red hair. He still refuses to accept him as he is. Instead, he prefers to believe the ridiculous story. Spund is open to outrageous lies, but rejects the simple truth. In view of such an attitude, it is not surprising that Titus continually uses cunning and deceptive language, even though it too creates problems for him.

His promise in the opening song, "Mir soll einer trau'n / Der wird sich verschau'n"(X,391), has certainly been kept; he continues to be deceptive until Spund declares him "Universalerb'." But when Frau von Cypressenburg and Constantia press Spund to sign the papers--the two women have hurriedly called a lawyer--Titus becomes suspicious, and notes to himself about Constantia, ". . . die betreibt ja meine Erbschaft viel eifriger als ich selber"(X,489). This quotation intimates an uncertainty about accepting the "Erbschaft." Frau von Cypressenburg, seemingly aware of Titus' rising suspicion, quickly tells him, "Sehen Sie, wie das gute Geschöpf (auf Constantia deutend) für Ihr Bestes sorgt? Ich weiss alles und willige gern in den Bund, den Liebe schloss und Dankbarkeit befestigen wird"(X,489). Titus, however, does not answer--he only bows. This is the only time where he prefers not to answer verbally. Still, his silence

speaks many words. Firstly, he, as a master in the cunning use of language, recognizes her intention. Thus, the words, "Ihr Bestes," "Liebe" and "Dankbarkeit," are meaningless, at least as they are used by Frau von Cypressenburg. But a far more important aspect of Titus' silence is seen in the fact that it signals his rejection of using language for manipulative purposes. Therefore, it would be pointless to reply.

Of even greater significance is the following statement by him:

> (für sich). Dass er mir ein' Offizin kauft, das kann ich annehmen, er is mein Blutsverwandter; aber durch einen Betrug sein Universalerb' wer'n, das mag ich doch nicht. (Laut zu Spund, welcher eben die Urkunde unterzeichnen will.) Halt, Herr Vetter! Erlauben S' -." (X,489)

The statement, "aber durch einen Betrug sein Universalerb' wer'n, das mag ich doch nicht," clearly indicates that he is fully aware of his deception toward Spund. It is interesting that he believes it to be just to take the "Offizin," but not the "Erbschaft." Titus seems to think that because Spund is his "Blutsverwandter," he does have a certain responsibility toward a relative as poor as Titus. This is brought out by his use of "Blutsverwandter," when he might just have referred to him as a "Verwandter." Related to this is also Titus' belief that people should assist each other, especially when the need arises. He practised this belief when he went to the aid of Marquis without concern for his personal safety.

Titus' words, "Halt, Herr Vetter! Erlauben S' -"(X,489),

see him at the point of refusing the "Erbschaft," but whether he would have admitted openly to wearing the grey wig is uncertain. The imperative, "Halt," although directed at the cousin, also alludes to the speaker himself, in that it may be seen as Titus admonishing and forcing himself to cast off his cunning use of language, which is employed for selfish reasons. This final unmasking is the job of Salome, who has been sent by Flora prior to the latter's knowledge of the arrival of Spund, in order to retrieve the grey wig from Titus. Salome arrives on stage at a most inopportune time, certainly from the viewpoint of Flora and Constantia, stating, "Der Mussi Titus soll die Perücken z'ruckgeben"(X,491). Aside from its obvious meaning, there are several interesting intimations that, although not apparent to anyone on stage, will be discerned by the audience. Firstly, she uses the informal "Mussi," which underlines her lowly position. Furthermore, this expression indicates her unpretentious nature. Secondly, although she is following Flora's instructions, Salome is unconsciously expressing her own wish, namely, the wish that Titus not be so proud, but present himself as he is, without any facade, be it visual or audible. Thirdly, by literally forcing him to take off the wig, Salome assists Titus in ridding himself of the behaviour he adopted in order to battle prejudice. Salome is the only one of the three women present who is sincere towards Titus. It is, therefore, fitting that she make the above statement.

In sharp contrast to Salome's direct and honest language is Frau von Cypressenburg's attempt to ameliorate the situation caused by Salome's message:

> (Laut zu Titus.) Sie haben sich einen ewas [sic] albernen Scherz mit Ihrem würdigen Herrn Onkel erlaubt; Sie werden aber doch nicht glauben, dass er sich wirklich äffen liess? Er müsste der dümmste Mensch unter der Sonne sein, wenn er die plumpe Täuschung nicht augenblicklich gemerkt hätte; aber als Mann von Geist und Verstand -." (X,491)

In view of her previous remarks on the appearance of Spund, this comment clearly unmasks her basic dishonest nature. Furthermore, it is a cunning attempt to deceive and manipulate Spund, not so much because of her concern for Titus' well-being, since she still dislikes him, as will become obvious in a few moments, but instead to assist Constantia in acquiring a wealthy husband. In spite of the fact that she is dishonest, not only toward Spund, but also toward Titus, there is nevertheless an element of truth in as far as the remark about Spund's intelligence is concerned. The clause, "Er müsste der dümmste Mensch unter der Sonne sein," intimates that he is fact is the "dümmste," because he did believe Titus until Salome spoke. Interesting is Titus' comment which concludes the last sentence started by the lady, because it appears that he, at least momentarily, succumbs again to using words in a manipulative manner. Frau von Cypressenburg notes, ". . . aber als Mann von Geist und Verstand -," at which point Titus interjects, "Hat er gleich alles durchschaut und nur mich aufsitzen lassen"(X,491). Of course, the opposite is the case, as Spund has not seen through anything, least of all

through the duplicity of the lady's remarks, nor through Titus' words. The latter, however, does not seem to be wholly selfish. Instead, there appears to be an attempt by him to conclude this matter quickly, without having Spund make an even greater fool of himself than he already has.

Titus' interjection might have given Frau von Cypressenburg the impression that he is supporting her basic intention as she explained it above, but this is only a ruse. However, his motives are not selfish ones. Constantia sees the realization of her goal near, and seeks to ensure it with the following words, "(zu Titus). Dass Ihnen der geistreiche Mann der Haare wegen die Erbschaft nicht entziehen wird, dürfen Sie mit Zuversicht hoffen. (Zu Spund.) Nicht wahr?"(X,492). Titus' retort reiterates his decision mentioned earlier, "(zu Constantia und Flora). Dass ich aber auf die Erbschaft freiwillig Verzicht leiste, das werden Sie nicht hoffen"(X,492). Titus uses the same syntactical structure as Constantia did above, because he aims to create an illusion of agreement. In actual fact, though, he expresses the very antithesis of what she intended. Indeed, he seems to spite her, as he changes her statement, "die Erbschaft nicht entziehen" to "auf die Erbschaft freiwillig Verzicht leiste." Titus is still a master of language, and easily controls the conversation, although it is no longer in order to deceive, but to inform succinctly of his true intentions. Titus' voluntary renunciation of the inheritance, and thereby of Flora and Constantia, shows his determination to remain independent,

a state which he seemed willing to forfeit when seeking employment in the "Gutshof."

Titus' outspoken honesty prompts Spund to say, "Bist doch a guter Kerl, trotz die roten Haar'!"(X,492). This remark at first glance appears to indicate a basic change in the cousin. Yet such is not the case. Once before, Spund stated, "Schau', Titus, du bist ein guter Kerl," but then the cousin went on to say that he was still "hartherzig," because he detested the red hair. In the first quotation above, Spund is shown as not being able to come to terms with the red hair, because he still feels compelled to state, "trotz die roten Haar!" The word "trotz" is significant, because when spelled with a capital, it designates stubbornness and obstinacy, which certainly is descriptive of Spund, particularly in his attitude toward Titus. He knows Titus is basically a decent individual. Still, he obdurately adheres to the prejudicial belief that red hair is the mark of meanness and dishonesty. Thus, Spund remains prejudicial. Titus is fully aware of this, and refers to it when Spund mildly complains, "Du tust aber, als wenn ich da gar nix dreinz'reden hätt'!"(X,493), after Titus has chosen Salome for his wife. The latter replies, "Ich weiss, Herr Vetter, die roten Haar' misfallen Ihnen . . ."(X,493). Here too, his language is succinct.

Inevitably though, prejudice will remain, not only as expressed by Spund, but also in open hostility as stated by Constantia representing Frau von Cypressenburg, "Die gnädige

Frau wünscht, dass man sie hier nicht ferner störe"(X,493), and by Flora, "Ich gratulier' zur schönen Wahl. Da heisst's wohl: ‚Gleich und gleich g'sellt sich gern'"(X,493). The difference in social status is easily recognizable by their language. Constantia's remark is in the subjunctive and stiffly formal, whereas Flora avails herself of colloquial language, which includes a commonplace intended as an insult. However, the audience recognizes the boomerang effect of the proverb, since the three "Gutshof" women have just unmasked their selfishness and dishonesty. Salome never did possess these shortcomings, and Titus is reverting back to his attitude and behaviour prior to his opening song.

In his opening song, Titus first discusses the ill-treatment he has been receiving because of his red hair. Then he threatens revenge. Thus, cunning and manipulative use of language is adopted by him--he is basically a decent fellow--in order to assert himself and prevent further mistreatment. His weapon is his extraordinary skillful use of language, which he uses deftly to deceive and manipulate. But in this process, it happens that his use, frequently his misuse, of the language, although aiding him in achieving small, immediate goals, ultimately forces him into positions which make him become just as mean and despicable in his dealings with his fellow man as those whose actions are governed by prejudices. Furthermore, his clever use of language begins to entangle him in a web of his own making when Flora, Constantia and Marquis, whom he sought to

discredit, unmask him. In the final analysis, language allows no-one to abuse it without punishment. Although Titus retains, and makes use of, his great dexterity with language until the end, he realizes that a misuse of this talent has a debilitating effect, and he therefore abandons the deceptive and cunning aspect of it in the final scenes. Nestroy implies that a character like Titus would be likely to use again the sharp weapon of language, which has won him victories in a society where dazzling word plays, empty phrases, false praise and hollow statements of values are accepted and taken for the truth. The fuller implications of this example would only become apparent with Karl Kraus and the relationship between politics and language in the twentieth century.

Conclusion

The most significant points of conclusion arising from this foregoing investigation concern Nestroy's revolutionary use of language, which, although growing directly out of the "Wiener Volkstheater," is nevertheless distinct and unique.

The following seven linguistic devices identified and analyzed in Chapter II, III and IV constitute important components of this uniqueness: 1) Particular words and phrases echo and reverberate, as well as anticipate, the same and related dominant themes. This results in a resonating of ideas, not only within certain individual plays, but often throughout several plays. In the writings of Nestroy's predecessors, such interplay between words is nugatory or nonexistent. 2) Words frequently have a plurisignation quality. That is, they project more than merely one level of meaning. This inevitably results in an incisive and comprehensive commentary on the matter under consideration. 3) Nestroy often uses proverbs and commonplaces in an ironic way, whereas the earlier writers of the "Wiener Volkstheater" did not use irony, certainly not in the Nestroyan manner. 4) Evaluative words may have a fluid meaning--evaluations are entirely relative to the speaker, situation and partner in dialogue. The audience learns to weigh and assess these expressions. There is a dislocation between the given meaning of a word and that given it by the speaker. Thus the meaning has been shifted and distorted. 5) There is the ironic

understanding by the audience of single words and phrases in a way that the speaker's words may refer back to him. This I call the boomerang effect of words. The understanding by the audience has been evoked by the playwright, who counts on the audience's consciousness in a new way. 6) Language corresponds to the character of the speaker. 7) Inevitably, language manipulates its manipulator. Consequently, language becomes a web, which means that the speaker creates his own linguistic trap, which ultimately catches him. All seven elements are closely related, and may coincide in a particular word or phrase. It seems that all of these devices, individually and in total, exist independently of the speaker's intentions. He is not necessarily aware of the various implications of his words, not merely as far as their denotation and connotation are concerned, but how they reflect the speaker and his immediate environment in reference to people and situations. Language, independently of the speaker, reflects that which is spoken, and this in turn implies that language is beyond the control of the speaker. Thus, it has become, as it were, independent, and unless dealt with directly, and without hidden motivation, its apparent meaning cannot be trusted. The primary import in Nestroy is not in the plot, which is often copied from elsewhere, and development thereof, but in the manner his characters use language.

The Bäuerle-Nestoy comparison brought out two fundamental differences between the two contemporaries, namely the view

towards the use of language, which reflects several additional dissimilarities. The first basic area of difference that is frequently manifested occurs in commonplaces and proverbs. The second is found in the shifting base of eveluative terms employed by Bäuerle entirely in the traditional and accepted sense, thereby supporting the audience's given understanding of them. Nestroy, however, frequently not only debunks or reverses the petrified meaning of the proverb itself, but seriously questions the validity of words themselves, by displaying the loss of meaning in evaluative terms, and in so doing questions the fossilized world view that continues to endorse and maintain them. This leads directly to a marked difference in their view of the individual, who, for Bäuerle, is seen entirely as an "Untertan." Indeed, the most important relationship of the individual is with the state, which, in turn, means that the individual must endorse without question the existing order. For Nestroy, the relationship that received by far the most attention, is the one between the individual and others in his immediate environment, and the difficulties that result out of the relationships. In Bäuerle, the individual must bow to order, whereas in Nestroy, the individual is not considered in relation to the overall social order.

There are several specific differences that develop out of those mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Firstly, in Bäuerle's view, the fundamental attitude and behaviour of the Viennese is an admiring one, while Nestroy detests and mocks it. Secondly,

when Bäuerle does refer to familial relationships, whatever problems do appear are easily overcome, whereas for Nestroy, such relationships, particularly between spouses, as well as between parents and children, are prevaded with ambiguities and problems, for which there appear to be no solutions. Thirdly, Bäuerle subscribes wholly to the traditional view of the magical realm. That is, the beings in this sphere are infallible and omnipotent. Nestroy, on the other hand, employs the magical to reflect the shortcomings found in human behaviour. Lastly, there is the question of the improvement of man, which for Bäuerle is a foregone conclusion, while Nestroy underscores the unchangeability of human nature, which precludes "Besserung." In conclusion, it might be posited that Bäuerle described things as they were not, but perhaps should be, while Nestroy depicted matters as they were, but should not be. Bäuerle is moralistic; Nestroy is not.

In Chapter III, several essential elements of Nestroy's language were distilled through an analysis of linguistic use in two plays. Simplicius, in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel, betrays himself continuously through his particular choice and use of words. He unmasks not only his foolishness, in spite of repeated setbacks, which are the direct result of his fatuity, but simultaneously underlines the impossibility of any fundamental change, as far as his basic nature is concerned. He provides an example of man's inability to learn from experience, or to express it differently: foolishness, if a basic component of an individual's nature, is irrevocable.

In the third part of Chapter III, the focus shifts from the importance of language, as the index of an individual's nature and its unchangeability, to the calculated and deceptive misuse of language in order to manipulate. Puffmann, in Der Unbedeutende, is the paradigm. There is also present the antithesis of such language habits in the person of Peter, who shows that there is still a possibility of using words directly and honestly. Peter, the antagonist of Puffmann, acts in part as a foil to underline the secretary's maliciousness. The latter, very similar to Simplicius in Gegen Torheit gibt es kein Mittel, also does not learn from experience. Even though his verbal machinations are entangling him more and more, particularly toward the end, he continues to use them, with the result that he is forced to marry Ottilie, whom he despises. It was Peter's direct and honest use of language which, in part, helped to expose Puffmann's dishonesty. Therefore, Peter's use of language seems not only possible, but has a crucial function, in so far as it contributes to the unmasking of deception.

The conclusions reached in the main body of this study, Chapter IV, emerge from an analysis of Nestroy's most flamboyant figure, Titus Feuerfuchs, in Der Talisman. Titus is not only a master of language, but also a word magician, who combines elements from both Peter and Puffmann. Titus is basically a decent man, but he is placed in a position where language is his only weapon of defence, which he uses with increasing strength and brutality. He frequently does not use the truth only as a matter

of self defence, and when this happens, language takes on a life of its own, and begins to work against him.

In the analysis of Titus and, to a somewhat lesser extent, of Puffmann, the attempt was to show that it becomes increasingly easier to manipulate language, because words no longer have a single relationship to their supposed meaning. Language has become more and more malleable. But as this happens, language takes on a life of its own, and takes revenge on those using it as a smoke screen. Titus is a decent individual, but he is put upon by society. He has, however, a peculiar gift, in that he can use language almost any way he wants to, but still encounters certain problems because of his highly metaphorical language which begins to refer back to his own position, even though he does not intend it that way. Originally, the audience is sympathetic to him, but he becomes an aggressive figure, and the spectator begins to turn against him. This had been prophesied--indirectly--by Salome, the most naive and socially lowest woman in the play.[1]

It must be noted, however, that Titus' clever use of language only works with an opponent who thinks that he is also sophisticated with language--that is, one who plays the game. His cleverness does not work with Plutzerkern, because the latter is insensate and outright stupid. In fact, he seems like a parody of those using fancy language. Even though Titus overwhelms him with flashy language, Plutzerkern is still able to destroy such linguistic cleverness, simply because he fails to

comprehend Titus on his level, forcing the latter to admit, "Ich bin entwaffnet!"(X,393). Salome too, is unable to understand him. She, however, does not pretend to do so, nor does she use language in a pretentious manner, and thus betray a foolishness. With both, Titus is disarmed. Titus seems like an excellent language swordsman fighting two who are unarmed. Therefore, nothing happens with his verbal flashiness, because he appears to work in a vacuum. With Salome and Plutzerkern, he does not seem malicious, because they do not understand him, and therfore they disarm him. Marquis presents a unique case. He truly disarms Titus, because the two are on equal terms in linguistic dexterity; both are clever, and know the other to be a language fraud. When the two confront each other, it depends on who, in the context of the plot, is in a superior position. The three women, Flora, Constantia and Frau von Cypressenburg, in ascending degrees, believe they can meet Titus on his own terms. Frau von Cypressenburg is especially gullible and receptive to metaphorical language which she does not understand. She and the other two are ready victims because of their relation to language. The three women work with, and accept, clichés, superficialities, banalities, even absurdities, because they do not use language as a tool for communication and perception of the truth. They are purpose-ridden themselves, hence fail to identify purpose-ridden language in others. It seems that the higher Titus moves up through the social scale, the more he finds people susceptible to hypocrisy.

An essential conclusion of this study is that the use of language, particularly by the foolish, and by those employing it as a smoke screen for manipulative purposes, inevitably results in hazard and peril. In fact, as already mentioned in reference to Salome and Klara, there are instances when silence alone seems to assure honesty and decency.[2] In this sense, Nestroy may be seen as a forerunner of linguistic philosophers like Wittgenstein on the one hand, and literary figures like Hofmannsthal on the other, who called into question the validity of any word, because words, it seems, no longer express reality.

This dissertation has sought to examine concretely and in detail some facets of Nestroy's language first suggested by Karl Kraus in his essay "Nestroy und die Nachwelt," written in 1912. It is only fitting to conclude with a quotation from the introduction to Karl Kraus's play, Die letzten Tage der Menschheit (1922), which may be seen as a powerful and tragic epilogue to Nestroy's writings:

> Die unwahrscheinlichsten Gespräche, die hier geführt werden, sind wörtlich gesprochen worden; die grellsten Erfindungen sind Zitate. Sätze, deren Wahnwitz unverlierbar dem Ohr eingeschrieben ist, wachsen zur Lebensmusik . . . Phrasen stehen auf zwei Beinen - Menschen behielten nur eines.[3]

It would take the politics, which Karl Kraus describes in his monumental play, and the continuing history of the twentieth century, to demonstrate in full the vastness of the threat implied by the loosening foundation of truth in the words we hear in Nestroy's apparently innocent comedies.

Notes

Introduction

[1] For the purposes of this dissertation, I have found the following in particular to be most worthwhile:

Jürgen Hein, Spiel und Satire in der Komödie Johann Nestroys, Ars poetica: Texte und Studien zur Dichtungslehre und Dichtkunst, 11 (Bad Homburg: Gehlen, 1970).

Jürgen Hein, ed., Theater und Gesellschaft: Das Volksstück im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Literatur in der Gesellschaft, 12 (Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1973).

Helmut Herles, Nestroys Komödie: „Der Talisman": Von der ersten Notiz zum vollendeten Werk (Munich: Fink, 1974).

Karl Kraus, Beim Wort genommen, ed. Heinrich Fischer (Munich: Kösel, 1955).

Karl Kraus, Untergang der Welt, ed. Heinrich Fischer (Munich: Kösel, 1960).

Franz. H. Mautner, Nestroy (Heidelberg: Stiehm, 1974).

Otto Rommel, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wiener Volkskomik, Vol. XV of Johann Nestroy: Sämtliche Werke, ed. Fritz Brukner and Otto Rommel (1924-1930; rpt, New York: AMS-Kraus, 1973). Future references to this edition will appear in parentheses in the text.

Chapter I

[1] Herbert W. Reichert, "Some Causes of the Nestroy Renaissance in Vienna," Monatshefte, 47 (1955), 225.

[2] Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, Wittgenstein's Vienna (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), p. 68.

[3] Reichert, p. 228.

[4] Walter Dohn, quoted by Jürgen Hein, in "Nestroyforschung (1901-1966)," Wirkendes Wort, 18 (1968), 233.

[5] Hein, "Nestroyforschung," p. 234.

[6] Hein, "Nestroyforschung," p. 236.

[7] Siegfried Brill, Die Komödie der Sprache: Untersuchungen zum Werke Johann Nestroys, Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, 28 (Nuremberg: Hans Carl, 1967), p. 1.

[8] Brill, p. 1.

[9] Herles, p. 85.

[10] Herles, p. 193.

[11] Herles, p. 85, fn. 8.

[12] Brill, p. 71.

[13] Brill, p. 72.

[14] Herles, p. 132.

[15] Brill, p. 75

[16] Brill, p. 72.

[17] Brill, p. 73.

[18] Brill, p. 71.

[19] Mautner, p. 78.

[20] Brill, p. 74.

[21] Brill, p. 74.

[22] Brill, p. 76.

[23] Brill, p. 79.

[24] Kraus, Untergang, p. 233.

[25] Herles, p. 92.

[26] Herles, p. 92.

[27] Herles, p. 103.

[28] Kraus, Beim Wort, p. 135.

[29] Herles, p. 188.

[30] Hein, Spiel und Satire, p. 159.

[31] Hein, Spiel und Satire, p. 43.

[32] Hein, Spiel und Satire, p. 43.

[33] Hein, Spiel und Satire, p. 46.

[34] Hein, Spiel und Satire, p. 55.

[35] Hein, Spiel und Satire, p. 121.

[36] Brill, p. 3.

[37] Mautner, p. 81.

[38] Mautner, pp. 80-81.

[39] Mautner, p. 73.

[40] Kraus, Beim Wort, p. 135.

[41] Mautner, p. 77.

[42] Mautner, p. 70.

[43] Mautner, p. 70.

[44] Mautner, p. 87.

[45] Kraus, Beim Wort, p. 135.

[46] Karl Kraus, Auswahl aus dem Werk, ed. Heinrich Fischer (Munich: Kösel, 1957), p. 354.

[47] The following is a brief account of the main developments. Kern, who is married to Regine, a woman forty years his junior, is assisting Anton in hiding from the authorities. The latter has been politically active, and has been apprehended, but has escaped. Kern decides to hide him in one of his properties situated in a mountainous area. A simultaneous development sees Regine maintaining a relationship that grows ever closer with Baron Rehfeld. Kern, somewhat mistrustful of his wife from the outset, finds his suspicions confirmed, and ultimately follows through with the separation, giving her the options to rejoin him in a year, or renounce him. Closely connected to both developments are the activities of Gabriel, who is Kern's servant of many years, and who attempts to be crafty and deceptive.

[48] William P. Alston, Philosophy of Language (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 32-33.

[49] Geza Révész, "Denken und Sprechen," Thinking and Speaking: A Symposium, ed. G. Révész (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1954), p. 45.

[50] Janik and Toulmin, p. 87.

[51] Kraus, Untergang, p. 233.

[52] Kraus, Beim Wort, pp. 134-35.

Chapter II

[1] Alois Eder, "Die geistige Kraft der Gemeinheit: Zur Sozialgeschichte der Rezeption Nestroys," in Hein, Theater und Gesellschaft, p. 140.

[2] Gerhard Helbig, ed., Das Wiener Volkstheater, in seinen schönsten Stücken, Sammlung Dietrich, 253 (Bremen: Schünemann, 1960), p. xxv.

[3] Helbig, p. 14.

[4] Helbig, p. 54.

[5] Helbig, p. 43.

[6] Brill notes: "In der Sprache unterscheidet sich Nestroy aufs stärkste von der traditionellen Alt-Wiener Volkskomödie" (p. 12).

[7] Otto Rommel, ed., Besserungsstücke, I, Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, 4, Barock (Leipzig: Reclam, 1938), pp. 234-35.

[8] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 237.

[9] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, pp. 237-38.

[10] Helbig, p. 4.

[11] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 239.

[12] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 239.

[13] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 239.

[14] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 240.

[15] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 244.

[16] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 239.

[17] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 249.

[18] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 267.

[19] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, pp. 296-97.

[20] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[21] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[22] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, pp. 313-14.

[23] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 242.

[24] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 246.

[25] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 247.

[26] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 247.

[27] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 247.

[28] Redlich, in Die Bürger in Wien, admonishes Therese, his wife, who is interested in Müller as a husband for their daughter, with: "Wer kein braver Untertan ist, kann auch kein braver Ehemann werden"(Helbig, p. 9). It seems that Arilla's promise in reference to Kitt's "Besserung," refers to both aspects. The term "Untertan" underscores the authority and control of the state over the individual, and the latter's willing submission to the former.

[29] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 247.

[30] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 289.

[31] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 240.

[32] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 240.

[33] Helbig, p. 3.

[34] Helbig, p. 8.

[35] Helbig, p. 9.

[36] Helbig, p. 9.

[37] S.I. Hayakawa, "What is Semantics?" The Use and Misuse of Language, ed. S.I. Hayakawa (Greenwich, Conn,: Fawcett, 1958), p. 22.

[38] S.I. Hayakawa, Language in Thought and Action (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972), pp. viii-ix.

[39] Helbig, p. 13.

[40] Helbig, p. 14.

[41] Helbig, p. 15.

[42] Helbig, p. 16.

[43] This view is the extreme opposite to that of Nestroy, as the following quotation by Syndikus Werthner, in Nur Ruhe, indicates: ". . . es gibt sehr wenig böse Menschen, und doch geschieht so viel Unheil in der Welt; der grösste Teil dieses Unheils kommt auf Rechnungen der vielen, vielen guten Menschen, die weiter nichts als gute Menschen sind"(XII,6).

[44] Helbig, pp. 16-17.

[45] Helbig, p. 45.

[46] Rommel, Besserungstücke, p. 247.

[47] Rommel, Besserungstücke, p. 247.

[48] Rommel, Besserungstücke, p. 248.

[49] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 269.

[50] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 308.

[51] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 277.

[52] Kitt's marriage problems have been discussed above as a result of his shortcomings.

[53] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[54] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[55] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[56] Generally speaking, it would seem that in Nestroy's plays the mainspring of an individual's difficulties is not seen as having its source in society, i.e., there is not a collective responsibility, but as having its origin in the particular individual himself.

[57] It should be noted that Nocturnus' comment in reference to "Der Schlamm des Lebens," is an answer to Longinus' question, "Was ist denn das da unten?", which was preceded directly by the

following stage directions: "(Musik, er steigt auf einer Wolkenstufe zum Ringe empor - aus der Versenkung unter ihm erhebt sich eine Gruppe von üppigen Mädchen, welche volle Becher, und kleine Teufel, die Kartenblätter zu ihm emporhalten und ihm winken.)"(I,18).

[58] The dream is of special significance, because it helps to illuminate Longinus' nature from within himself. In Der Tod am Hochzeitstag, written one year after Die Verbannung aus dem Zauberreiche, the "Chor der Kobolde," who are in the service of Lunara, the queen of dreams, explain the nature of dreams: "Was jeder sich malet in furchtsamen Sinn / Das stellen wir schnell vor die Augen ihm hin"(I,143). The emphasis is on the phrase, "Was jeder sich malet," i.e., the self is responsible for the subject matter of the dream. Thus, in Longinus' particular case, the desire for pleasure will remain, and he will continue to be a "Lump." The verb "beherrscht" clearly shows that his inner self is sovereign, and will not permit anyone or anything to usurp its power.

[59] Arilla is the medium that serves as the string which Bäuerle works. Thus, Bäuerle intervenes directly through her. The attitude and behaviour of the three protagonists seems contrived, synthetic rather than organic. This is not the case in reference to Longinus.

[60] This awareness of his situation does not lead to a change. Thus, he remains true to himself, in spite of the great difficulties his attitude and behaviour are causing for him. He knows that he only hurts himself, yet he continues stubbornly in his ways, and the unchangeability of his nature is reflected by the unchangeability of his linguistic habits.

[61] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 265.

[62] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 289.

[63] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[64] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 313.

[65] Rommel, Besserungsstücke, p. 247.

[66] Here is one use of "solide" not mentioned in the analysis of Nestroy's evaluative terms. In this particular instance, "solide" is synonymous with "ordentlich." Both are seeking to convey their traditional meaning, and the audience interprets them accordinly. The use of "zurückzukehren" is interesting, because Longinus has never been "solide," at least, not in the play.

[67] This may be seen as a further corrosive remark and a debunking of the "Zauberwelt," whose denizens are very similar to mortals. It is in sharp contrast to Bäuerle's treatment of this aspect of the "Wiener Volkstheater."

[68] It must be remembered that the particular aim of Longinus' "Besserung" was to improve him, so he would become a proper husband for Urania.

Chapter III

[1] Simplicius' words, particularly, "so einen Freund," immediately reminds the spectator, who is knowledgeable in Nestroy's plays, of Schnoferl's--the protagonist of Das Mädel aus der Vorstadt (1841)--opening song, where he comments on the 'bliss' of marriage:

> Schad', dass ich nit heiraten tu', das wär' schön,
> Die Seligkeit soll schon ins Aschgraue gehn.
> Wie schön, wenn man ein' Affen mit hambringt auf d'Nacht
> Und 's Weib ein' acht Tag' drüber Vorwürfe macht!
> Wie schön, wenn man z'erst in Kaffeehaus verliert
> Und z' Haus von Weib extra noch ausgemacht wird!
> Wie schön, tut das Schicksal ein' Freund gleich bescher'n!
> Wie lieb, wenn die Kind'r in der Nacht unruhig wer'n!
> Und wie überraschend tut sich oft d'Famili vermehr'n!
> Na, der Mensch muss nit alles auf einmal begehr'n.
> (XI, 10-11)

There is, however, a crucial difference. Simplicius believes Narciss to be a genuine friend, when the latter is really Aglaja's lover, whereas Schnoferl is ironic, and implies precisely such friends as Narciss. Here is an example of an echo word contributing toward the reverberating of a particular theme between plays.

[2] Here, it might be noted that the attitudes of Aglaja and Simplicius towards each other prompt the knowing spectator to think of Ledig's observations in Unverhofft (1845), when he notes: "'s Heiraten is offenbar keine Kunst, denn es kommt sogar bei die Wilden vor, und damit uns das recht augenscheinlich wird, heiraten selbst in Europa viele Wilde, wenn s' nur a schönes Geld haben"(XIII,12). Both Aglaja and Simplicius are "Wilde," a term echoed by Simplicius when he uses the words "unsinniges Glück" in reference to his coming marriage.

[3] Puffmann's lack of success with Thomas is very similar, and anticipatory of Titus' dilemma in the following chapter, where the latter is unsuccessful in dealing with Plutzerkern, because of Plutzerkern's inability to respond to Titus' flamboyant language. Plutzerkern's attempt at formal and elevated language results in unwitting self-ridicule.

[4] The term "Narr" and its connotations are anticipatory of Packendorf's remark only a short time later, when he says to Massendorf: "Du bist ein Hans-Narr"(VII,15). In this manner, key terms reverberate throughout the play, and, thereby, emphasize significant thoughts.

Chapter IV

[1] Kraus, Untergang, p. 233.

[2] The contemporary critic, George Steiner, observes the following: "Political-social satire in London and New York, the sick joke, the conviction that the language of those who govern us is a poisonous smoke screen echo the genius of Karl Kraus"(George Steiner, "Wien, Wien, Nur Du Allein," The New Yorker, June 25, 1979, p. 101). Perhaps it should be added that Karl Kraus had noted this type of language misuse in the plays of Nestroy.

[3] Kraus, Untergang, p. 233.

[4] Kraus, Beim Wort, p. 135.

[5] Kraus, Untergang, p. 226.

Chapter V

[1] In reference to Salome, an interesting aspect must be noted. When suddenly confronted by Titus, she faints. She is totally silent, and thus avoids, at least as long as she is silent, compromising her verbal integrity. This brings to mind Klara's stance, who, when confronted by the slanderous remarks of her neighbours, also remained silent. Later, she explained to Peter, her brother, ". . .ich hab' g'schnappt nach Luft, aber sie war so von Verleumdung verpest't, dass die Sprach' der Wahrheit hat müssen ersticken drin"(VII,59). It appears that Klara and Salome must remain silent at crucial times, in order to retain their honesty and decency, because language can only deceive.

[2] It is significant that Titus too remains silent in one crucial place. This occurs when Frau von Cypressenburg seeks to convince him that Constantia has only his interest at heart. Frau von Cypressenburg states, "Sehen Sie, wie das gute Geschöpf (auf Constantia deutend) für Ihr Bestes sorgt? Ich weiss alles und willige gern in den Bund, den Liebe schloss und Dankbarkeit befestigen wird." Titus, however, does not reply; the stage directions note, "(verneigt sich stumm)" (X,489). His silence registers the refusal to join with Constantia and Frau von Cypressenburg in a conspiracy, as it were, whose aim would be to have him become Spund's "Universalerbe."

[3] Karl Kraus, Die letzten Tage der Menschheit (Vienna, Leipzig: Fackel, 1922), p. vii.

Bibliography

Part One: Primary Texts Cited

Helbig, Gerhard, ed. Das Wiener Volkstheater, in seinen schönsten Stücken. Sammlung Dietrich, 253. Bremen: Schünemann, 1960.

Kraus, Karl. Beim Wort Genommen. Ed. Heinrich Fischer. Munich: Kösel, 1960.

----------. Die letzten Tage der Menschheit. Vienna, Leipzig: Fackel, 1922.

----------. Untergang der Welt. Ed. Heinrich Fischer. Munich: Kösel, 1960.

Nestroy, Johann. Sämtliche Werke. Ed. Fritz Brukner and Otto Rommel. 15 vols. 1924-1930; rpt. New York: AMS-Kraus, 1973.

----------. Gesammelte Werke. Ed. Otto Rommel. Vienna: Schroll, 1962. Vol VI.

----------. Three Comedies. Trans. Max Knight and Joseph Fabry. New York: Ungar, 1967.

Rommel, Otto, ed. Das Parodistische Zauberspiel. Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, 3, Barock. Leipzig: Reclam, 1937.

----------, ed. Besserungsstücke. 2 vols. Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, 4 and 5, Barock. Leipzig: Reclam, 1939.

----------, ed. Die romantisch-komischen Original-Zauberspiele. Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, 6, Barock. Leipzig: Reclam, 1939.

Part Two: Secondary Literature

A.

Basil, Otto. Johann Nestroy. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1975.

Bauer, Roger. Lasst sie koaxen, Die kritischen Frösch' in Preussen und Sachsen! Vienna: Europaverlag, 1977.

Boeschenstein, Hermann. German Literature of the Nineteenth Century. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969.

Brill, Siegfried. Die Komödie der Sprache: Untersuchungen zum Werk Johann Nestroys. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, 28. Nuremberg: Hans Carl, 1967.

Eder, Alois. "Die geistige Kraft der Gemeinheit." In Theater und Gesellschaft: Das Volksstück im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Ed. J. Hein. Literatur in der Gesellschaft, 12. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1973, pp. 133-35.

Fischer, Ernst. Von Grillparzer zu Kafka. Vienna: Globus, 1962.

Hein, Jürgen. Der Talisman. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1975.

----------. "Nestroyforschung (1901-1966)." Wirkendes Wort, 18 (1968), 232-45.

----------. "Neuere Nestroyforschung (1967-1973)." Wirkendes Wort, 25 (1975), 140-51.

----------. Spiel und Satire in der Komödie Nestroys. Ars poetica: Texte und Dichtung, 11. Bad Homburg: Gehlen, 1970.

----------, ed. Theater und Gesellschaft: Das Volksstück im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Literatur in der Gesellschaft, 12. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1973.

Herles, Helmut. Johann Nestroy, Der Talisman. Komedia, 17. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971.

----------. Nestroys Komödie: „Der Talisman": Von der ersten Notiz zum vollendeten Werk. Munich: Fink, 1974.

Hillach, Ansgar. Die Dramatisierung des komischen Dialogs. Munich: Fink, 1967.

Kahl, Kurt. Johann Nestroy. Vienna: Molden, 1970.

Mautner, Fritz. "Der Talisman." In Das Deutsche Drama. Ed. Benno von Wiese. Düsseldorf: Bagel, 1968, pp. 23-42.

Müller, Christoph. "Nestroy für Heute?" Theater Heute. February, 1976, pp. 26-30.

Pichler, Gustav. Nestroy gehört den Komödianten. Vienna: Bergland, 1978.

Preisner, Rio. Johann Nepomuk Nestroy. Munich: Hanser, 1968.

Reichert, Herbert W. "Some Causes of the Nestroy Renaissance in Vienna." Monatshefte, 47 (1955), 221-230.

Weigel, Hans. Johann Nestroy. Braunschweig: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1972.

B.

Engelmann, Paul. Dem Andenken an Karl Kraus. Vienna: Kerry, 1967.

Fischer, J.M. Karl Kraus. Kronberg im Taunus: Scriptor, 1973.

Kraft, Werner. Karl Kraus. Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1956.

Kraus, Karl. Auswahl aus dem Werk. Ed. Heinrich Fischer. Munich: Kösel, 1957.

Schick, Paul. Karl Kraus. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, n.d.

Weigel, Hans. Karl Kraus oder Die Macht der Ohnmacht. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1972.

C.

De Boor, Helmut and Richard Newald. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Munich: Beck, 1967. Vols. V and VI.

Fürst, Rudolf, ed. Raimunds Vorgänger. Bäuerle. Meisl. Gleich. Schriften der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, 10. Berlin: Selbstverlag der Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte, 1907.

Janik, Allan and Stephen Toulmin. Wittgenstein's Vienna. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.

Jaszi, Oskar. The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Nadler, Josef. Literaturgeschichte Österreichs. Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1951.

Nagel, J.W., Eduard Zeidler and Jakob Castle. Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Vienna: Fromme, 1899. Vol. II.

Prang, Helmut. Geschichte des Lustspiels. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1968.

Rommel, Otto. Die Alt-Wiener Volkskomödie, Ihre Geschichte vom barocken Welt-Theater bis zum Tode Nestroys. Vienna: Schroll, 1952.

----------. Die Grossen Figuren der Alt-Wiener Volkskomödie. Vienna: Bindenschild, 1946.

Steiner, George. "Wien, Wien, Nur Du Allein." The New Yorker, June 25, 1979, pp. 101-05.

D.

Alston, William, P. Philosophy of Language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Arntzen, Helmut. Die Ernste Komödie. Munich: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1968.

Hayakawa, S.I., ed. The Use and Misuse of Language. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett, 1958.

Hayakawa, S.I. Language in Thought and Action. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

Révész, G., ed. Thinking and Speaking. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, 1954.

Wilson, John. Language and the Pursuit of Truth. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.