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At the time Wedekind began his career, Germany was experiencing both a cult of masculinity as well as a crisis in masculinity. In the latter decades of the nineteenth century, imperial Germany underwent a new engendering that expounded a revived emphasis on virile masculinity. Philosophers like Nietzsche cried out for a new race of supermen. Bismarck's "blood and iron" politics made Germany a European power. Industrialization produced entrepreneurs and barons of industry. And from the ranks of the military arose the Junker-styled officer. At the same time there was this intense emphasis on masculinity, there was also a great feeling of impotence as the overarching systems of value crumbled away under the weight of commerce and science. Caught between the alpha males who ran the nation and the New Woman who was now demanding equal rights and privileges, the ordinary man felt increasingly isolated and emasculated—from his work, from his home, and eventually even from his own manhood.

Like many in his day, Frank Wedekind believed life had become an affected charade belying the vitality it once possessed. While this decadence was due in part to the overly cultured and refined aspects of his times, Wedekind saw pretentious morality, what he culled "burgerliche Moral," as the leading cause of society's downfall. To counter this decline, he proposed a new way of life which was supposed to reawaken the most vigorous of human
This "menschliche Moral," as he labeled it, was not a morality per se, but rather an expression of the life force now presumed missing from his world. Viewing sexuality as the most rejuvenating of human drives in that it held within it the primal instinct for life, this dissertation explores Wedekind's championing thereof as a means for fostering his new lifestyle.

As this investigation discusses, sexuality held a prominent place not only in Wedekind's oeuvre, but indeed was a hotly debated issue at the end of the nineteenth century as a new brand of physicians called sexologists tried desperately to confine men as well as women to rigidly separate social spheres. Whenever there was a transgressing of engendered boundaries, as seen with the increasingly vocal and assertive Women's Movement, sexuality, and in particular female sexuality, was defined in pathological terms. While Wedekind did believe in the regenerative function of sexuality and thus the prostitute, or the more appropriately-coined German term Freudenmädchen, holds a prominent place throughout his oeuvre, this study shows how his works, like the medical discourses of his time, were also a warning against the potentially rampant nature of her sexuality and the harm it could do male sexuality.

In looking at Wedekind's early works, and in particular at his Lulu-plays, through the lenses of medical, anthropological, and sociological discourses, this dissertation reveals to what extent Wedekind's own works were influenced by the debates on sexual pathology so widespread during his day. While research to date has focused predominantly on his female characters, as scholars have interpreted Wedekind's oeuvre as either a promotion of female liberation or a misogynist rebuke of the liberated woman, this study pays special attention
to his male characters as I demonstrate how his works are not only an advocacy for men, but indeed a battle-cry for the male to recoup his weakened masculinity.

In analyzing the way Wedekind portrays masculinity and femininity as well as the intersection of the two in the act of sex, this dissertation identifies the types of women Wedekind posited as most deviant and dangerous to male sexuality as well as the types of men he found to be most susceptible to these women. Although Wedekind professed advancing a more liberated sexuality as a means for attaining his "menschliche Moral, my research demonstrates that the vitality to be regained through this lifestyle was a vitality for man-kind only; it was to be gained through the woman, but not for the woman.
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INTRODUCTION

Like many in his day, Frank Wedekind believed life had become an affected charade belying the vitality and verve it once possessed. While this decadence was due in part to the overly cultured and refined aspects of his times, Wedekind saw pretentious morality, what he called "bürgerliche Moral," as the leading cause of society's downfall. To counter this decline, he proposed a new way of life which was supposed to reawaken the most vigorous of human drives. This "menschliche Moral," as he labeled it, was not a morality per se, but rather an expression of the life force now presumed missing from his hypocritical world. Viewing sexuality as the most rejuvenating of human drives in that it held within it the primal instinct for life, Wedekind championed a more open expression thereof as a means for fostering this new lifestyle. This belief that reliance on primal instincts would revitalize society can be seen throughout his extensive œuvre where it is the dynamics of sexual relationships and even more specifically the sex act itself which takes center stage. Because this particular instinctual drive plays such a dominant role in his concept of a renewed society, the prostitute, or the more appropriately-coined German term Freudenmädchen, holds a prominent place in Wedekind's œuvre. With a particular focus on this figure, this dissertation will explore how sexuality functions within Wedekind's literary works by analyzing these works through the medical, anthropological, and sociological discourses
of the day that determined what was considered acceptable and unacceptable (or “normal” and “abnormal”) sexuality in both men and women. Specifically, it will look at the role of the body in Wedekind’s works, how men and women are constructed, and how they interact with one another.

While sexuality is central to Wedekind’s thinking and construction of his literary works, his concept and use thereof remains in debate even today. Scholars such as J.L. Hibberd (1984), D.C.G. Lorenz (1976), Ronald Peacock (1980), Wolfdietrich Rasch (1969), and Fritz Strich (1924) all interpret Wedekind as a champion of a more liberal sexuality. Hibberd lauds Wedekind not only for renouncing the idea that the flesh is the evil opponent of the mind, as so many had claimed during his day, but also for forcing his audiences to question normal assumptions about good and evil. Lorenz correlates Wedekind’s emphasis on sexual liberation to the socialist feminist program, seeing in Wedekind’s works a warning against patriarchal dominance. Arguing that Wedekind adopted the dialectic method of the German socialists Engels and Bebel, she sees him envisioning a society in which men and women have equal rights and equal power. Looking more at the aggression Wedekind portrays, Peacock interprets Wedekind’s depiction of sexuality, particularly as it is represented in the Lulu character, as a justifiable, but diabolical anger which strikes out against the repressive morals of the day. Acknowledging the socially critical aspects of Wedekind’s plays, Rasch sees Wedekind, through the figures of his uninhibited, unreflective characters, as demanding social recognition and acceptance of instinctual drives as a source of rejuvenation. Strich again picks up the socialist thread as he credits Wedekind with
holding up the sexually-active woman for admiration at the same time he exposes the bourgeois norms that would degrade her.

Taking a more critical stance are scholars such as Elizabeth Boa (1987, 1992), Carol Diethe (1988), Peter Michelsen (1975), Friedrich Rothe (1968), and Gerhard Vogel (1972) who all see Wedekind objectifying the female, pushing for sexual freedom, but not for social or political equality. Indeed, what is most often noted among this second group of critics is the derogatory manner in which Wedekind continually portrays feminists throughout his works. While Boa observes that Wedekind exposes social stereotypes, she points out that he does not manage to subvert them, but rather in many instances actually seems to support them as he takes an antagonist view toward liberated women. In looking at distorted sexual attitudes, Diethe, like Boa, notes Wedekind’s inconsistent position relative to women. Additionally, she also notices a violence and brutality toward women which Wedekind appears to condone. Michelsen too picks up on the misogynistic currents and reads Wedekind as siding with Schopenhauer and against women. Accordingly, he sees Wedekind’s women portrayed as objects of lust and male satisfaction rather than as true individuals. In similar fashion, Rothe, while granting that Wedekind was trying to show what could happen to sexuality when repressed by society, nevertheless notes the fracturing of the female body as he refers to Lulu as not only possessing Pandora’s box, but actually depicted as Pandora’s box. Lastly, Vogel argues that Wedekind represents sexuality as a demonic sensuality that lures men to their deaths. In concurrence with Michelsen, who does not see Wedekind’s women portrayed as individuals, Vogel sees them instead representing archetypes of sensuality, and in the case of Lulu, the more dangerous femme fatale-type.
Despite prior focus on Wedekind, little attention has been paid him in the last decade and no scholarship to date has investigated his sexual politics from a medical point-of-view that incorporates images of both masculinity and femininity. It is from this perspective that I will explore Wedekind’s complex use and advocacy of sexuality to interpret these images within his works and particularly within his Lulu-dramas. In order to better understand the emphasis on the pathological body at the turn-of-the-century, Chapter One will discuss the evolution of sexuality. I will look at the concepts of the human body in Classical Antiquity which placed woman beneath man on the cosmic continuum of perfection, the Renaissance post-mortem autopsies which continued to see the female as an inverted version of the male, the scientists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries who now used biological reasoning to continue designating the female as that which was less than male, and then finally, at the end of the nineteenth century, to the new brand of physicians, the sexologists, who, in reaction to increasingly vocal and assertive women, began defining female sexuality in pathological terms. From here, Chapter One will address how literature not only reflected but also promoted society’s concepts of sexuality and how, as the nineteenth century came to a close, images of femininity became increasingly more insidious while images of masculinity became more precarious owing to issues and concerns surrounding the Frauenfrage.

In addressing the predominance of the prostitute in Wedekind’s early works, Chapter Two will focus on the evolution of Eros in Frühlings Erwachen, Mine-Haha,
Das Sonnenspektrum, and Tod und Teufel. While this examination will delineate Wedekind’s own idyllic belief in the regenerative nature of sexuality, as represented in the figure of the prostitute, it will then contrast this with the dangers as well as warnings of female sexuality alluded to in these works.

Wedekind’s most famous dramas, his Lulu-plays, will be the subject of Chapters Three through Five. Coming from a medical family that was well versed in the scientific discourses of the day, Wedekind had ready access to and a keen interest in the discourses on deviance abounding at this time. Referring back to Richard von Krafft-Ebing’s renowned work Psychopathia Sexualis as the source material for much of Wedekind’s writing, these chapters will focus on the sexual pathology Wedekind incorporates throughout his works, but especially in his Lulu-plays. Chapter Three will focus predominantly on the distorted images of male and female sexuality as portrayed first in bourgeois ideals of marriage and then as it is corrupted through a market economy. By noting the commodification that takes place in both Erdgeist as well as Die Büchse der Pandora, this chapter will analyze the fears and insecurities of late-nineteenth-century men as they reacted and responded to the pressures arising from the changes occurring in their social and sexual roles. In particular it will look at images of emasculated masculinity and the measures Wedekind suggested for countering this impotence.

Starting with the premise that Lulu is the personification of Wedekind’s “menschlicher Moral,” the embodiment of his notion of revitalizing instincts, Chapter Four will discuss this enigmatic concept. Although Wedekind describes this “menschliche Moral”
as above and outside of society, and therefore beyond social reproach, he nevertheless envisions it somehow implemented within society. With Lulu’s character hinging on the definition of this notion, this chapter will show that this concept is the pivot around which many scholars struggle to interpret not only the character of Lulu, but then also Wedekind’s own personal stance toward women. With a strong focus on the manuscript, which did not come to light until 1990, this chapter will show the precarious connection between the original work, *Die Büchse der Pandora: Eine Monstretragödie*, and the subsequent companion-plays, *Erdgeist* and *Die Büchse der Pandora*. By demonstrating that the successively more innocuous characterizations of Lulu presented later were Wedekind’s efforts to circumvent the severe censorship which did not allow his original creation to be published or performed, this chapter will expose Lulu, as Wedekind originally conceived of her, as a sexual monster and therefore not the personification of his “menschlicher Moral,” as so many interpretations have claimed.

Chapter Five will then take a closer look at the Prologue to gain not only more insight into Lulu’s true role in Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” but likewise the purpose of Jack-the-Ripper. In defining Jack as the quintessential form of masculine bravado and self-assertion so admired by Wedekind, this chapter will investigate the function of the strong man relative to female sexuality. Additionally, by looking at Jack’s murders of both Lulu and Geschwitz, issues of control—within Wedekind’s works and likewise within society at large—as well as Wedekind’s own misogynist attitudes will be addressed.

This study will conclude by placing Wedekind’s work into the context of his time, showing how literature not only reflected discourses on what was considered acceptable and
unacceptable sexuality at the turn-of-the-century in Wilhelmine Germany, but then also how literature, through artists such as Wedekind, contributed to this discussion by exemplifying and condemning that which was considered deviant sexuality.
CHAPTER 1

CHANGING CONCEPTS OF SEXUALITY

For centuries the female body has been the site of contested positionalities. As far back as biblical references that blamed mankind’s fall from grace on uncontrollable female inquisitiveness and seductiveness to contemporary pop culture that still reiterates female sexuality as the source of man’s unhappiness and destruction, it has been the woman, or more specifically, the female body that has functioned as the projection of and scapegoat for men’s apprehensions and angers. Concurrently, it has been this very same body which, in its virginal form, Christianity has upheld as the vessel that carried mankind’s salvation and in more modern times poets have seen as the vehicle to reunite estranged man with his harmonious past. To understand the importance and simultaneous ambivalence given the female body, it is first best to trace the evolution of the body from the Classical notion of a single-sexed form to the contemporary binary model and from here to then illustrate how woman came, in the nineteenth century, not only to be designated the opposite of man—physically, intellectually and spiritually—but then also opposing man and therefore blamed for all his fears and foibles.
A Brief History of the Human Body: The Single-Sex Model

The human body has not always been so neatly categorized into the two binary sexes we now identify. It was, in fact, only with the advent of the eighteenth century that distinction was made between specifically male-sexed and female-sexed bodies. While in modern times this distinction seems so commonsensical as to be beyond reproach, ancient philosophers and physicians alike viewed the human body not as two opposites that contrasted or complemented one another, but rather as a single anatomical form containing both sexes. This is not to say that men and women were seen as anatomically exact or possessing hermaphrodite characteristics. Rather, both ancient Galenic and later Renaissance theorists held the female to be a lesser version of the male--to be at a lower stage of development, possessing neither the heat nor the energy displayed by the male.

In the Galenic account of existence, heat was nature’s primary instrument; it was a sign of perfection and of one’s place in the hierarchical order of the cosmos. In a world that believed in a vertical continuum toward metaphysical perfection, the Greek physician Galen ¹ considered humans to be the most perfect of animals, and men more perfect than women by reason of their excess of heat. Men and women were, therefore, not different in kind, but rather in the degrees of heat embodied in their corporeal humors.² Following on the

---

¹Not allowed to dissect human bodies, Galen, who is considered the father of experimental physiology, derived his theories from observations of animals.

²Ancient beliefs held that the essential fluids of the body (blood, phlegm, choler and melancholy) determined a person’s physical and mental qualities and that these fluids were fungible; that is, they were transformable from one to another. The most precious and life-giving of these fluids was blood, which, when purified through heat, reached its most refined state—semen.
hypotheses of Hippocrates, Galen postulated that both men and women produced semen, but that the female’s was thinner and cooler, thereby indicating her lower hierarchical standing in nature and her lesser stage of development toward perfection.\(^3\)

Of greater influence to later Renaissance anatomists was Galen’s belief that there was no difference in male and female genitals other than their configuration and placement. “[A] woman has testes with accompanying seminal ducts very much like the man’s one on each side of the uterus, the only difference being that the male’s are contained in the scrotum and the female’s are not.” (On Semen 4:596). Physical location of the genitalia was the only line of demarcation. The male, having a hotter body, necessarily carried his organs on the outside, whereas the woman, being of cooler nature, carried hers on the inside. Galen’s use of the same term, orchis, to refer to both the female sexual organs and the male testes further supports the lack of distinction made between genitals. There was no uniqueness to the female body that distinguished it from her male counterpart; it was instead interpreted, as Thomas Laqueur observes, “as merely an inferior and inverted version of the male body, all of the woman’s reproductive organs simply underdeveloped homologues of male organs” (Modern Body viii).

The use of post-mortem dissections and anatomical illustrations that became prevalent with Renaissance medicine did not alter this tenet of a single-sexed body.

\(^3\)In contrast to Aristotle, who posited only men possessed heat intense enough to convert blood into semen, Galen and Hippocrates maintained both men and women had this ability. Unlike Hippocrates, however, Galen believed the quality of the female’s reproductive fluid, while not morphologically different, was inferior due to its cooler, thinner nature.
"Ideology," as Laqueur notes "not accuracy of observation, determined how they [the human sex organs] were seen and which differences would matter" (Making Sex 88). He continues:

The absence of a precise anatomical nomenclature for the female genitals, and for the reproductive system generally, is the linguistic equivalent of the propensity to see the female body as a version of the male. Both testify not to the blindness, inattention, or muddle-headedness of Renaissance anatomists, but to the absence of an imperative to create incommensurable categories of biological male and female through images or words. Language constrained the seeing of opposites and sustained the male body as the canonical human form. (Making Sex 96)

Despite the increase in anatomical investigation through autopsies, Renaissance doctors continued to believe in the existence of only one sex. In fact, the more they dissected and visually represented the body, the more convinced they were that the female body was merely a version of the male. There was no imperative to create and therefore to see two distinct sexes. With the continued belief in a single-sexed body and with the male body upheld as the norm, the Renaissance, like the Classical period earlier, had no equivalencies for modern terms we now give genitalia. Words such as vagina, uterus, fallopian tubes, and clitoris did not yet exist. Gender distinctions could be seen, however, in the different social privileges and obligations accorded those possessing an "external" penis. To have this type of penis meant to have specific rights and standing in society not accorded those with an "internal" penis. Thus, while there was no ontological distinction made, there was a sociological distinction. The penis, while not a sign of an ontological essence, was in the

4 Although the term "gender" is a twentieth century distinction made between sex as a person's biological or chromosomal make-up and gender as a socially imposed role, the difference in social roles to which this distinction alludes was not unique to the Renaissance. Already in Plato's world one sees a designation of social roles linked to "gender." Those possessing humoral proportions that allowed for intense heat and activity, what we would now designate as "masculine," could take on public, civic roles,
Classical and Renaissance worlds a symbol of status just as it would continue to be in more modern times.

The Renaissance body was far less fixed and constrained by categories of biological difference than modern concepts of the body. In fact, the fluidity and instability of “sex” as it was defined in the single-sex model is exemplified in medical accounts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that reported individuals changing sex. In the medical journal of Ambroise Paré, the foremost surgeon of his day, there is an account of a young girl whose organs were thrust outward when running in a quick and ferocious boy-like manner. This transformation brought on by an expansion of extraordinary heat and energy reflected the continued belief in the Galenic hypothesis that it was greater heat which distinguished men from women and that women’s sex organs were merely inverted versions of the male organs.

While it was a common belief that a woman could become a man, the opposite was not held to be true. “Woman can turn into men,” Paolo Zacchia maintained, “but men cannot turn into women. . . . Heat,” he says, “drives forward, diffuses, dilates; it does not compress, contract, or retract. . . . members which project outwards will never recede inwards” (qtd. in Laqueur Making Sex 141). With heat as the sign of perfection on the metaphysical continuum, it was impossible for the male body, as the more perfect, to slip back into the less perfect female form. This is not to say, however, that men could not become effeminate in their mannerisms and appear to be less than “manly,” but this did not

____________________

whereas those with cooler (i.e., more “feminine”) humoral predispositions were limited in status and political activity.
alter their physical make-up or their social rank.\(^5\) Even if no physical change could ensue, the anxiety that came with the potential loss of “manliness” is aptly expressed in Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier* (1528). No longer like their forefathers who were of a powerful, cunning warrior class where military prowess and naked brutality had been highly valued, Castiglione describes Renaissance courtiers as of a more “cultured” class where courtesy, dress and conversation were held in greater esteem. But this refinement, as Castiglione warned, was potentially threatening in that it could lead men to take on of feminine airs which undermined their masculine qualities. “Men can gain a ‘soft and womanish’ countenance through overrefinement—curling their hair, plucking their brows, pampering themselves in every point like the most wanton and dishonest women in the world” (39).\(^6\) While the experts in the single-sexed world maintained that men could not revert back into women, there were nevertheless clear social boundaries that were judicially defined and enforced to insure appropriate behavior (i.e. social roles) for men and women.\(^7\)

---

\(^5\)Even in Antiquity, while it was not deemed unnatural for mature men to be sexually attracted to young boys (to have pederast relationships), there was a stigma placed upon such attraction among adult men. In particular, it was the effiminate male who carried this blemish and he who then suffered a difference in status. As Laqueur observes, “[t]he active male, the one who penetrates in anal intercourse, . . . did not threaten the social order. It was the weak, womanly male partner who was deeply flawed, medically and morally (Making Sex 53).

\(^6\)This same fear will continue to be expressed throughout the centuries and is, indeed, picked up again over 200 years later by Ernst Brandes in *Über die Weiber* (1787, original anonymous), in which he discusses the dangers of courtly customs that feminize men. Reflecting the increasing fear and anger against women, however, he goes beyond Castiglione’s work and blames women in particular for contributing to this feminizing and thus perverting of society.

\(^7\)For more information on what constituted, and how one was punished for, inappropriate conduct, especially where sexual behavior was concerned, see Lyndal Roper’s “‘Wille’
Thus while there was no sexual distinction, "gender" had already found its place in Antiquity and in the Renaissance. This idea of a social distinction rather than a sexual one would continue well into the seventeenth century, as Laqueur observes. "During much of the seventeenth century, to be a man or a woman was to hold a social rank, to assume a cultural role, and not to be organically one or the other of two sexes" (Making Sex 142).

The Binary-Sex Model

By the end of the seventeenth century, the scientific revolution began undermining the Galenic mode of comprehending the body as arrayed on a cosmic continuum. But it was not so much the new scientific discoveries and advancements that brought about the rejection of Galen’s theories as it was the cultural, political, economic, and intellectual changes taking place in the eighteenth century. The power struggles that led up to and emerged after the French Revolution prompted a desire to see difference and therefore a need to create difference. Following on the foot heels of the French Revolution, which saw women as well as men fighting for the ideals of liberty, woman’s proper role in society became a hotly debated issue. The promises of the French Revolution, as Laqueur points out, “gave birth not only to a genuine new feminism but also to a new kind of antifeminism, a new fear of women, and to political boundaries that engendered sexual boundaries to match” (“Politics of Reproductive Biology” 18).

The vast majority of articulate men opposed increased civil and personal liberties for women, believing, rightly so, that these liberties would lead to increased public and private

und ‘Ehre’: Sexualität, Sprache und Macht in Augsburger Kriminalprozessen” and Mark Breitenberg’s Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England.
power for women. But to justify this position within the framework of enlightened thought that postulated an individual body sexed but unaffected by social gender, proof of natural inequalities had to be found to counter the appeal for natural rights.  

Experts and laymen alike now turned to science, and in particular to biology, to defend the position that women were unsuited to function autonomously inside or outside of the domestic realm. To support these claims, anatomical distinctions between the sexes were sought and found. While there was no specific moment in time when the claim was made that there were, indeed, two separate sexes, the various struggles for power between men and women as well as those between feminists and antifeminists sparked the need to see an inequality that led to this new perception and reconstitution of the human body. A “biology of incommensurability,” as Laqueur calls it, emerged as ontological “facts” supporting “natural inequality” were now used to designate specific social roles for both men and women.

To prove difference was more than skin deep, scientists now investigated and analyzed everything from the organs to the muscles, the nerves, and the skeleton. As early as 1775 the French physician Pierre Roussel reproached his colleagues for considering

---

8. In his work On the Admission of Women to the Rights of Citizenship, the French philosopher and feminist Jean Antoine de Condorcet condemned the exclusion of women from the public realm with these words: “This exclusion must be an act of tyranny, unless it can be proved either that the natural rights of women are not absolutely the same as those of men, or that women are not capable of exercising these rights” (98). Ironically, while he goes on to add “[i]t would be difficult to prove that women are incapable of exercising the rights of citizenship” (98), this is exactly what his contemporaries would then do—prove woman to be physically and mentally unsuitable for public duties.

9. With few women admitted into the scientific community, women had little opportunity to employ the same scientific methods to revise or refute the emerging claims about their nature.
woman similar to man except in the sexual organs. “The nerves, vessels, muscles, and ligaments ... are thinner, finer, and more supple and therefore indicate the kinds of duties for which the female is naturally predetermined” (5). Roussel’s thesis was that woman’s more sensitive nature, as indicated in the finer quality of her internal make-up, precluded her from higher thought processes. “Because of their greater sensitivity, based on organic reasons, women are incapable of functioning in the ‘higher sciences’. Their opinions are much less expressions of their reason as they are mere impressions on their minds” (Roussel 22). In 1786 Paul-Victor de Sèze took Roussel’s premise a step further when he asserted rational thought was actually harmful to the female constitution.

While it is true that the mind is common to all human beings, the active employment thereof is not conducive to all. For women, in fact, this activity can become quite harmful. Because of their natural weakness, greater brain activity in women would exhaust all the other organs and thus disrupt their proper functioning. Above all, however, it would be the generative organs which would be the most fatigued and endangered through the over exertion of the female brain. (228)

But it was more than the delicate construction of the female nervous system and other internal organs that precluded woman from rational thought, even in her skeletal make-up scientists and physicians alike uncovered evidence of woman’s mental inferiority. Noting that the female skull was smaller than the male skull, 10 which therefore meant a lesser brain

10In his 1796 work Vom Baue des menschlichen Körpers, the German anatomist Samuel Thomas von Soemmerring contested such arguments by noting that the female skull, as compared to the rest of the female skeleton, was relatively larger than the male skull as compared to the male skeleton. This observation was then undermined by Scottish anatomist, John Barclay, in the 1820s when he observed that children’s skulls too were larger relative to their overall body size. Thus for Barclay, and many of his contemporaries, the relatively larger female skull signaled women’s incomplete growth. This observation would be picked up and continued throughout the nineteenth century. Arthur Schopenhauer reiterates it as late as 1852 in his Parerga und Paralipomena: kleine
mass, experts extrapolated these findings to indicate inferior intellectual capabilities. This "scientific measure of women’s lesser ‘natural reason,’ as Londa Schiebinger writes, “was used to buttress arguments against women’s participation in the public spheres of government and commerce, science and scholarship” (43). This misuse of science not only restricted women from the public sphere, but simultaneously confine her to the private sphere by finding corporeal evidence for her maternal inclinations.

The French physician Pierre-Jean-Georges Cabanis pointed to woman’s weaker, more delicate constitution as indicative of her more passive nature. “[The] weakness of the muscles causes an instinctive disgust (emphasis mine) for violent exercise; it leads to amusements and . . . to sedentary occupations” (Cabanis, 1:221). The German anatomist and pupil of Soemmerring, Jakob Fidelis Ackermann, emphasized the same weakness and passivity in his work Über die körperliche Verschiedenheit des Mannes vom Weibe außer den Geschlechtsteilen (1788). “Das weibliche Geschlecht führt nun größtenteils eine sitzende Lebensart, und beschäftigt sich nicht mit solchen Arbeiten, die anhaltende Körperkräfte und Muskelstärke fordern. Ihre Knochen und Muskeln sind überdies schwächer und die Nervengänge dünner” (146). The wideness of the female pelvis was also cited as

philosophische Schriften when he notes “[das Weib ist eine] Mittelstufe, zwischen dem Kinde und dem Mann” (677).

In contrast to Theodor Gottlieb von Hippel, who indicated in Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Weiber (1792) lack of education as the reason for women’s lesser intellect, most of his contemporaries saw intelligence as an innate characteristic independent of education.

Following in the footsteps of his mentor, Soemmerring, Ackermann believed the lesser physical strength of women actually made them more suited to intellectual life than men. “Jene aber, welche eine sitzende Lebensart führen, sich weniger mit
proof of her complacent nature in that it supposedly hindered greater activity. "Die Bewegungen des weiblichen Geschlechts werden nun noch zusätzlich durch das weite Auseinanderstehen der Hüften erschwert, das ihren Gang langsam und behäbig mache" (Honegger 158). Thus, the make-up of the female body not only predetermined a more passive lifestyle, but within this narrower sphere of activity, also predetermined specific social roles.

This search for difference was not just limited to the physical body, however. As medicine and philosophy began to conflate in the eighteenth century, the soul now too became incorporate in this search for difference. As early as 1703 the German physician George Ernst Stahl wrote in his Theorie medica vera that the soul was indivisible from the body. In his statement "[d]ie Seele würckt das Leben" (Zufällen 647) he theorized that it was the energy of the soul which was responsible for movement and therefore life within the physical body. In 1754 the Swiss doctor and university professor Albrecht von Haller wanted to prove that a force he surmised as the soul remained within the body even after death. In his experimentation with corporeal movements, he distinguished irritation (movements evoked through muscular reactions) from sensitivity (movements evoked through pain reactions) on living creatures. Once he was able to prove one could evoke movement even out of dead bodies, it became scientifically easier to disprove a link between the physical körperlichen Arbeiten beschäftigen, dafür aber mehr den Wissenschaften widmen, größere Geisteskräfte, oder doch wenigstens eine größere Fähigkeit, sie zu vervollkomen erlangen" (146) Of course, this observation too would be undermined as theorists, scientists, and doctors would continually point to the size of the female brain was an indicator of her lesser intellectual capabilities.
world and a transcendental. For the French physician Julien LaMettrie this meant that morality was no longer something deigned by God, but rather found already within the physical body.

If all the abilities of the soul are dependent on the proper organization of the brain and the body as a whole, in other words, the soul is entwined within this organization, then what we have in the human body is a very enlightened machine. If this is the case, this machine (i.e. the human being) no longer needs a God to reveal the moral code, theologians or other virtuosos of salvation to enlighten it, nor those versed in metaphysics to teach ethics because good and bad is embodied directly within the corporeal material. (58)

Once physical reactions became categorized according to the sexes, with the woman confirmed as more sensitive (i.e. emotional reactive) and the male as more physical (i.e. tending toward the more muscular reactions), it was only a matter of time before morality also became categorized in this manner.

Where in 1703 Stahl had argued that sensitivity was itself an expression of the soul, in his 1775 work *Système physique et moral de la femme*, Roussel now argued that female sensitivity far surpassed male sensitivity—physically as well as morally. A quarter of a century later, Jacques Moreau de la Sarthe, one of the founders of “moral anthropology,” reiterated that the sexes were not only different, “they [were] . . . different in every conceivable respect of body and soul, in every physical and moral aspect” (15). Thus, it was

---

13The Italian physician and anatomist Luigi Galvani would do similar experiments with electric currents on frog legs in 1780. Thinking this current originated in the leg nerves, he called this “animal electricity.”

14While this work did not experience the same overwhelming success in Germany that it had in France, it became the standard reference work used by German anthropologists, psycho-physiologists, and gynecologists for years to come. (See Honegger 143.)
not just the body that was differentiated, but also the psyche (the soul and the mind). While it initially appears paradoxical that woman was confined to the biological at the same time she was being raised to a higher level of moral sensitivity, this too had organic reasons. Women were “naturally” inclined, through their maternal instincts, to civilize men and to raise children in virtue. This was emphasized not only through the various anatomical discourses that construed woman as more passive, lethargic, and domestic, but furthermore through discourses that pointed to her lack of sexual desire. Whereas her greater delicacy and sensitivity allowed her to be categorized as morally superior to men, this was because her erotic, sensual side had been suppressed as civilization progressed. “Beasts,” the English physician Elizabeth Blackwell claimed in 1894, “have no mental component in their sexual relations; primitive people and the working classes have relatively little and are thus unchaste; civilized people have a dominant mental component and thus value chastity highly” (34). Among the more “civilized” races, woman’s sexual urges were believed even more mental in nature than even that of the male, who was already established as being more active and aggressive.

---

15As the corporeal body gained increased importance, the intellect and spirit were no longer considered directly linked to the metaphysical, but rather affected by environmental influences. Anatomical science now turned partially to these environmental influences to account for difference. With variables such as climate and geographic location pulled into the equation, the focus was not directed only at establishing difference between the sexes, but also, as Claudia Honegger notes, between the races. “Nicht nur der weiße zivilisierte Mensch wird untersucht, sondern eben auch der Primitive, der Naturmensch, der Wilde” (112). As the nineteenth century unfolded, this concept of “Naturmensch” as one who is closer to instinctual nature, would be applied increasingly to both women and more primitive peoples in an effort to distance them from the superiority of the civilized (i.e., white) European male.
That the sexual urges of the female were mental and not physical could also be supported through the physical sciences. Eighteenth century phrenologists regarded the cerebellum as the seat of sexual instinct. With an already smaller brain established, it followed that a smaller cerebellum indicated a lower sex drive. In addition, once spontaneous ovulation in some mammals was discovered, physicians drew a correlation between women's menstruation and estrus in animals. If women had any sexual desire at all, it biologically had to occur only during periods of fertility, i.e., when the woman was menstruating or "in heat." As early as 1854, the American physician Augustus Gardiner, phrasing his observations in a less than delicate manner, noted, "[t]he bitch in heat has the genitals tumefied and reddened, and a bloody discharge. The human female has nearly the same" (17).

With virtues and moral tendencies seen as separating civilized man from the animals and his own primitive past, scientists and physicians alike now correlated woman's lack of sexual desire with her greater moral inclinations, which in turn were interpreted as a sign of increasing civilization. Even Condorcet, who was an avid feminist fighting for women's citizenship, saw woman as "a purer race . . . destined to inspire in the rest of the human race

16 This belief held despite research done by biologists such as Albrecht von Haller who found that women "denied a heightened desire of venery during their periods and reported rather being affected by pain and languor" (290) and Johannes Müller, who noted in his 1843 textbook on forensic medicine that while the causes of menses were unknown, in all likelihood it occurred in humans to "prevent in the human female the periodical return of sexual excitation (Brurst) that occurs in animals" (640).

17 Many professional works such as John Millar's Origins of the Distinctions of Ranks (1843), now defined woman as the moral barometer and the vanguard that improved society. As such, the behavior of women was seen as the most reliable guide to the character of a society.
the sentiments of all which is noble, generous and devoted” (98-99). While his belief in women’s heightened moral sensitivity was supposed to bestow upon women more positive attributes and more influence, this argument unwittingly confined her even more to the domestic realm, as the home became equivocated with the purity of the feminine soul. Thus as Maria Müller notes, “Die Idealkonstruktion nach ist die Seele der Frau wie das Haus selbst ein aseptischer Raum, in dem das Böse nicht aufkeimen darf und kann” (61). Science had shown woman to be different from man in her abilities to think, feel, and judge. While “proven” intellectually and physically weaker than man, woman was simultaneously seen as morally superior. As such, she now became the “keeper of man’s soul,” making the home a haven and refuge to which the man could return after dealing with the everyday evils of business.

Ironically, where science had initially rejected the Galenic belief that woman was merely an inferior, inverted version of man, its methods of empirical investigation came eventually to the same subjective conclusions, albeit in a social versus corporeal respect. In 1808 the surgeon Philip Franz von Walther refered to the male of the species as the positive

\[\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\] In The Wives of England (1843), the domestic ideologist Sarah Ellis argues that in order to open a new political sphere of influence, many women deemed it necessary to go along with this definition of being passionless and of having heightened moral sensibilities. “Though women [were] to have no role in the world of mundane politics, they [were] to confront issues such as extinction of slavery, the abolition of war in general, cruelty to animals, the punishment of death, temperance, and many more... In short, women’s politics must be the politics of morality” (345).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\] The confinement of women to domestic duties was, however, not unique to the late eighteenth century society. As Barbara Becker-Cantarino observes in Der Lange Weg zur Mündigkeit, the early modern period already saw women restricted to the domestic sphere. The difference between these two periods was that the latter supported this limitation using biological versus biblical reasoning.
and the original of which the female is merely a copy and a negative one at that and more importantly, the reverse or inverted (umgekehrte) version.

Das Männliche ist etwas durch sich selbst, in allen seinen Attributen rein positiv, daher das Uranfängliche. Das Weibliche aber ist rein negativ, nur im Gegensatz das Männlichen, nur durch dieses, und in dem dasselbe ihm einen Theil seiner Wesenheit verleiht. ... Es ist nicht bloß eine Differenz der Geschlechtstheile; sondern das Weibliche ist das in jeder Beziehung umgekehrte Männliche: ... (373-75).

By describing the woman as being a negative man, lacking all the qualities that made up the “Uranfängliche,” he reiterates a tone that would resound with increasing resonance as the nineteenth century unfolded. In his 1822 Lehrbuch der Anthropologie, Johann Christian August Heinroth extrapolates these findings to define woman not just as man’s opposite, but in a more positive bend, as his necessary complement, something Rousseau had already claimed as early as 1762. For Heinroth, however, the existence of one not only necessitated the existence of the other but indeed required it to reach a complete state of being.


A couple of years later the German zoologist Karl Ernst von Baer defines this polarity more precisely by delineating the biological “facts” science had uncovered.

In 1830 the physician J.J. Sachs takes this scientific analysis a step further to explain how physical complementarity leads to complementary social roles.

The male body expresses positive strength, sharpening male understanding and independence, and equipping men for life in the State, in the arts and sciences. The female body expresses womanly softness and feeling. The roomy pelvis determines women for motherhood. The weak, soft members and delicate skin are witness of woman’s narrower sphere of activity, of home-bodiness, and peaceful family life. (qtd. in Schiebinger 69)

In 1840 the German anthropologist Carl Ludwig Michelet helps cement the idea of engendered social roles by recapitulating the different psychological proclivities of each sex that make them more suited to function in one social arena over another.


b. Der Mann im Gegenteil gilt nur durch das, was er leistet, als Glied eines Ganzen: und beurtheilt auch nur hiernach sich und Andere. Die Sphäre seiner Wirksamkeit ist der Staat, weil dieser auf Gesetze und allgemeine Grundsätze gegründet ist. . . Die Thätigkeit des Gedankens, die Productivität fürs Allgemeine kommt ausschließlich dem Manne zu. In Kunst, Wissenschaft und Politik bahnt er allein neue Richtungen und schafft neue Gestalten. (126ff)
Woman had become not just the opposite of man, she had become his complement and as such was confined to particular roles within society--specifically, those to which her male counterpart was not confined.

As the nineteenth century unfolded, this new designation of social roles based on scientific “evidence” of woman’s lesser intelligence and greater proclivity for domestic duties would be advanced with increasing urgency. In particular, this would occur the more vocal and adamant women became about rejecting these roles. Indeed, the ensuing tensions that would arise, were already being suggested in terminology that not only carried the concept of woman as man’s opposite, but as some of the previous citations were already suggesting, simultaneously as his opponent. For Walther, in 1808, woman has become “rein negativ” and “Gegensatz des Männlichen.” In 1822, Heinroth sees the sexes as “entgegengesetzte Zweiheit.” By 1840, the terminology has become much sharper as Michelet now refers to woman as “die geborene Feindin des Gesetzes.” And enemy is exactly how woman would come to be seen, especially the New Woman who would threaten not only the existing world of patriarchy, but simultaneously, destabilize contemporary definitions of womanhood, and even more importantly, those of manhood.

**Literature as a Re-former of the Human Body**

Although the growth of democratic tendencies brought about a reshuffling of the social order, and anthropological and medical texts functioned as foils for restructuring socio-economic as well as political relationships, it was in literature, and in particular in the depiction of gender relations within literature, that these shifts and struggles were most
prominently portrayed and even promoted. More than just depicting existing relations, however, literary works functioned to construct gender by reiterating and even furthering specific beliefs and cultural values that defined and simultaneously confined the sexes to complementary but separate social spheres. Where anthropological texts inscribed cultural values upon the physical body, literary texts did likewise on the social body by delineating what was appropriate and inappropriate behavior for both genders. On the biological battlefield where men and women, feminists and antifeminists jockeyed for power, literature perhaps more so than science, reached the greater audience and thus became the forum in which the social implications of the human body and in particular the female body were investigated and redefined.

**Literary Images of Women in the Nineteenth Century**

Over the past few decades, feminist studies have focused much attention on literary images of woman, especially male-created images. Through this research, we have come to understand the fictional image of woman as the surface onto which men project either their ideals or their fears. As such, the depiction of woman as good or evil has invariably been interpreted as reflecting man's security or insecurity with himself and his world. Under the nineteenth century concept of “good,” woman could represent both a transcendental ideal of truth and beauty as well as more “earthly” values of social morality. In both cases, either as that eternal spirituality towards which man strives, or that domestic haven which supports man in his daily struggles, woman was portrayed as asexual. Where woman’s sexuality was

---

20 Medical texts printed in the nineteenth century were, for the most part, still written in Latin and thus not accessible to the average reader.
recognized and lauded, as with the early Romantics, the female figure was still tied to roles that serviced the male. The “evil” woman, by contrast, was portrayed as sexually assured and sexually active. Her focus was not on the man, but on herself. It was this narcissistic behavior, as well as her conspicuous sexuality, which reflected, emphasized and threatened man’s own precarious concepts of masculinity. The “evil” (i.e., sexually independent) woman did not pull man to loftier heights or lend him stability as did the “good” woman, but rather dragged him down to the depths of hell as she brought disruption, disaccord and destruction to his life.

Although the portrayal of evil women can be seen throughout literary history, the emphasis on female sexuality as an inherent threat controlled and exerted by women was not prevalent in German literature until the nineteenth century. Even in this century, however, the dominant representation of woman was, as Ingrid Rose notes, “that of an innocent, gentle, domestically-oriented being” (10). While the Classical and Romantic Periods placed less emphasis on domestic duties, portraying their female figures as symbols of higher harmony or universal ideals, once the literary focus shifted from Idealism to Realism, these lofty images of women took on more humble, concrete forms. Woman’s function was no longer that of intermediary between man and a higher form of humanity, but once again one of domestic support and security as home now became the sanctuary to which man returned at the end of each day’s work. Unlike their Idealist counterparts, the female figures of Biedermeier and Realism now took on subordinate positions to men--especially to their fathers and husbands. It was this “domesticated,” subservient image of woman that was to remain their allotted role throughout the rest of the century-- within literature and without.
Although the image of woman in nineteenth-century literature was predominantly positive, there were peripheral female figures in each literary period that represented antithetical values. These marginal figures were consistently self-centered, self-indulgent women concerned with personal gains of wealth, power, or security. Invariably, their deviation from the positive female characters took the form of sexual promiscuity or extreme narcissism. As literary figures, however, they were of minor importance until the last third of the century. Although the “evil,” corrupting woman was already an important figure with the Late Romantics, also known as the Dark Romantics, it was with the writers of the so-called Decadence Literature that she became most prevalent, especially in her 
*femme fatale*-form. Two factors contributed to the more prevalent focus on this female-type: the expanding discourse on sexuality and the increasing insecurity of the individual (male) brought on by the turmoils and instability in nineteenth century Europe.

**Cultural Crises that Affected Literary Discourses**

The increased discourse on sexuality began, as Michel Foucault notes in *History of Sexuality*, already in the seventeenth century. In this century, where sexuality was still seen as a “sin of the flesh,” the discourse was religious in nature. As the natural sciences gained in prominence in the eighteenth century and as sexuality was recognized as a natural biological drive, it then became part of medical discourse. Despite appearances of objectivity, however, these medical discussions, like the religious ones before them, were employed to exert power and control. In addition to the medical community, however, Carola Hilmes notes that the educational and judicial institutions now also became active
participants in the creation and dissemination of these discourses. "Seine Verwaltung und die Funktion einer sozialen Kontrollinstanz übernehmen die Bildungsanstalten des 18. Jahrhunderts sowie Medizin und Strafjustiz" (40). Attempts to control women by controlling female sexuality met with increasing resistance, however. By the second half of the nineteenth century, as women began asserting themselves more openly and female sexuality could no longer be repressed or denied, the medical community now discussed it in pathological terms. Woman’s sexuality, as well as her increasing resistance to prescribed roles, was seen as a degeneration harmful to society.\textsuperscript{21}

The other factor that contributed to this shift in the literary focus on female sexuality was the individual’s (i.e., man’s) own increasing sense of instability. As agrarian lifestyles shifted to more urban forms of living, more and more cities began springing up. Eventually this demographic shift began undermining the feudal way of life. By the mid-eighteenth century, the increase in urban populations and in commerce saw the rise of a new middle-class. With these new social structures came a realignment of traditional familial roles and what Nancy Cott calls the "doctrine of separate spheres"--a reassignment of duties within and outside of the home.\textsuperscript{22} According to Doyle, in many cases industrialization redefined men as the sole provider of the family’s material needs (259). But it was not just the

\textsuperscript{21}Carol Diethe notes in Aspects of Distorted Sexual Attitudes in German Expressionist Drama that at the end of the nineteenth century in Germany, while a large amount of writing was available on sexual deviancy, there was barely anything written in German on normal sexuality and that what little there was often downright misleading (21)

\textsuperscript{22}In The Male Experience, James A. Doyle points out that in preliterate hunter-gatherer groups and agricultural societies, men and women cooperated to provide for their families’ sustenance. Once urbanization and the industrial revolution drew men away from their homes and the land, a gulf between themselves and their families was created.
realignment of familial roles and the pressures that came with this that created so much stress in men’s lives; it was also woman’s increasing questioning and subsequent rejection of their new roles that added to men’s miseries. In discussing the crisis of masculinity (Die Krise der Männlichkeit) at the turn of the century, Elisabeth Badinter observes “[c]s ist weniger die Auflösung der traditionellen Keimzelle Familie im proletarischen Milieu, die den . . . Intellektuellen beunruhigt, als vielmehr die (sehr fortgeschrittene) Emanzipation der Frau des Mittelstands. . . . je lauter die Frauen ihre Forderungen zum Ausdruck brachten, . . . [desto deutlicher wurde] die Verletzlichkeit der Männer . . . ” (30, 34).

Literature picked up on and exemplified this “Verletzlichkeit” of men by focusing on the new power struggles between men and women. As the nineteenth century progressed, and the “battle of the sexes” became more prevalent in literature, the female protagonists became increasingly more powerful and devious. By the same token, the main male characters became increasingly weak and inept as they reflected the growing insecurity and instability of modern life.

Historical Images of Masculinity

Although the Enlightenment reconstituted the individual (i.e., man) politically, age-old concepts of male sexuality remained essentially unchanged. Following the Classical tradition which held the male body as the more perfect form, the nineteenth century continued to maintain the androcentric perspective which held the male anatomy, and more specifically the white European male anatomy, as the norm and the standard of excellence against which to judge all other forms. While we have seen in our brief overview of the
literary image of woman, how the female was the unstable factor which continually transformed to reflect changes in social intercourses, critics for the most part have paid little heed to images of masculinity. 23 Both inside and outside the literary realm, it was the female who was unanthomable and therefore to be analyzed and understood, not the male. "Noch vor langer Zeit war die Frau der dunkle und unerschlossene Kontinent der Menschheit," Badinter stresses, "und niemand wäre auf die Idee gekommen, den Mann in Frage zu stellen. Männlichkeit erschien als etwas Selbstverständliches: strahlend, naturgegeben und der Weiblichkeit entgegengesetzt" (11). This is not to say that the male characters in literature were unchanging, but rather that little attention was given them, or in fact to masculinity itself as a social construct.

While each historical time period has had its standards of excellence by which to judge the male of the species, there have been some common denominators down through the centuries that allowed a tradition of manhood to emerge. Men were supposed to be strong, active, independent, and above all else, courageous. "At one time," Doyle comments, "men reveled in their physical prowess as they applied their sinewy strength to whatever task required brute force. They were honored for their feats of courage in the face of untamed and unchartered frontiers" (4). In the tallying of males to emulate, however, Doyle notes there was a certain partiality about which males were deemed worthy of recognition and adulation.

23 It was American critics first, and only as recent as the seventies, Badinter notes, who started investigating constructs of masculinity. She refers to the following works: Warren Farrell, The Liberated Man, 1974; Joseph Pleck and J. Sawyer, Men and Masculinity, 1974; Deborah S. David and Robert Brannon, The Forty-Nine Percent Majority, 1976.
Upon closer scrutiny, we . . . find that most historians have been rather selective in the choice of which males to focus on. Most have been content to chronicle only the deeds of a few, namely, the kings, generals, presidents, dictators, bishops, and philosophers whose power and social positions made them stand out. Painfully absent are the stories of the multitudes of males who were merely soldiers, clerics, slaves, farmers, storekeepers, serfs, and workers whose lives unfolded in rather mundane and inauspicious ways. Consequently, we could argue that until very recently history has dealt almost exclusively with the lives of men, a few notable and powerful men, that is. Mention of women and powerless and nameless men was strikingly absent. (25)

In addition to chronicling the lives of the extraordinary men, Peter Filene finds that historians have generally concentrated only on the public lives of these individuals and not on their private lives--what he calls "the 'secret' side, the nearly invisible side of the male gender" (111).

Factual texts were not the only sources that tended to look at and exemplify the extraordinary male. Literature too, for most of its recorded history, has done likewise. Indeed, much of the Western world that we have reconstructed today we derived from literary texts: from stories, tales, and sagas handed down generation by generation. Looking back at the images of masculinity that have been transmitted over the last three thousand years, Doyle sees five distinct models or ideals that Western men were expected to imitate. 24

24Of course, as Doyle observes, "[a]s with all ideals, each of the five is a larger-than-life exaggeration impossible for any one man to achieve in its entirety. Even so, most of the males who lived during each of these periods knew of the ideal's distinctive features and were influenced by them in their daily lives" (27).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Major Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epic Male</td>
<td>Epic sagas of Greece and Rome (800-100 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>Action, physical strength, courage, loyalty, and beginning of patriarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Male</td>
<td>Teachings of Jesus Christ, early church fathers, and monastic tradition (400-1000 C.E.)</td>
<td>Self-renunciation, restrained sexual activity, antifeminine and antihomosexual attitudes, and strong patriarchal system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivalric Male</td>
<td>Feudalism and chivalric code of honor (twelfth-century social system)</td>
<td>Self-sacrifice, courage, physical strength, honor and service to the lady, and primogeniture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Male</td>
<td>Sixteenth-century social system</td>
<td>Rationality, intellectual endeavors, and self-exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeois Male</td>
<td>Eighteenth-century social system</td>
<td>Success in business, status, and worldly manners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Five Historical Male Role ideals

Coming down to us primarily through the epic sagas written by men like Homer and Virgil, the epic male was first and foremost a warrior-ruler, a fighter and a leader. His essential characteristics were prowess and skill in battle, physical strength, courage, and loyalty—first to leader and kind, then to male comrades, and finally to clan and family (Doyle, 28). In contrast to the male, Eva Cantarella notes that the female figure of epic times was esteemed more for her physical beauty and dedication to men than for any endeavor based on talent or ability. One thinks here of Helen of Troy who was portrayed more as an object of profound beauty to be possessed than as a living breathing woman. Where epics did portray women as active and powerful, these women were invariably evil beings or immortal goddesses.
Contrary to the epic male whose sexual acumen was as much a reflection of his manhood as was his valor, the Christian male’s role was one of abstinence and self-denial. Sex, now linked to the fall from grace, was to be avoided at all costs. Woman too, linked as she was to original sin, was now seen as corrupt and to be controlled, chastised, and when necessary even punished. As Raoul Mortley points out, “[u]nder Christianity, women especially suffered from the link between sexuality and evil” (45). Portrayed as the image of God, the male now functioned as the ultimate authority in all matters, both spiritual and secular. Woman, being directly of man and not directly of God, was required to submit to his authority. In support of this view, church fathers turned to Paul’s letter to the Corinthians: For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man (1. Cor. 11:7-9).

Only with the emergence of the chivalric male did man regain his sexuality, albeit in an unconsummated version. In many respects, the chivalric male was a conflation of the previous two versions of manhood. Like the epic male before him, his abilities as a fighter and soldier as well as his loyalty to king were highly valued. Tempered with a more Christian tone, though, knightly ideals of justice and charity were added to this image of the

---

25 According to Doyle, much of what we refer to today as the Christian view of the male and female genders came from the monastic tradition of the fourth and fifth centuries as well as the writings of the early church fathers (29). For further information on these writings, see J. Buckley (1986), E. Pagels (1988), and R. Ruether (1987).

26 For more on the male’s role under Christianity, see S.B. Boyd (1990, 1993).
ideal male. In sharp contrast to the previous two models, however, was the central focus on
the female role. The lady, for whom the knight performed most of his duties and missions,
was loved ardently but from afar. While a sensual yearning was acknowledged between the
two, and most works of this genre revolved around these sexual tensions, the actual act was
unrealized. Woman was placed upon a pedestal of virtue and was therefore untouchable.27

The focus of the Renaissance male was neither the physical perfection as noted with
the epic and chivalric males nor the spiritual perfection of the Christian and chivalric males.
Instead, his rational and intellectual abilities were stressed. “Men were still expected to be
doers, active and in control,” Doyle notes, “but the goals of their activity had changed. . . .
Renaissance man sought intellectual goals that would free him from the restraints of a
dogmatic church authority” (31) In response to this, the female role too was once again
required to shift. According to Renaissance historian Patricia Labalme, the great majority
of women were steered toward either one of two lives, marriage or the convent. While there
were women such as Elizabeth I, Eleonora of Aragon, Marguerite de Navarre, and Catherine
of Sienna who became powerful persons in their own right, even with them there was still
a male presence in the background.28

By the time the bourgeois male emerged, acquisition of material wealth now took
precedence over metaphysical issues. The middle-class male of the eighteenth century had

27 This is not to say that there were no sexually active women in the literature of this
period. Indeed, women were seen as either the lady mentioned above, virginal and pure,
or her antipode, the lusty temptress or prostitute. See J. Dillenberger (1985) and S.

become a businessman, or more precisely, an entrepreneur who strove after money, prestige, and influence. His prowess and talents were reflected in the competitive manner in which he did business. Quantity became the sought-after goal—the more one had, the more power and control one could exert. With the rejection of all that was transcendental, the female now became “the keeper of man’s soul,” what Bram Dijkstra calls “the household nun.” As such, her role was to prepare and maintain a domestic haven of virtue. Home was now the place in which the male could escape the harsh world of business, the place where he expected to rejuvenate himself in preparation for the next day’s business. According to Barbara Welter, “The ideal wife was pictured as possessing a high degree of domestic ability and was expected to create an inviting shelter to which her husband could return after a hard day of business dealings in the unfriendly male world” (162). Indeed, the ideal of the young virgin who would become a dutiful housewife and as such a reward for the hard-working and successful male played a dominant role in eighteenth-century literature (Doyle, 32).

Deconstructing the Masculinity Myth

For thousands of years women were seen as carnal in nature and therefore portrayed as the source of passion and sensuality. By the early nineteenth century this trend was reversed and men were now assumed to have stronger sexual drives, as denoted under the Binary-Sex Model. Being intellectually superior, however, man was expected and believed able to control these desires. Scientists and physicians alike theorized that the act of sex robbed the body of vital energies necessary for the proper functioning of the intellect. “For this reason,” Doyle observes, “men were encouraged to exert themselves in their work, to
become successful in their business ventures because through work a man could expend a large portion of his sexual energies on tasks more worthwhile than mere sexual release” (36). The “strong” man, the one whose will far outweighed any bodily urges had no trouble suppressing his physical side. Such a man rose above the ordinary man to take charge and become a self-made man, a man of power and prestige. Like the heroes of the past, this astute and aggressive businessman of the nineteenth century created his own fame and fortune. In contrast to this type of man—the bankers, industrialists and entrepreneurs of the day—the common man was nothing more than an insignificant cog in the machinery of commerce and big business.

Unlike the great heroes of the past, this individual was unable to rise up and meet the challenges of life. Instead, he felt and reflected all the insecurities and instabilities of the day. In his hopeless quest for identity, community, and meaning in life, this “non-hero” did not embody idealized concepts of masculinity—he was cowardly, indecisive, weak, and disillusioned. In his existential crisis, he was riddled with fears, anxieties, anger, and rage. At the same time he was consumed with desires and yearnings—for stability, for certainty, for security, and for resolve. Above all else, though, he longed for control—control of his life, control of his world, but especially control of woman. In an attempt to compensate for his own shortcomings and his self-perceived inadequacies, it was woman whom this man blamed for his miseries—and for good reason. As the nineteenth century unfolded, woman’s refusal to stay within socially-determined boundaries rose at an alarming rate. Her questioning of male authority and status in social hierarchy too became more frequent. Woman was no longer the complacent companion whose sole purpose was to make man
whole; she had now become his adversary--competing with him for privilege and place. Even in the sexual arena, woman was rejecting the passive role for a more active one as she sought and demanded satisfaction.

The more women fought to change their roles, the more destabilized men felt in theirs. Consequently, the stronger and more powerful man perceived the female becoming, the weaker and more impotent he perceived himself becoming. His loss of control as well as his loss of self-esteem he therefore blamed on woman. She was not only transgressing into his spheres, but in so doing, was forcing him into hers. The weakness, helplessness, and passiveness once associated with the feminine, man now saw within himself. The image of woman now function as a carnival mirror--reflecting the image of man, but in a warped form he did not want to accept. As Hilmes observes, “das Bild der Frau [fungiert] vorrangig als Spiegel ‘verstümmelter Männlichkeit’” (45). This weaker man saw woman as not only reflecting his insecurities, but simultaneously also exploiting them. Only through the suppression of woman, the real one as well as the one within himself, could he hope to regain command of his world and his destiny. Having blamed the New Woman for his fears and foibles, it was only through the suppression or even eradication of her that the nineteenth-century male, both inside and outside of literature, hoped to recoup his lost masculinity and thereby regain for himself the role of a “real man,” a “man’s man.”

The progressive ideas which ushered in the nineteenth century had by its close crumbled away to faint memories. The bourgeois yearnings for equality, brotherhood, and

---

20 Badinter uses the same terminology but places the blame on the patriarchal system itself. “Das patriarchalische System hat einen verstümmelten Mann geboren” (151).
freedom which had their impetus in the liberal ideology of the French Revolution, were by the *fin de siècle* exposed as pipe-dreams—fleeting and elusive. Man’s rejection of the authority of Church and Monarchy did not lend him greater freedom but rather greater insecurity. The advent of industrialization did not replace the old system of traditional values with a new, more liberal system, but rather with the market economy. Technologies that were supposed to simplify man’s life, detrimentally compartmentalized his life. Although a trebling of the population instigated massive migrations from the countryside to the cities, the large populations of the growing cities did not lend themselves to a feeling of community. Instead, the individual had become an insignificant member of the new phenomenon of the masses. The crowded conditions of the cities only contributed to this sense of insignificance as they exacerbated feelings of anonymity, alienation, and anomie. Big business and finance, which fueled the emergence and growth of these cities, was now seen as the culprit that robbed man of all sense of self and self-esteem.

But it was not just the overcrowded conditions of the cities that led to this sense of isolation and loneliness. The advent of industrialization brought several other changes with it. One was the rise of a new proletariat class of workers who earned their living working in factories. No longer the master craftsman of the past whose work had personal value or the farmer whose crops supported his family and village, the proletariat male now worked for someone else outside the home often under horrendous conditions and for substandard wages. The bourgeois male, although better off, also found himself trapped in the bureaucracy of big business. Unlike the proletariat male whose value lay in brute physical labor and his machine-like skills of repetition, however, the bourgeois male had the ability
for advancement. Judged on his intellectual prowess and business skills, he was defined according to his abilities to accumulate affluence and influence. While his adeptness in these areas was crucial to his success, this was not the only factor which established his social status. The bourgeois male’s choice of spouse, which reflected his abilities to enter into a good partnership and maintain the desired social facade, also determined his reputation within society.

Unlike the proletarian wife, who more times than not was forced to work outside the home, often in the same factories as her husband, the bourgeois wife was increasingly confined to the home, where she now functioned as an ornament that reflected her husband’s status. The more she was able to adorn herself and her home in opulence, the more she displayed the business acumen and wealth of her husband. The drawback to this life of luxury for the woman, however, was that she had, for all intents and purposes, become one of the furnishings—expected to be as passive and unobtrusive as her surroundings. The drawback for the male in placing his wife into this extravagant lifestyle was that she had now become an object for display but not for consumption. Despite centuries-long beliefs that the female was more highly sexed than the male, in the sexually repressive world of Wilhelmine Germany, perhaps the most important quality that exemplified a wife’s value, was her total lack of carnal desires. The good wife was valued for her civilizing functions and her ability to raise the offspring in a moral fashion as well as to create a domestic environment which functioned as a haven and refuge for the beleaguered male. With the wife’s virtues so closely linked to and exerting influence on her husband’s honor and reputation, masculine identity became, as Mark Breitenberg observes, “dependent upon and
figured through female chastity” (98). The conundrum here for the male, was that in placing his wife on this pedestal of celibacy he could now not readily turn to her for sexual pleasure. In an effort to keep his wife, his household, and subsequently his own reputation unsullied, the bourgeois male now had to look elsewhere for his sexual gratification.

**Prostitution in Wilhelmine Society**

Although prostitution was not unique to the modern age, the emergence of a vast number of urban prostitutes was a phenomenon associated with industrialization and the rapid growth of cities.\(^{30}\) Indeed, as Dijkstra notes, there was no period, before or since, where the sight of prostitutes was so common and so much taken for granted (355-56). Young girls, often from working-class families, who either could not find suitable employment or who had become “fallen women” while working as domestic help, found themselves increasingly walking the streets in an effort to sustain a livelihood. It was to these women that the middle-class male now turned his attention. In a society that sought to repress the carnal nature of even its male members, however, the prostitute paradoxically served the dual function of being simultaneously man’s salvation and his damnation. As a vice that lured the male away from his private and public duties, she was viewed as the “moral rot” that corrupted the virtues of bourgeois society.\(^{31}\) But by allowing the male

\(^{30}\) See E Born, 311.

\(^{31}\) With woman’s polyandrous nature seen by Otto Weininger and others as too strong to be tamed, Weininger was very adamant that prostitution could not be considered a state into which men have seduced women. “[D]ie Eignung und der Hang zum Dimentum [ist] ebenso wie die Anlage zur Mutterschaft in einem Weiße organisch, von der Geburt an vorhanden (284). By placing the sole responsibility for prostitution on women, Dijkstra observes “it was easy for the middle-class male to see himself as the helpless victim of . . .

41
momentary release from the tumescence and sexual urges he would otherwise have to inflict upon his wife, the prostitute became what Alain Corbin designates "society's drain or sewer" taking upon her society's excess of seminal fluid as well as its excess of depravity and immorality (211). Ironically, in taking on this excess, the prostitute also functioned as a means of middle-class birth control in a period that saw few effective means nor use of contraception (Evans, Feminist 116).

While the lower-class woman allowed the male a momentary outlet for his carnal desires, there was a price to be paid. In cities that now saw masses of people living in much closer quarters than ever before, infectious diseases were escalating. Despite efforts to control such illnesses, the rise in prostitution brought with it a proliferation of communicable and highly contagious maladies—not the least of which was syphilis. As the carrier of this contagion, the prostitute was correlated increasingly with death in that she threatened not only the physical body of her clients, but also the whole social body as well. With the virulent syphilis she passed on to her clients leading to insanity, sterility, and even

\[ \text{these lusty creatures of the working class who did not seem to have any of the middle-class woman's reticence about sex} \] (357).

32 The phenomenon of tumescence, and more specifically, the male need to find appropriate relief from this condition became an increasing topic of concern among the sexologists who were gaining prominence in the latter half of the century (Dijkstra 69).

33 In the lower classes, where the standard of living was abysmal, typhus and cholera were especially rampant. Indeed, in 1851, the physician F. Oesterlen estimated that the life expectancy of the proletariat on the average was two-thirds or even one-half that of well-to-do people (qtd. in Frevert 323).

34 Indeed, Corbin refers to the association between the prostitute and cadaverous flesh as occurring so frequently in nineteenth-century hygienists' discourse that it starts to resemble a leitmotif (211).
birth defects in the offspring of an infected mother, the prostitute was seen as threatening the genetic patrimony of the dominant classes by setting in motion “a process of degeneration that threatened to annihilate the bourgeoisie” (Corbin 212).35

Beyond the physical and moral rot the prostitute represented, she was also dangerous to society because she carried within her the potential to undermine traditional male authority. In Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud, Lacqueur notes that while “[w]horing, of course, had long been regarded as wicked and detrimental . . . so had drunkenness, blasphemy, and other disturbances of the peace. Not until the nineteenth century did it come to be the social evil” (230). He suggests what made this vice so particularly disruptive and singularly threatening was that the prostitutes did not feel affection for the men with whom they had sex. The majority of prostitutes on the streets were not high-classed paramours catering to one man or even the “süße Mädel” hoping to find a middle-class husband, but rather women from the lower echelons of society trying to eke out a meager living. As with the other faceless masses produced by the anonymity of the city, the increase in sexual commerce produced its own industry of anonymous entities. Offering a service with no affection, the prostitute became what Hilmes calls a symbol of lost love. “Die Prostituierte, die verfemte Frau von der Straße, avanciert zum Sinnbild verlorenen Liebe” (56). Without the emotional connection, the prostitute’s clients had

35One of the points August Bebel made in decrying prostitution as a phenomenon of capitalism was that medical examinations of prostitutes did nothing to counteract venereal disease and that too often the innocent victims of these maladies were the wives and children. “[E]in Heer von Krankheiten bei Ehefrauen und Kindern verdankt ehemännlichen, beziehungsweise elterlichen Geschlechtskrankheiten seinen Ursprung” (192-93).
become as anonymous and meaningless to her as she had always been to them. Threatened with the same lack of identity under which the prostitute (and for that matter, most women) had long suffered, the male populace increasingly came to see the prostitute no longer as someone who would help release them from their baser urges as well as provide emotional closeness, but rather as yet another in the long series of threatening women who were making their presence increasingly known at the close of the century. In order to protect the "moral" fiber of German society as well as to attempt to confine the rampant spread of prostitution (which included within it the threat to man's individuality, his physical health, and even his spiritual well-being), laws against this vice became increasingly stricter.  

The Question of Prostitution under the Auspices of the First Women's Movement

The courts were not the only arena in which socialized sex was debated. While industrialization and the expansion of cities could be cited as the reason for the rapid rise of urban prostitution, prostitution became the vortex around which another phenomenon attributed to industrialization and urbanization came to focus--the Frauenfrage or more specifically, the first women's movement. Spurred on by the hypocrisies of a society whose double standards turned a blind eye to male indiscretions while simultaneously severely condemning women for similar behavior, the women's movement fought for a redefinition of social roles. While there was agreement that the status quo was unacceptable, there was no consensus on how to change it. With the movement, as Rose notes, developing in two

---

36See Richard J. Evans for a detailed account of the various German and Austrian statutes addressing sexuality and marriage. For a detailed analysis of the what constituted violations of these statutes, see Richard von Krafft-Ebing.
directions: (1) the efforts to awaken the woman to a new role in society and to a new understanding of herself, and (2) the struggle for civil rights (9), the two major factions within the movement approached the goal of sexual equality from entirely different perspectives and indeed clashed severely when it came to the issue of prostitution.\textsuperscript{37} The more conservative bourgeois movement favored an equality of the sexes based upon the existing social and political order. Their aim was to hold the male populace to the same moral standards to which the female populace was held. In contrast to this stance, under "Die Neue Ethik,"\textsuperscript{38} the socialistically-oriented movement, while also wanting equity, advanced the same sexual liberties for women that men had long enjoyed.\textsuperscript{39}

The main focus for the more conservative wing was the improvement of social morality. While they wanted to gain women access to better education and more employment opportunities--especially in the field of medicine,\textsuperscript{40} they were reserved when

\textsuperscript{37}According to Evans, the issue of prostitution and morality was to be the dominant subject of controversy within the women’s movement during the years 1898-1902 (Feminist 52).

\textsuperscript{38}Under the "Neue Ethik," Helene Stöcker itemized the following conditions: 1) recognition of "open marriages," 2) equal rights for children borne out of wedlock, 3) the introduction of a state-run insurance program for motherhood (Mutterschaftsversicherung, 4) sexual education as well as access to methods of birth control, and 5) economic independence and equal rights for women (Feminist 20).

\textsuperscript{39}Rejecting traditional moral teachings which condemned extra-marital affairs, Helene Stöcker, the strongest advocate for what was called the "free love"-movement, declared there could be no true emancipation from economic subjection without emancipation from sexual subjection (qtd. in Evans, Feminist 118).

\textsuperscript{40}Medicine, it was felt, was a discipline for which the motherly qualities of women were ideally suited, and as Evans points out, "a discipline which fulfilled a real need, as many women had too strong a sense of decency to let themselves be examined and treated by male doctors" (Feminist 27).
it came to issues of sexuality and morality. They accepted for the most part the official ideology that the “true German woman” was emotional, subordinate, and above all motherly (Evans, Feminist 26). In an effort to enoble this view of women, they fought against prostitution as a disruption of their ideals for single marriages, fidelity within marriage, and chastity. To ward off this threat to marriage and decent women, a major organization within the movement, the Women’s Welfare Association (Verein Frauenwohl), under the leadership of Hanna Bieber-Böhlm, advocated the abolition of police-controlled brothels, the deportation of foreign prostitutes, and the imprisonment of all other prostitutes, including first offenders, for between one and three years (Evans, “Prostitution” 122). Ironically, despite the fact that they were supporting the official position of the “Sittenpolizei,” which was itself supposedly trying to stamp out or at least constrain prostitution, these women too were harassed by the police for banding together and speaking out in a public forum.41

For the more radical faction, the main issue was a complete undermining of the existing patriarchal value system. Operating during a time when the political climate had relaxed somewhat, they became increasingly more vocal and politically oriented. These women did not want the separate but equal education advocated by their more cautious sisters, but rather wanted women to be given the same education and the same access to universities as men. Going beyond the more conservative feminists, they demanded access to professions other than just those that “nurtured.” Through protest meetings, public

41The Law of Association (Vereingesetz), passed in Prussia in 1851, expressly forbade women to join political parties or attend meetings at which political affairs were discussed in public. Most of the states throughout Empire passed similar laws, thereby effectively barring women from expressing their political views in public (Evans, Feminist 11-12).
crusades and mass petitions, they spoke out against various legislations. They lobbied for reforms and pushed for full equality in every sphere. In their demands for individual self-determination they even went so far as to insist on the right to vote. \(^{42}\) In the private domestic realm, these socialistically-oriented feminists also rejected the legal statutes which set up double standards within the institution of marriage. They objected that a system which claimed to uphold the sanctity of marriage, while unofficially declaring this same institution unsatisfactory for men, placed all the blame and burden for its inadequacy on women—on the wives for not being able to meet their husbands’ sexual needs and then ironically also on the mistresses or prostitutes precisely for catering to these needs. Following in the footsteps of the English women’s movement, led by Josephine Butler, these more radical feminists saw prostitutes as victims of a male-dominated society and wanted the removal of all State interference in private morality. For these women, legal punishment and degradation that extended only to prostitutes but not to their male clients only served to further symbolize and legitimize the double standard of morality (Evans, Feminist 43).

\[\text{It was not just women, however, who spoke out against these injustices. In a speech before the Reichstag, Bebel strongly condemned the State’s position which made only}\]

\(^{42}\)In 1896, this more radical wing persuaded the BDF (Bund Deutscher Frauenvereine) to launch an unprecedented public campaign against the provisions of the new Civil Code, which were very disadvantageous to women. This signaled the beginning of a new, more active phase in the development of the women’s movement in Germany. (Evans, Feminist 40-41). Indeed, in their demands for availability and dissemination of knowledge about contraceptive methods, for the legalization of abortion, for the recognition of “free marriages,” and for State financial support of unmarried mothers, this faction had much more in common with the Women’s Liberation Movement of the 1960s and 1970s than with the conservative feminists of pre-1914 days (Evans, “Prostitution” 138).
women responsible for the consequences of sexual intercourse. “Derselbe christliche Staat, der die Vorrangstellung des Mannes innerhalb der Ehe sanktioniere, begünstige gleichzeitig Mädchenhandel, Kindesmord an Unehelichen und Heuchelei” (144). Because of the scandalous behavior of Hamburg’s officials in particular, another member of the SPD, Ernst Müller-Meiningen, went so far in the Reichstag as to denounce these officials for making prostitution an institute of the State and called for a national Law of Association (Vereingesetz) to reform discrepancies and abuses existing in the Vereingesetze at the state level (Reimann 42).

Despite the occasional ally from the male-quarter, the increasingly vocal and public nature of the women’s movement produced a strong backlash from several corners. With political congregation of women outlawed until 1908, the legal authorities treated rallying feminists as social criminals and took stricter actions to reinforced existing laws against public speech.43 The medical field, too, convinced that women needed to expend their limited energies on their “natural” callings of childbirth and child rearing, decried politically active women as sexual misfits. Even well-known philosophers, such as Friedrich Nietzsche, spoke out against and rejected feminist efforts. “Sich im Grundproblem ‘Mann und Weib’ zu vergreifen, hier den abgründlichsten Antagonismus und die Notwendigkeit einer ewig-feindseligen Spannung zu leugnen, hier vielleicht von gleichen Rechten, gleicher Erziehung, gleichen Anprüchen und Verpflichtungen zu träumen; dies ist ein typisches Zeichen von Flachköpfigkeit” (qtd. in Savramis 133). Ironically, irrespective of whether one was a

43In Hamburg, where the Abolitionists, as some of the more radical women were now calling themselves, gathered, the police were harshly repressive and went so far as to send agents to observe and harass even their closed assemblies (Evans, Feminist 57).
member of the more conservative faction that upheld most of the social norms and spoke out
against sexual promiscuity or a member of the faction which rejected the stricter moral
standards and advocated a more liberal sexuality for women, the emancipated woman, like
the prostitute, was viewed as standing outside the narrow scope of social acceptability and
was therefore just as condemned and severely punished by society as was the streetwalker.
CHAPTER 2
THE DEVELOPMENT OF EROS IN FRANK WEDEKIND’S EARLY PLAYS

As a socially critical writer during the turn-of-the-century, Frank Wedekind’s works expressed a keen interest in the various issues and debates surrounding the Frauenfrage. Because he sought to unmask the double standards and incongruities inherent in his world, and more specifically, because he advocated a more liberal sexuality, critics for many years read him as a champion of women. They lauded not only his recognition of female sexuality, but also his demand that this sexuality be acknowledged and accepted. 44 By condemning the double standards of his times, Wedekind appeared to align himself with the first women’s movement which was itself fighting for sexual equality, but Wedekind’s agenda was not the same as theirs. 45 He was by no means a political activist and definitely not an advocate for these women, as one can see by his derogatory treatment of feminists in such works as Kinder und Narren (1891), Mine-Haha (1903), and Tod und Teufel (1906). Nevertheless, as


45 While Wedekind’s writings may have carried very strong social messages, Rolf Kieser notes that they are primarily determined not by social concerns but by his very private ones. “In an epoch of assaults against taboos, these private concerns unintentionally came to be regarded as a general social message” (“Pandora” 12).
Lorenz notes in “Wedekind und die emanzipierte Frau,” much of his early writing does confront many of the same issues that were at the forefront of the socialist women’s movement. Paramount among these issues for Wedekind was a repressive public morality which limited sexual freedom and consequently human freedom.

Like many in his day, Wedekind believed life had become an affected charade belying the vitality and verve it once possessed. While this decadence was due in part to the overly cultured and refined aspects of his times, Wedekind saw pretentious morality, which he called “bürgerliche Moral,” as the leading cause of society’s downfall. To counter this decline, he proposed a new way of life which was supposed to reawaken the most vigorous of human drives. This “menschliche Moral,” as he called it, was not a morality per se, but rather an expression of the life force now presumed missing in mankind’s nature. Viewing sexuality as the most rejuvenating of human drives in that it held within it the primal instinct for life, Wedekind championed a more open expression thereof as a means for fostering this new lifestyle. But Wedekind’s sexuality was not regenerative in terms of procreation. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Wedekind did not focus on reproduction, nor on family, motherhood, or children, but instead on the principle of pleasure. For him, the reinvigoration of mankind would not come about by fathering more offspring, but rather through the reawakening of those dormant energies and senses within the individual which science and society’s fraudulent virtues had long repressed. In Wedekind’s own words, he wanted to reawaken the “spontane Naivität des Kindes oder des Tieres in seiner Wildnis” (qtd. in Michelsen 62).
The belief that a life based on primal instincts would revitalize society can be seen throughout his extensive *œuvre* where it is the dynamics of sexual relationships and even more specifically the sex act itself which takes center stage. Because this particular instinctual drive plays such a dominant role in his concept of a renewed society, the prostitute, or the more appropriately-coined German term *Freudemädchen*, holds a prominent place throughout Wedekind’s works. It is in his earlier works in particular, though, that this figure is most conspicuous and celebrated. Indeed, as the following analysis will show, in Wedekind’s early works one sees an actual promotion of the *fille de joie* through a form of sexual education that advances the art of lovemaking as a true art form.

The Development of Wedekind’s Prostitutes: Emblems of Eros?

Perhaps more than any other writer of his time, Wedekind used excerpts from his own personal life and those of friends and family as the material for his art. In *Frühlings Erwachen*, one of his earliest works and the first for which he gained public recognition and acclaim, Wedekind recounts the traumas of his own youth and those of friends and classmates. Blaming these traumas, at least in part, on his repressive society, Wedekind

---

46 Here Hilme’s separation of the word into it’s two key components, *Freudem-Mädchen*, to indicate a “Mädchen der Freude” — die junge Frau, die ihre Erotik unangemessen genießt und freizügig dem Mann das erträumte Sinnenglück gewährt” (156) is even more concise and appropriate.

47 For details on the *Frühlings Erwachen* production that secured Wedekind’s fame, see Christian W. Thomsen.

48 Numerous critics have noted the similarities between the suicide of the pupil Moritz Stiefel in this work and the actual death of Wedekind’s friend and school mate Moritz Dürr in 1885. Further correlations have also been drawn to another acquaintance, Franz Oberli, who also committed suicide as a result of school pressures (Kieser, “Vorfrühlings”
used this drama as a forum to attack the perversity of bourgeois morality. With a focus on the sexual awakening of adolescents, Frühlings Erwachen depicts the fears and confusions these children undergo in the process of discovering their sensual natures. In a world that does not discuss sexuality, the children are left to their own resources of investigation. While he depicts the boys and girls experimenting with autoeroticism, homosexuality, and even sado-masochism, these acts are not the perversions to which Wedekind alludes. For him, such experimentation was a natural stage in the development of human sexuality. What Wedekind saw as unnatural and what he criticizes in this work is a society, here represented by the parents and teachers, which avoids discussion of sexuality. It was this censured speech that Wedekind saw as the true perversion in that it instilled anxiety and ignorance in children, and in Frühlings Erwachen was even portrayed as leading to the eventual death of one of the adolescents.

Despite death brought about through sexual ignorance, Wedekind depicts these children, for the most part, as strong, healthy, and highly sensual individuals who symbolize, so Walther Sokel, “the truth, purity, and absolute joy of sensuous experience” (201). While physically sound, society’s scruples interfere with their emotional development as prudery meant to instill modesty is forced upon them. The instinctive reaction against the ignorance


49In contrast to my stance here, in his Wollüstige Phantasie Horst Glaser contends just the opposite. Glaser in fact sees the experimentation of the adolescents as inadvertent acts of perversion brought on by an inability for “normal” sexual interaction under bourgeois constraints. “Die verworrene Landschaft früher Sexualität, durchzogen von bizarren Schranken und kurvenreichen Abirrungen, liegt unter der glatten Steppdecke bürgerlicher Sexualmoral” (150).
and shame these children share is made clear in a discussion between two of the boys, Moritz and Melchior, where Moritz describes an idyllic world of unhindered nakedness that would do away with the tensions of guilt and shame.

Ich habe mir schon gedacht, wenn ich Kinder habe, Knaben und Mädchen, so lasse ich sie von früh auf im nämlichen Gemach, wenn möglich auf ein und demselben Lager, zusammen schlafen, lasse ich sie morgens und abends beim An- und Auskleiden einander behilflich sein und in der heißen Jahreszeit, die Knaben sowohl wie die Mädchen, tagsüber nichts als eine kurze, mit einem Lederriemen gegürte Tu-nika aus weißem Wollstoff tragen. — Mir ist, sie müßten, wenn sie so heranwachsen, später ruhiger sein, als wir es in der Regel sind. (Drama 1:100)

While Melchior can see the advantages to Moritz’ idyl, he also sees the disadvantages. “Die Frage ist nur, wenn die Mädchen Kinder bekommen, was dann?” (Drama 1:100). Noting the instinctual drives that would draw the sexes to one another, Melchior, unlike Moritz, is able to foresee negative consequences if the children are allowed completely unsupervised freedom. Moritz’ solution, which foreshadows the activities Wedekind portrays in Minen-Haha a couple years later, is to keep the children so busy with work and play during the day that they sleep soundly at night.

Having delineated Moritz as more fanciful and Melchior as more practical, Wedekind continues this distinction in their subsequent discussion of nocturnal emissions. Whereas Moritz admits to feeling shame and even worse, a Todesangst, Melchior concedes to only a bit of shame, since he has studied up on the subject. In order to alleviate some of his friend’s concerns, Melchior offers to explain the changes of puberty. Too shy to discuss this further, however, Moritz asks Melchior to give him a written essay. Here too we see difference stressed between the two—Moritz is confused, afraid, and not yet ready to come
to terms with his budding sexuality; Melchior on the other hand, actively seeks information to grasp the changes his body will undergo. Ironically, despite his greater understanding of the maturing process, it is Melchior and not Moritz who will fall victim to the repercussions of his sexuality when he later impregnates one of the girls.

In many respects, the adolescent girls in this drama are even worse off than the young boys, as we see in the case of Wendla Bergmann. Here we have a young girl who is far ahead of her friends in physical development, but it is a development she does not understand, nor even fully recognizes. Although Wendla is not ready to exchange her Prinzesskleidchen for the longer Bußgewand her mother has made for her fourteenth birthday, her questions about childbirth make it clear she stands on the threshold of adolescence. Unlike Melchior’s liberal mother who has encouraged her son’s enlightenment, Frau Bergmann seeks to shelter her daughter from the facts of life. As she stutters and stammers her way through feeble explanations, she unwittingly misleads her daughter into believing pregnancy can only occur when one is in love and married.

Although prostitution is not the main theme of Frühlings Erwachen, Wedekind does already interject a prostitute into this drama in the figure of Ilse. Very late in the play, as we encounter Moritz about to commit suicide, Ilse comes along. She stops and talks to Moritz, telling him of her exploits in the city where she has not only modeled for but slept with several painters. Despite tales of misfortune and mishandling, she projects an air of energy and vitality. Unlike Moritz who is not strong enough to withstand the blows of life, Ilse has an instinct for survival that allows her to rise above its miseries. Additionally, there is a passion and joy in her that can’t be found in Moritz. This young girl, whom Moritz refers to
as “Glückskind,” “Sonnenkind,” and then in a very literal sense, “Freudenmädchen,” is indeed just that and as such emblematizes the essence of life in this work.\textsuperscript{50} Whereas Michelsen refers to Ilse as the “Vorläuferin der Lulu” (52),\textsuperscript{51} and there are indeed many correlations between the two,\textsuperscript{52} there is an innocence or naïveté in this character which will not ring true with the later Lulu-character. While there is a will to live associated with both female figures, Ilse’s will still has a positive quality associated with it in that anyone who follows her will also live.\textsuperscript{53} With Lulu, as we later will see, this is no longer the case.

While the focus of Frühlings Erwachen is the detrimental side effects of sexual repression, as the subtitle Eine Kindertragödie makes clear, Wedekind sets up his subsequent work Mine Haba as a counterpiece to show how sensuality can develop positively once all negative social mores are removed. It is not just the destructive social norms that Wedekind eliminates in this work, however, but indeed the influence of the whole adult world. At a school far from the confines of society, the children in this work are educated and trained

\textsuperscript{50}The correlation between Ilse and the life-affirming prostitutes portrayed in Das Sonnenspekttrum can be seen not only in the term “Sonnenkind” Wedekind gives Ilse, but additionally by one of his songs entitled “Ilse,” which is a variation of the song of rape of the young women of Sonnenspekttrum sing. (See Tante 49 and page 86 of this chapter.)

\textsuperscript{51}In his work The Ironic Dissident: Frank Wedekind in View of His Critics, Ward Lewis credits Paul Fechter as being the first to make this observation, saying that Ilse treads the path of Lulu and will develop into this character in the later tragedy (38-39).

\textsuperscript{52}The scene where the painter Fehrendorf chases her around his studio anticipates the scene between Schwarz and Lulu. The animal descriptions Ilse gives her various clients also foreshadow those the animal trainer will use in of the prologue to Erdgeist.

\textsuperscript{53}Here again, it is Fechter who first notes a widely overlooked allusion in which the Masked Gentleman suggests that had Moritz followed Ilse, he would have embraced Life instead of Death (39).
by a hierarchy of their peers—children slightly older than themselves. Here, in a setting very much like the one Moritz imagines in Frühling Erwachen, they live in a carefree world where both sexes mingle and play in their natural state of nakedness. Allowed to become aware and unashamed of their bodies, they are taught to take pride in themselves as they develop to physical perfection. Indeed, unlike the society in Frühling Erwachen that attempts to repress all attention to the body, in the world of Mine-Haha there is an extraordinary focus on the corporeal as one learns to appreciate the grace and agility which can be achieved through proper training.

In contrast to the competitive intellectual education in Frühling Erwachen, which singles out the best and instills feelings of inadequacy and ineptitude in the rest, the training in gymnastics, music and dance portrayed in this work requires a certain amount of collaboration and cooperation as the children learn in unison to express the rhythms inherent in their bodies. In this manner, they become parts of a symphonic whole. The rejection of the egocentric focus that forces individuals to become rivals, is further stressed in the total lack of individuality. There are thirty houses on the property with seven girls to a house. All girls get the same training in dance and gymnastics. As far as music, one does not get an instrument of choice or upon which one might excel, but rather fills the gap left whenever an older girl moves onto the next stage of development and education. There is no duplication of instruments within the various houses, and the training one receives on each instrument is done in communal fashion as the girls from the different homes come together jointly for their lessons. This process of stepping into the previous person’s shoes also occurs with the trainers as each girl instructs her subsequent successor in the role of leadership.
This lack of individuation, as well as the exclusive focus on the body, is exemplified in the narrator’s description of her comrades.


Although Wedekind makes the connection between this work and Frühlings Erwachen abundantly clear in the Rahmenerzählung of Mine-Haha, there is an important shift in focus from the former work to this one. As if addressing Melchior’s concerns that unwanted pregnancies might occur as sexual instincts take over, Wedekind separates the children of Mine-Haha into gender-specific camps long before they reach puberty or sexual awareness. Once this separation occurs, however, Wedekind’s emphasis is no longer on both sexes as it was in Frühlings Erwachen, but rather solely with the female sex, as seen in this work’s subtitle Über die körperliche Erziehung der jungen Mädchen. As this title also makes clear, these young girls receive no education in the formal sense. While this lack of formal instruction has evoked much debate among scholars, ranging from those who see this as a repression of the female on the one extreme to those who see this as Wedekind’s critique of the typical female education in the nineteenth century, it must be noted that this lack of

54In the Rahmenerzählung, the narrator who receives Helene Engel’s (a.k.a.: Hidalla’s) autobiography, identifies himself as the author of Frühlings Erwachen.

55For a critique against Wedekind’s physical education, see Silvia Bovenschen (1979) and Boa (1987), among others. For the opposite stance, see Sol Gittleman (1969) and
institutional education applies equally to the young boys in this work. Wedekind’s focus here is not on intellectual training, but rather on a redirection of education. By shifting the emphasis from the cerebral back to the corporeal, Wedekind attempts to show how one can reawaken the instinctual nature of humans. At the end of the work, when the adolescents are finally released into society in a garlanded procession, the suggestion is that they have developed along natural lines without any social interference and that they will continue to act and live along natural lines. In this work, the young people represent Wedekind’s concept of the rejuvenating aspects of eros and as such are being injected back into a sick social body in the hopes of resurrecting its lost vitality.

Despite his advocacy for the development of a natural sexuality unobstructed by social prudery, however, Wedekind was not so naïve as to believe this to be the final solution to society’s decadence. Indeed, as the ending of the Rahmenerzählung delineates, Wedekind foresees a losing battle as the forces of society use and abuse the natural sexuality represented by Hidalla and her comrades.

Man kann sich leicht vorstellen, daß nicht eine einzige mit ihren Vermutungen auch nur im entferntesten an die ungeheuerlichen Überraschungen heranreichte, die unser harren. . . . [Man ließ] uns durch die gewaltigsten Prüfungen hindurch in eine völlig unbekannte Welt hinaus. . . . Ich möchte auch den Mitlebenden die bangen Schauer ins Gedächtnis zurückrufen, die wir zur Belustigung einer besinnungslosen, wollusttrunken, rohen Menschenwelt alle einmal durchgekostet, wenn uns auch die gewaltigen nie geahnten Schicksale des Lebens sehr bald nur mit spöttischem Lächeln an jene Schrecknisse zurückdenken lassen. . . . Die Dinge gingen daraus doch von Generation zu Generation ihren unabänderlichen Gang, und mich trübe nur Schimpf und Spott von seiten aller, . . . Es wird mir vielleicht auch schmerzvoll, wenn ich zur Schilderung jener Epoche meines Lebens gelangt bin, den Leser davon zu überzeugen, daß die von mir durchkämpften Konflikte in unserer Gesell-

schaftsordnung, unter der Herrschaft unserer straffbemessenen sozialen Gesetze, für eine Frau überhaupt nur entstehen konnten. (Prosa 132-33)

With this closing, we see Wedekind struggling to envision how natural sensuality developed outside of society could be reintroduced into and accepted by society. Indeed, it is this theme of conflict between unrestrained eroticism and bourgeois prudery that will dominate all Wedekind’s following works and become the fulcrum around which his own concepts of eros will revolve and evolve.

In Das Sonnenspektrum, Wedekind’s concept of sexual education culminates in an apprenticeship of sorts as he replaces the school from Mine-Haha with a Freudenhaus. No longer removed from society, as were the girls in Mine-Haha, the young women in this work are nevertheless sheltered from it behind garden walls that offer them refuge and protection. As the work’s subtitle Idyll aus einem Leben suggests, the idyllic nature of this life lies in the fact that this park is a locus amoenus, the ancient topos of the garden of love. Here in this modern world, it is situated within society but simultaneously without. The emphasis on this pre-societal state is reflected not only in the overriding focus on the world of nature—the trees, the sunlight, the warmth, the grass, but also through the numerous playground motifs that evoke a sense of childlike innocence. Although physically mature, as these young women play on swings, on see-saws, in the sand, and with jumping ropes, one has the feeling that psychologically they are not that far removed from the young girls in Mine-Haha. Beyond the mere emphasis on innocence or naturalness, however, is also the suggestion of unhindered play and freedom. The sense of freedom in particular can be seen not only in the unrestricted clothing the girls wear, but also in their free-flowing hair. Indeed, contrasted
to this is Elise, the new arrival, who is not only described as having braided hair, but also wearing a tightly-laced dress of muted colors.\textsuperscript{56}

While the title \textit{Das Sonnenspektrum} suggests the life-giving aspect of the sun, it also refers back to Mine-Haha’s Ilse as the \textit{Sonnenkind}. That these girls are also \textit{Sonnenkinder} is emphasized not only in the lifestyle they share with Ilse, but also by the fact that their vibrant clothing actually allows them to be seen as personifications of the spectrum—each representing a different facet of colored light. Indeed, one client even refers to them as “der schönste Regenbogen, den ich je gesehen habe” (\textit{PDV} 2:114). While the name of one of the girls, Minehaha, again refers to Mine-Haha, it also brings with it the idea of the noble savage, living freely and unrestricted with and within nature. The name itself, which translates as laughing water, too evokes a sense of joy and freedom. That this is not just a place of blissful openness, but also one where fantasies can be played out, is suggested in the fairy tale name of Schneewittchen that another girl bears. In this place of sheer sensuality, women flit across the grounds like sparkling jewels or brilliant flowers. Indeed, as seen in the description below, the musician Theophil even envisions them as colorful notes of music weaving their way through the landscape, winding in and out of the trees, stimulating not only his imagination, but also his creativity. As with Mine-Haha before,

\textsuperscript{56}Interestingly enough, the colors of this outfit, grey, black, and dark blue, are the same as those the one the madam wears at the opening of the play and thus suggests the continuation we’ve already seen in Mine-Haha of each girl stepping into the shoes of the previous one.
woman is once again portrayed as a symphonic whole, a symphony of sensuality—of sights and sounds and sex.\textsuperscript{57}

Ich schwelge hier in einer Flut von Akkorden. Ich höre Symphonien, ohne daß ein Laut die Stille unterbricht. Dieses sonnendurchleuchtete Grün, mit den bunten Mädchenhemden dazwischen, die weißen Arme, die durch die Blätter blinken, wenn ich das einmal in Musik setze, das wird mein Lebenswerk. Das wird eine neue Kunst, ein andachtsvoller Kultus, voll traumhafter Schönheit, voll feiner naive Sinnlichkeit . . . (PDV 2:98)

While the focus on sexual freedom is still presented positively, as Wedekind depicts both men and women delighting in their sensuality, there is even greater emphasis on female eroticism than seen previously. By portraying women as living at the brothel, but men as choosing only to visit it, Wedekind subtly begins to suggest that the female, unlike the male, has a greater need for sexual gratification and thus places herself in a setting where she can be assured continual sexual contact. That the men only visit the brothel furthermore suggests that their lives encompass something outside of the brothel, beyond sexuality, whereas the women’s do not.\textsuperscript{38} Certainly, this is exactly what Wedekind portrays in the figure of Franziska when she says: “Je mehr man liebt, um so mehr möchte man lieben.” (PDV 2:94) and in the figure of Elise when, in response to Gregor’s question “Wollen Sie hier in Dienst treten?” she refers to her as yet unfulfilled sexual desires and responds: “Ich kann nicht

\textsuperscript{57}Again, as in Mine-Haha, we see a lack of individuality as the Madame’s accolades illustrate. “Es ist jedes Mädchen auf Gottes weiter Welt so schön wie das andere. Da macht der gütige Himmel zum Glück keinen Unterschied” (PDV 2:113).

\textsuperscript{38}With this we start to see Wedekind echoing Weininger who declared: “W ist nichts als Sexualität, M ist sexuell und noch etwas darüber”(113).
anders” (PDV 2:105). While this phrase can also be read as Wedekind’s critique of a society that relegates the sexually active woman to the brothel, it also carries another implication with it. Although Gregor’s comment “Das kann ich Ihnen nicht verdenken. Ich kann auch nicht anders” (PDV 2:105) implies that men share a similar plight in that the same restrictive rules of conduct force them to visit brothels, the situations are not the same. In attempting to express their sexuality, men do not becomes whores and outcasts of society as the Madame makes clear in delineating the male position as the more favorable.

Die eine geht drauf, weil sie all ihre Jugendkraft in sich hineinwürgen muß; die andere geht drauf, weil sie den Anforderungen, die die heutige Gesellschaft an ein junges Mädchen stellt, nicht gewachsen ist. Ihr Männer habt es eben doch gut, ihr bekommt eure Ration zugemessen. Ihr könnt euch die genzenlose Leidenschaft gar nicht vorstellen, wenn man es nur noch dumpf über sich rauschen hört. (PDV 2:118)

Wedekind’s acknowledgment of the double standard at play here is ambiguous at best, however, since Elise’s “inability to do anything else” attests not only to the intensity of her sexual desires, but also to her inability to control these desires. With this, we see Wedekind ever so subtly beginning to insinuate that women do not merely enjoy sexual intercourse, but actually require it. While his concept of open sexuality has up to this point been portrayed as liberated and liberating, with this he begins to sound suspiciously like Otto Weininger, who saw woman’s sole function as sex and all women as Hetäre.  

59As opposed to the starving, ill-clad prostitutes of the Naturalistic stage, Rose notes that Wedekinds’ women willingly leave good homes to fulfill their sexual drives. “Their conscious and unconscious sensuality is affirmed over sexually repressive social morality. The sexual instinct is held up as a positive force even when totally divorced from any thought of procreation, fidelity, or wedlock”(155).

60In juxtaposing the intellectually and physically strong male principle “M” with the female principle, Weininger defines “W” as “die ichlose, gedächtnislose, treulose
Unlike Weininger, who saw the whore as a negative entity, Wedekind still portrays his ideal prostitute in a positive manner and in fact makes a very clear distinction in this work between the _Freudenmädchen_ who follows her natural inclinations and the _Prostituierte_ who pursues sexual freedom for other reasons. The contrasts he makes between innocence and pretense between naiveté and guile can be seen readily in the various girls he describes. Where Elise blushes freely and painfully thereby expressing her natural modesty, Melitta, we are told, paints blush on her cheeks to affect this air of innocence. “Er hat ihre Schminke für das Rot der Unschuld genommen” (PDV 2:115). Elise comes to the brothel to find release from her sexual desires and is told “[d]as zeugt von gesunder Natur” (PDV 1:2).

Geilheit schlechthin, die völlige Gegenrasse zu Jesus im Menschen oder der Reinheit . . . denn nur die Frau als Hetäre ist die Wahrheit, die Frau als Madonna ist eine Schöpfung des Mannes, nichts entspricht ihr in der Wirklichkeit (334).

Although Wedekind rejects concepts such as love, shame, and fidelity as falsehoods superimposed on society, he does not place modesty—which he considers a “natural” shame—into this category. (For further discussion on this topic, see Hibberd, Ulrike Prokop and Diethe.) Wedekind’s acceptance of a “natural” modesty in women becomes problematic, however, once one realizes he views it as a tool for male stimulation. “Der Wert der jungfräuliichen Scham der Braut in der Brautnacht besteht darin, daß eine edle seelische Erregung, die sich im ganzen Körper des Weibes äußert, immer im höchsten Grad anregend auf die Potenz des Mannes wirkt” (GW, 9:202). Indeed, in one of his last works, _Simson_ (1913), we see that lack of female modest is actually blamed for male impotence as Og commiserates that Delila no longer resists him sexually.

. . . Damals
Fühlte ich mich machtvoll, stolz, gewaltig, fürstlich,
Weil schamhaft du dich meiner Liebeswerbung
Versagtest. Dein verschämter Widerstand
Gab das Gefühl mir höchster Manneswürde
Auch Manneskraft verdankt ich deiner Scham,
Durch die ich als dein Überwinder mir
So riesenstark erschien, wie Simson selbst
Als Jüngling niemals war. -- Mit einem Schlag
Hast du die Herrlichkeit in mir zertrümmert. (PDV, 2:561)
Schneewittchen, on the other hand, sees sex as a commodity of exchange and complains when one of her customers expects more for his money. “Er meint, weil er vier Nächte bei mir geschlafen, müsse ich in ihn verliebt sein. Da könnte noch mancher kommen. Daß ich mit ihm schlafe, ist nicht meine Sache, wenn er für die Nacht bezahlt. Dafür füttert Madame uns mit Kaviar. Aber zum Lieben bin ich nicht engagiert. Man soll nicht mehr tun, als wofür man bezahlt wird” (PDV 2:99). While Wedekind plays not only with male fantasies and expectations here, but with the falsity of society’s concepts of love as a form of indebtedness as well, he also portrays this particular girl in a negative light depicting her as petty, jealous and backbiting. It is in this portrayal that we now begin to see where Wedekind will place the blame for the ensuing deterioration in his concept of eros as this description starts to sound very much like the deviant nature Paul Möbius and others attributed to women. Indeed, as Rose observes, “Wedekind’s outline for the remainder of

---

62 Although Wedekind did not share John Stuart Mill’s concerns relative to the economic position of woman, by exposing male expectations, he nevertheless echoes in part Mill’s argument that women are raised to be pleasing and yielding to men. “Men do not want solely the obedience of women, they want their sentiments”(169). Despite his rejection of Mill’s feminist position, Kutscher tells us that Wedekind referred to Mill’s work *Über die Hörigkeit der Weiber* when writing *Hidalla* (W 215).

63 In “Woman as Sexual Criminal,” Barbara Hales notes that jealousy and vanity were two of the traits that Paul Möbius claimed reflected woman’s instinctive, animalistic nature (102). The inability to control oneself, as we’ve seen portrayed in both Elise and the unnamed prostitute, was yet another. Where Möbius saw these as traits that linked woman to her animalistic nature, in their study *The Female Offender*, Cesare Lombroso and Guglielmo Ferrero saw these as traits that identified the criminal (hypersexual) nature of woman. “[T]he normal woman is deficient in moral sense, and possessed of slight criminal tendencies, such as vindictiveness, jealousy, envy, malignity, which are usually neutralized by less sensibility and less intensity of passion. Let a woman, normal in all else, be slightly more excitable than usual, or let a perfectly normal woman be exposed to grave provocations, and these criminal tendencies which are physiologically latent will take the upper hand”(263).
the play also suggests the onset of doubt regarding sexuality . . . as a viable life-sustaining principle” (170). And while she sees these doubts crystallizing in the Lulu-plays, we will actually see them coming to fruition in his next work Tod und Teufel. ⁶⁴

In Tod und Teufel the focus is no longer on carnal pleasure but instead has shifted back to adverse influences that rob this drive of its rejuvenating qualities. While sexuality is depicted as warped once again, in this work it is not caused by the repression Wedekind portrayed in Frühlings Erwachen, but rather by commodification as well as woman’s increasing independence. Although this work still centers on sexuality, there is little focus on the prostitute until the very end of this play. Instead what we have is a discussion between Casti Piani, the white-slave trader from the Lulu-plays,⁶⁵ and the suffragette, Elfriede von Malchus that encompasses the two most extreme views on sexuality seen in Wedekind’s day. As “Mitglied des Internationalen Vereins zur Bekämpfung des Mädchenhandels,” Elfriede represents the bourgeois feminists who sought to hold the male populace to the same standards of decency to which the female populace was held. She fights against prostitution as an immoral institution that exploits young women, but simultaneously also against any form of sexuality that takes place outside of marriage.

⁶⁴ Although Wedekind’s Lulu-plays follow Das Sonnenspektrum thematically, given their pivotal role in elucidating his concept of “menschliche Moral” as well as issues of deviance, separate chapters will be devoted to their discussion.

⁶⁵ Here again, as in the previous works, we see Wedekind very specifically linking one work to another in order to reinforce the thematic continuation.
While there is subtle condemnation of feminists in the previous works discussed, it is in Tod und Teufel and in the Lulu-plays that Wedekind’s vehemence is most blatantly expressed. In this work, he paints Elfriede as a woman who sought education and emancipation because she was too frigid to accept proposals of marriage. That she is not capable of handling the responsibility that comes with receiving an education, however, becomes clear when Casti Piani blames her for Lisiska’s fall from innocence. “An diesem Unglück waren aber doch, wenn ich recht unterrichtet bin, nur Ihre eigenen Papiere, Bücher und Zeitschriften schuld, die Sie allem Anschein nach vor dem jungen Geschöpf, um dessen Rettung willen Sie augenblicklich hier sind, nicht sorgfältig genug verwahrt hielten?” (Werke 2:669). While Casti Piani denotes Elfriede’s lack of desire as her reason for joining the Verein, her subsequent attack on him for abducting young girls reveals a passion that undermines his reproach.

Glauben Sie, Sie könnten mich, die ich wie eine gehetzte Hündin von Lasterhöhle zu Lasterhöhle hinter dem Geschöpf her bin, durch Ihren abenteuerlichen Gefühlschokuspokus einschläfern?! Ich bin jetzt nicht Mitglied des Vereins zur Bekämpfung des Mädchenhandels! Ich bin als eine unselige Verbrecherin hier, die, ohne etwas zu ahnen, ein blutjunges Leben in Elend und Verzweiflung gebracht hat! (Werke 2:167)

66In Frühlings Erwachen we see the ambiguous nature of Frau Gabor, who wanted to offer her son every opportunity to become an enlightened individual, but when faced with his sexuality, sided with her husband and had him confined to a reform school. In Mine-Haha, the narrator Helene Engel apologizes for the need to take up pen and paper and decries Blaustrümpefe in the process. “Wenn ich mich dazu entschließe, in diesen Zeilen meine Lebensgeschichte niederzulegen, so geschieht es nicht, weil ich irgendwie den Beruf einer Schriftstellerin in mir fühle. Ich darf wohl sagen, daß mir nichts auf dieser Welt so verhaftet ist wie ein Blaustrumpf” (Prosa 88). Finally, in Das Sonnenspektrum the Madame reprimands one of the girls for wanting to dress Elise in blue stockings. “Bist du verrückt? Soll ich noch Blaustrümpfe dick füttern?” (PDV 111).
With this we see that it is not lack of passion, but rather repression thereof, that Wedekind once again portrays as degenerate.

The perversion Wedekind reflects in Casti Piani on the other hand is one of commodification. Rather than seeing the rejuvenating aspects of sexuality, he sees only the financial gain. In order to justify his actions, however, the young prostitutes Casti Piani describes are no longer like the vital, life-affirming Freudenmädchen Wedekind portrays in Das Sonnenspektrum, but rather much more akin to the hungry and homeless waifs of Naturalism. “Wenn sich ein Mann in Not befindet, dann bleibt ihm oft keine andere Wahl mehr übrig, als zu stehlen oder zu verhungern. Wenn sich dagegen ein Weib in Not befindet, dann bleibt ihm außer dieser Wahl noch die Möglichkeit, seine Liebesgunst zu verkaufen” (Werke 2:672). Indeed, as he portrays pimps as the noble defenders and protectors of these women, fighting to bring them the highest prices, he simultaneously twists things around so that the feminists appear to be the ones actually hindering women’s freedom. “Und nun wollen Sie Ihren unglücklichen Schwestern den geringen Vorzug, in äußerster Not Ihre Liebesgunst verkaufen zu können, rauben, indem Sie diesen Verkauf als eine unauslöschliche Schande hinstellen?!” (Werke 2:673). That he suffers under his own misconceptions as much as Elfriede does under hers becomes clear when he reveals that, like Elfriede, he too cannot enjoy sex. “Ihnen hat die Natur nur eine äußerst kärgliche

67Lorenz notes that in decrying the way in which unwed mothers and illegitimate children are condemned by society, Casti Piani starts to sound amazingly like Bebel. A difference she notes between the two, however, is that where Bebel suggests methods of birth control as a means of giving women more freedom, Casti Piani advocates more rights for mothers. “Der Unterschied zwischen Bebel und Casti-Piani liegt in Bebels Forderung nach Geburtenkontrolle als emanzipatorisches Mittel, während Casti-Piani anachronistisch ein neues Mutterrecht fordert”(51).
Sinnlichkeit verliehen. Mich haben die Stürme des Lebens längst zu einer schauerlichen Einöde gemacht” (Werke 2:671).\(^6^8\) That they are actually two of a kind in their own lack of vitality and ability to express their sexuality is made clear when Casti Piani notes how their approaches to the issue of prostitution reflect their own shortcomings. “Aber was für Ihre Sinnlichkeit die Bekämpfung des Mädchenhandels ist, das ist für meine Sinnlichkeit, falls Sie mir etwas der Art noch zugestehen wollen, der Mädchenhandel selbst” (Werke 2:671).

While many scholars have seen Wedekind reflecting himself in Casti Piani,\(^6^9\) they have overlooked the fact that he reflects himself equally in Elfriede thus reinforcing that these two characters are, in fact, simply different sides of the same coin. We see this not only when Elfriede responds to Casti Piani’s accusations by attacking his commodification of sex. “Sie sind ein Lügner! Sie glauben an Ihre eigenen Worte nicht! Sie haben das Mädchen nicht aus unbefriedigter Sinnlichkeit verhandelt, sondern aus Geldgier! Sie haben das Mädchen verhandelt, um ein gutes Geschäft dabei zu machen” (Werke 2:672).\(^7^0\) Their

\(^6^8\)In a conflation of the sufferings of both Moritz and Martha in Frühlings Erwachen, we learn that Casti Piani did not perform well in school and was therefore physically abused as a child. Unlike either of these two children, however, he retaliated and beat his father to death. This allows him a certain level of independence not seen in the others, as well as a level of cynicism that reminds one of the sentiments the Masked Man of Frühlings Erwachen expresses.

\(^6^9\)Aside from observing the similarities between Casti Piani’s social criticisms and those of Wedekind, Rasch notes also that Wedekind has given this character his own childhood experiences. “Casti Piani hat Züge von Wedekind selbst. Das geht schon daraus hervor, daß ihm Wedekind seine eigenen Kindheitserfahrungen zuteil: die eigene Unterdrückung und die brutale Behandlung seiner Mutter durch den Vater, den er selbst prügelte”(417).

\(^7^0\)Despite similarities between Wedekind and Casti Piani, Rasch also sees Wedekind distancing himself from this character in that Casti Piani does not speak as an intellectual, but rather out of personal interests as a bordello owner. “Er [Casti Piani]
similarity is expressed even more so at the end of the work when both see not only the validity in the other’s stance, but also the flaws in their own. As if to confirm their commonality, Wedekind then has them speak using the exact same words once both realize life in the brothel is neither the lust nor the lewdness they had expected.

It is not, however, just these two figures representing the repression and exploitation of sex that are portrayed here as deviant. In Tod und Teufel the brothel itself is no longer a haven and an idyll from the outside world. Here sexuality is no longer represented outdoors where it can run free in park-like settings, but is confined instead to the indoors, to a setting reminiscent of the closed-in, stifling classrooms seen in Frühlings Erwachen. And as if echoing the abode that houses her, the prostitute too is no longer portrayed as free. Indeed, she is no longer portrayed as a Freuden-Mädchen at all. Gone is the innocence of Mine-Haha and the joy of Das Sonnenspektrum. Instead what we have in Lisiska is a young woman suffering from the torments of her insatiable sexuality. Initially Wedekind blames her misery on the suffragette writings that enticed and seduced her out of her innocence. Unlike Melchior whose sexual anxieties were stilled once he has studied the subject of sexuality, Lisiska’s readings awaken unnatural desires and urges she cannot control. With this, we not only see Wedekind again rejecting intellectual education as a corruption of the natural—at least in women, we also see him rejecting intellectual women by dismissing their writings.71

verleugnet seine Geschäftsinteressen nicht, er denkt--wie die von ihm angegriffene Bürger--in kommerziellen Kategorien und spricht daher, wenn er den Unterschied der elementaren Liebe von der Ehe kennzeichnen will, nicht von der freien Liebe, sondern vom ‘freien Liebesmarkt’”(418).

71Although it is never specified, we can assume that the works which Melchior reads are texts written by male physicians.
Beyond this, however, we also see Wedekind portraying the whole process of learning differently in the two. Where Melchior pursues his studies openly and with the acceptance of society, Lisiska acts in a clandestine manner invading someone else’s privacy as she reads something off-limits to her secretly late at night. While Elfriede bemoans the “verführerischste Bildern des Sinnengenusses” (Werke 2:669) that have led Lisiska astray, Wedekind alludes to yet another reason for her corruption. In stating that Lisiska is the illegitimate child of a washer woman and unknown father, Wedekind picks up on contemporary discourses that blamed many acts of deviance and perversion on tainted heritage.²² Lisiska comes from the lower strata of society where immorality was held to run rampant. That Lisiska does not have the same healthy desires expressed in the previous Freudenmädchen can be seen not only in her interaction with the client, Herr König, but equally in Casti Piani’s statements that she may be one of those women not naturally inclined to bring joy and pleasure. As he makes clear, a true Freudenmädchen beams with an unmistakable bliss. “Die Frau, die für den Liebesmarkt geschaffen ist, erkenne ich auf den ersten Blick daran, daß ihre freien, regelmäßigen Gesichtszüge unschuldige Glückseligkeit und glückselige Unschuld ausstrahlen” (Werke 2:682). While this image echoes back to the bliss seen in Wendla after the rape, it is not what Casti Piani sees on Lisiska’s face once he observes her with her client. It is at this point that Casti Piani now admits having on one other occasion committed what he calls “a crime against nature” – having misjudged the calling of another young girl. “Einmal schon habe ich ein Geschöpf, das von der Natur nicht dazu geschaffen war, auf dem Liebesmarkte verschachert! Für dieses

²²See here in particular Krafft-Ebing and Lombroso.
Verbrechen gegen die Natur habe ich sechs volle Jahre hinter schwedischen Gardinen zugebracht" (Werke 2:692). With this we now see that there are only specific women created by nature to become Freudenmädchen and use or misuse of others leads to detrimental side-effects for all involved.

**Frühlings Erwachen: Warnings against the Insidious Nature of Female Sexuality**

As we have traced the evolution of eros in Wedekind’s early works, we’ve seen how the image of the prostitute as a life-giving emblem deteriorated in these works. While many scholars have interpreted this degeneration as Wedekind’s own disillusionment that sexual vitality could survive in a world of commerce and big business, this degradation begs closer examination. The writing of Frühlings Erwachen, as we know, was triggered by Wedekind’s response to a society that hindered the “natural” expression of sexuality in children. While Wedekind did indeed portray budding sexuality in both sexes and showed the detrimental outcomes of it’s repression, a closer look at the scenes where sex takes place or where there are sexual overtones will problematize his appeal for an unhindered expression of sexuality in all children.

The first such scene is Martha relaying the abuse she suffers at the hands of her parents--being torn out of bed by her mother, stripped and beaten by her father, and then

---

73 Ironically, Casti Piani does not understand his incarceration as punishment for the selling of young women into prostitution, but rather for simply employing the wrong type woman into this profession.

74 In a letter written in 1891 to an anonymous critic, Wedekind claims he wanted to poetically depict the phenomenon of puberty in order to facilitate more humane and rational views among parents and educators (Hahn, “Kritiker” 452).
forced to spend the night tied up in a sack. With no direct reasons given for this abuse, the unspoken Vorwürfe are that she has reached the age of sexual maturity and that she has become or will soon become sexually active unless the desire is beaten out of her. While there is no overt sex taking place in this scene, there are hints of incestuous desire in the father which Boa observes find expression through his brutality. “In Martha’s father the desires aroused by his child lie close to the surface and emerge as sadism” (Circus 40). The whipping thus becomes not just a means of subjection but one of sexual arousal as well.  

The very next scene that is suggestive is the forest encounter between Melchior and Wendla. In discussing the thrashings that Martha endures, Wendla speculates on how it feels to be beaten. She then begs Melchior to whip her. Despite his desires not to, he persists until he gives in. Although depicted as momentarily aroused by the beating, Melchior is repulsed once he realizes he is not in control of his actions nor his desires. “Plötzlich springt er empor, faßt sich mit beiden Händen an die Schläfen und stürzt, aus tiefster Seele jammervoll aufschluzend, in den Wald hinein” (Stücke 25). If one considers that Melchior had earlier related coming to orgasm as he dreamt of beating the family dog, it is clearly not the whipping itself which is portrayed here as unacceptable, but rather the girl who has taken control and commanded it of an unwilling male subject. Indeed, while professing to depict innocent sexuality in children, Wedekind in fact represents Wendla in a very temptress-like position as she instigates this whipping.

Wendla: Würdest du mich nicht einmal... [mit der Gerte] schlagen?

75The whip as a tool for arousal and domination is a motif that will not only appear again within this work, but indeed will weave itself throughout Wedekind’s whole œuvre.
Melchior: Bist du nicht bei Verstand?
Wendla: Ich bin in meinem Leben nie geschlagen worden!
Melchior: Wenn du um so etwas bitten kannst . . . !
Wendla: --Bitte--bitte--
Melchior: Ich will dich bitten lehren! --(Er schlägt sie.)
Wendla: Ach Gott--ich spüre nicht das geringste!
Melchior: Das glaub ich dir--durch all deine Röcke durch . . .
Wendla: So schlag mich doch an die Beine!
Melchior: Wendla! --(Er schlägt sie stärker.)
Wendla: Du streichelst mich ja! -- Du streichelst mich!
Melchior: Wart, Hexe, ich will dir den Satan austreiben! (Er wirft den Stock beiseite und schlägt derart mit den Fäusten drein, daß sie in ein fürchterliches Geschrei ausbricht. Er kehrt sich nicht daran, sondern drischt wie wütend auf sie los, während ihm die dicken Tränen über die Wangen rinnen. . . .) (Werke 1:114-15)

In a manner that echoes the previous scene with Martha’s father, we see Wedekind once again portraying a male forced, for his own sake as well as the female’s, to beat the devil out of a woman.

Although the next scene is one of autoeroticism, as Häschen Rilow locks himself inside the bathroom with a picture of Venus, the same dynamics are at play. The female image arouses him, but once he has climaxed he vilifies the object of his lust.

Aber du saugst mir das Mark aus den Knochen, du krümmst mir den Rücken, du raubst meinen jungen Augen den letzten Glanz. -- Du bist mir zu anspruchsvoll in deiner unmenschlichen Bescheidenheit, zu aufreibend mit deinen unbeweglichen Gliedmaßen! (Dramen, 1:125)

Expressing in words what has previously only been expressed in actions, Häschen describes his interaction with this image as an actual battle. “Du oder ich! und ich habe den Sieg davongetragen” (Dramen, 1:125). He then thinks of all the other pictures he has brought into the bathroom and all the other wars he has had to fight: “all die Entschlafenen, mit denen ich hier den nämlichen Kampf gekämpft!” (Dramen, 1:125). The conflicts he imagines are
not just a matter of control, but also of power as Häschen envisions himself becoming mentally and physically stronger with each conquest. “Aber mein Gewissen wird ruhiger werden, mein Leib wird sich kräftigen, wenn du Teufelin nicht mehr in den roteisenen Polstern meines Schmuckkästchens residierst” (Drämen, 1:126). That he is trying to gain control over his own sexuality becomes clear when he tells Venus that she will have to die, not for the sake of her own sins, but for the sake of his. When he refers to this object of his arousal as Teufelin, however, it becomes clear that the sin is indeed hers, if for no other reason than as a transference of guilt.76 Here, as in the previous two scenes, it is again the woman who is punished for evoking an uncontrollable sexual reaction in the male. In this scene in particular, it is important to note not only the battle of the sexes that Wedekind portrays, but the strength that is to be gained by the male in conquering female sexuality, for this is an echo that will resound louder and louder throughout his works.

The fourth sexual encounter is again between Wendla and Melchior. After several attempts to make Wendla leave him alone, Melchior’s sexual urges get the better of him and he forces himself on her. While this is clearly a rape scene, several critics have seen Wendla, despite her ardent protests, as either instigating this treatment or at least deserving it. In 1908 Paul Goldmann describes Wendla as so perverse she would have followed Melchior into the hayloft even if her mother had told her the truth about pregnancy (122-23). Richard Elsner, writing four years later, in 1912, claims Wendla feigns ignorance and innocence and lets herself be seduced in order to show her mother what happens when children are left sexually

76Here once again, we see Wedekind espousing statements similar to those of Weininger who saw woman not so much sinning as sin itself. “Das Weib sündigt nicht, denn es ist selbst die Sünde, als Möglichkeit im Manne”(398).
uninformed (19-20). While counter arguments see Wendla as well as all the other children as society's victims, 77 there is some credence to the opinions of Goldmann and Elsner when one considers the previous meeting between Wendla and Melchior. Indeed as Rothe observes, by instigating the initial beating, Wendla evokes the sadistic drive that overpowers Melchior and deprives him of his individuality and self-determination (22-23). Seeing this beating then as a prelude of the encounter in the hayloft, Rothe accuses Wendla of provoking her own rape for masochistic pleasure (Wedekind 25). As Lewis notes, however, Rothe takes a milder stance a year later when he raises the issue of consent in an ambiguous manner and posits Wendla as the conscious initiator ("Frühlings Erwachen" 20). Seeing Wendla as provoking her own rape in order to conform with the tenets of a patriarchal system which permits the woman pleasure only when it is forced upon her from without ("Frühlings Erwachen" 37), Rothe now defines her less as a masochist than as a victim. Whether provoked or not, that Wedekind does not represent Wendla as traumatized by the rape but rather existing in a state of bliss afterwards, gives credence to common beliefs in his day that woman not only wanted sex, but actively sought to initiate it and thus forced men to rape them.

The final sexual encounter in Frühlings Erwachen is between the two boys, Ernst and Häschen. Here in a scene quite different from the previous ones, Wedekind paints a romantic .Jugendstil-type image, as his stage directions reveal. "Winzer und Winzerinnen im Weinberg. -- Im Westen sinkt die Sonne hinter die Berggipfel. Helles Glockengeläute

vom Tal herauf. -- Häschen Rilow und Ernst Röbel im höchstelegen Rebstück sich unter
den überhängenden Felsen im weckenden Grase wälzend" (Dramen, 1:156). There is a
nostalgic quality to the scene as the boys talk of a future time when they will look back
longingly to the beauty of this day. The boys kiss each other gently and confess their love
for each other. Romantic and sweet, this scene is set in stark contrast to the four other
scenes that all epitomized heterosexual sex as a form of violence and domination.

While Wedekind’s main focus in this work may well be to show the detrimental
effects of repressed sexuality, there is nevertheless a distinct difference in how he portrays
the budding sexuality in boys and that in girls. Each scene, with the exception of the
homosexual one, shows not only a need to control female sexuality but also the violent
means for carrying this out. This emphasis on domination is exemplified even in Wendla’s
death. While Wedekind professes that her death was his critique of a society which keeps
its children in ignorance relative to their emerging sexuality, the manner in which Wendla
dies is very problematic. Of the two deaths in this work, Wendla’s and Moritz’, the girl dies
as the result of an infected uterus after a botched abortion, whereas the boy commits suicide.
Where Wendla dies at the hands of a midwife who injures her in the seat of her sexuality,²⁸
Moritz is allowed to die by his own hands as he shoots himself in the head, in the seat of
reason. Although Wedekind represents Moritz as actively controlling his death, he robs
Wendla of this agency. While it can be argued that bourgeois morality is to blame for

²⁸While it is a female and not a male who actually performs this surgery, it must be kept
in mind that throughout Wedekind’s works it is women who often carry out the work of
the man. Like the older girls in Mine-Haha or the madame in Das Sonnenspektrum, the
final authority to whom these women answer is still masculine.
Wendla’s death, Melchior, the other perpetrator in this crime, is left almost completely unscathed. The double standard at play here becomes even clearer, when one realizes that although imprisoned briefly, Melchior is allowed to live and in the end to even regain his independence. Indeed, as the closing scene reveals, he is not only free, but brought under the tutelage the Masked Man.

Although it has already been noted that Ilse, as the symbol of amoral eroticism, exemplifies the Life Force missing in society, through Melchior’s encounter with the Masked Man, we are now given to understand that this figure too represents the Life Force. There are, however, sharp contrasts between Ilse and her male counterpart that stress yet again disjunctions in how Wedekind handles the sexes. Ilse comes from the lower castes of society where poverty is so great it is often expected that daughters will prostitute themselves in order to bear some of the family’s financial burden (Evans 122). Despite her supposedly carefree life of modeling and lovemaking, this child has not experienced a life of luxury. Instead, as she stands there in her colorful tatters, she tells of beatings, threats on her life, arrests, and homelessness. Her reminiscings are not for the life she now lives, but for the more innocent, playful days of childhood. Although she is exemplified as

---

79 And here the impetus for placing him in the reform school is in fact not his rape of Wendla but rather the injury to social decency his frank essay on sexuality caused.

80 In the final scene when Moritz is complaining about not having had the same chance at life that Melchior now receives, the Masked Mann reminds him of his encounter with Ilse. “Erinnern Sie sich meiner denn nicht? Sie standen doch wahrlich auch im letzten Augenblick noch zwischen Tod und Leben” (Stücke 69).

81 While Rose is correct in noting that Ilse gives herself fully to the sexual drives that frustrate the other children (163), she misses the bittersweet tone of this scene when she comments that Ilse has no desire to lead a different life.
possessing the energy and will to live, her trade, as Boa notes, is dangerous and short-lived (Circus 46). This is even reflected in her comment that she will be lying on the garbage heap (Kebricht) before long.

Juxtaposed to the female Life Force which is portrayed in Ilse as ragged and destined for the dump, is the Masked Man—a finely dressed gentleman obviously from the bourgeois class. He too offers life, but his is different. In contrast to the natural world the children represent, he represents what Hahn calls “das reale Leben . . . das bürgerliche Leben” (“Introduction” 16). Where Ilse sees only the positive as she tries to paint a rosy picture of life, the Masked Man warns against the harsher aspects of life and points to corruption and intrigue. Unlike Ilse’s Life Force which comes through the body and requires a certain level of physical contact if not emotional intimacy, the Masked Man’s emanates from a cold, calculating mind that not only grasps the brutalities of life but then reaches out and dictatorially takes control of them. Where Ilse, as a child, represents an honest openness and perhaps a certain degree of naïveté, the adult figure projects a cynicism and what Boa calls “a mocking game of concealment and survival” (Circus 31). That his way is the more powerful can readily be seen in the two lives at stake. Where Ilse is unable to coax Moritz back from death through the allure of her youthful zeal, the Masked Man is able to guide Melchior out of the graveyard and back into life through his reasoning alone.

In a work where Wedekind professes depicting the natural innocence of childhood as opposed to the warped lifestyle of the adult world, we ironically find Wedekind espousing exactly that which he initially rejected as he now presents the Masked Man as the only true chance for survival in the modern world. Just as his concept of sexuality has a Janus-face
where the homosexual experience between the two boys, Ernst and Häschen, is condoned as mutual exploration, but the sado-masochistic act initiated by Wendla is not, so too does his form of eros as a Life Force now take on the same contradiction. Through her sexuality, woman shows the means to a more natural way of living, but it is through male rationality that this life must be grasped and controlled.

Mine-Haha: An Internat for Prostitutes

With the female figures and heterosexual intercourse problematized in Frühlingserwachen, it behooves us to take a closer look at the kind of sexual education Wedekind portrays in Mine-Haha. As previously mentioned, the focus in Mine-Haha is no longer on both sexes as was Frühlingserwachen, but has already limited itself to the female sex as exemplified by this work’s subtitle Über die körperliche Erziehung der jungen Mädchen. Furthermore, as this subtitle makes clear, the sexual “education” these young girls receive is not instruction in the form of intellectual development, but rather a training of the female body to become agile, lithe, and flexible. The young girls in this work, the protagonist tells us, are taught to think not with their heads but with their hips. “Wir [lehrten] gewissermaßen mit den Hüften [zu] denken . . .” (Stücke 142). While the story begins with boys and girls alike receiving the same training, Wedekind makes clear early on that the boys are not as comfortable with their bodies as the young girls and that they perform much more awkwardly. That we are told at the end of the fragment that neither sex can read and we can therefore conclude that neither received a formal training, does not allow us to assume both sexes received the same or similar treatment. Indeed, that Hidalla later refers to one of the
boys as her “Beschützer” actually suggests that they were trained differently with the boys
taking on the role of protector and the girls the protected.

While the girls are being trained to become increasingly more familiar with their own
bodies, the exploration of each others bodies, shown as so natural in Frühlings Erwachen,
is no longer allowed. Indeed, since the greatest transgression in Mine-Haha is to enter
another girl’s bed, this prohibition reveals, as Elizabeth Boa recognizes, “the secret locus
of desire as adult, male and heterosexual” (Circus 193-94). While Wedekind professes to
place these young girls in a setting “uncontaminated” by society’s norms, the girls are in
actuality prisoners. They do not know where they are, since they arrive boarded up in coffin-
like boxes. They cannot leave the grounds because the property is surrounded by a high wall
and a locked gate. In fact, early on we learn that there are two monstrously ugly old-maid
servants who transgressed against the rules of sexual conduct in their own childhood and as
punishment are now confined to the park for the rest of their days.

The image that Moritz portrayed of a world where children could run and play freely
in their natural nakedness is in Mine-Haha replaced instead with a boot camp or boarding-
school of sorts. 82 While the adolescents in Mine-Haha are being trained to become sensual,
and thus the implication is to become sexually receptive, they are in fact kept in isolation

82 Dismissing or simply overlooking the ignorance in which the girls are kept and the
obvious exploitation that takes place later in this work, Glaser does not see this training
as a “Training für die Orgie,” but rather offers an interpretation that suggests Moritz’
earlier solution. “Die endlose Tanzerei, zu der sie [die Mädchen] von strengen
Erzieherinnen angehalten werden, hat Triebenergien bloß in ein Körperritual fließen
lassen, statt sie in Verstandesarbeit zu sublimieren. Solch raffinierte Sublimation mit
dem Körper rückt die freisinnige Mädchenerziehung in die Nähe der asexuellen
Freikörperkultur” (173).
from the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{83} Despite the lack of society's fraudulent morality, they are still governed by rules and regulations and, just as in \textit{Frühlings Erwachen}, kept in ignorance relative to their budding sexuality. At each level of sexual development, they enter another stage of training, but this training remains as obscure to the girls as the changes in their own bodies. Hence, the emphasis of this work is to show how one can keep the female mind innocent (or more accurately, ignorant) while honing the female body to perfection. The implication here being that the ignorant woman cannot become the demanding or commanding woman that we have already seen emerging with Wendla in \textit{Frühlings Erwachen}.

Although the girls are trained to have lithe, flexible bodies, the discipline they undergo is also a means of curbing and controlling their sexuality. That, unbeknownst to them, they are to become a marketable commodity is made clear in the scene at the music studio. Here, in a fashion similar to the way one shows horses, the girls perform for two well-dressed women.\textsuperscript{84} They are made to strip, commanded to parade around in this naked state, and then ordered to dance and play their instruments again completely nude. They are then told to line up as they are examined from head to toe. Once the women make their selection, the chosen girls are taken away--still unclothed. Their whereabouts and what

\textsuperscript{83}That we know nothing of the parents of these children suggests they are illegitimate and thus fits easily with Diethe's contention that these children might be the progeny of brothels such as the one described in \textit{Das Sonnenspektrum} (80).

\textsuperscript{84}That these two women were in all likelihood former inhabitants of this park themselves is suggested not only in their clothing which is of the same white color as the girls' dresses, but that the girls are always introduced to each new stage of training by older girls.
happens to them is left a mystery. The remaining girls are then told to dress and to go about their business as if nothing has happened.

The production of the pantomime portrayed within this work is further evidence of the ignorance in which these girls are kept. In their own pubescent naïveté they do not understand the sexual overtones of the play in which they participate, nor the fact that they are performing for a voyeuristic male audience that comes not just to watch the performance, but also to assess their young female bodies. These girls are doubly exploited in that through this display they also earn the money which supports the very institution that uses them. Although Wedekind professed to promoting a liberated sexuality, it becomes very questionable whether the training of these young girls is for the promulgation of their own sexual pleasure or rather for the later pleasing of men. Indeed, once the girls reach puberty and a certain degree of sexual awareness, they are removed from the confines of the school and sent elsewhere. While this “elsewhere” is never directly specified, their whole course of training alludes to yet another arena of exploitation.  

Das Sonnenspektrum: From Boarding-School to Bordello

Although female sexuality is no longer “under training” as in the previous work, it is still kept under control by being confined to a limited space within society. While the setting appears idyllic and female sexuality is apparently allowed free expression, there is, nevertheless, a warning against its tendency to run amok. Although from his diaries we know

85 That we later see the prostitutes of Tod und Teufel looking just like these girls—all dressed in white and all looking like copies of one another—seems indeed to suggest that a bordello is where these girls will end up.
that Wedekind was well aware of the occupational hazards of prostitution, a delineation of these dangers is hardly his reason in this work for depicting a nameless young prostitute dying of venereal disease. Instead, Wedekind points to excess as the pathological agent when he has the Madame explain: “Sie war immer die erste . . . und die letzte. Das ist nun ihr Dank dafür” (PDV 2:96). While the Madame sympathizes with the young girl’s condition, she nevertheless attributes it to her ravenous need for sex which, in fact, is confirmed by the doctor’s question: “Sie hat ja natürlich auch des Guten ein wenig zu viel getan?” (PDV 2:95). The insinuation here is that this inordinate need is itself the disease which weakens and destroys. As if taken directly from the theories of the sexologist Richard von Krafft-Ebing, with whose research Wedekind was very familiar, the condition of this young prostitute seems to echo several of the case studies on nymphomania that Krafft-Ebing describes in his work Psychopathia Sexualis. Indeed, as Wedekind’s biographer Kutscher points out, there is even direct reference to Krafft-Ebing in Das Sonnenspektrum. “Einen Hinweis auf die Quellen seiner Wissenschaft finden wir in der achten Szene des Sonnenspektrums, wo Mantegazza, Charcot und Krafft-Ebing erwähnt werden” (W 108). Wedekind’s warning against excess goes beyond the bodily harm the prostitute does to herself, however. Above and beyond what can happen to the female is the threat her insatiable needs poses to the male. In a scene similar to the one in Frühlings Erwachen.

86 As with Wendla before her, her fatal injuries have also happened in and through her uterus.

87 A specialist in nervous disorders and professor in Vienna, Krafft-Ebing was best known for his studies of sexual deviations. He became world famous for his seminal work Psychopathia Sexualis which first appeared in 1886. By 1902 it was in its twelfth edition.
where Wendla's demands cause Melchior to lose his wits, here Wedekind again portrays a situation where female sexuality overpowers male reasoning as he describes Adalbert losing his compulsion to avoid Schneewittchen. "Da wiegst sie sich und wartet, ob ich mich umsehe. Ich hatte ein Ziel vor mir, ich weiß nicht, was daraus geworden. Ich hatte einen Rückfall, ich spüre ihn nicht mehr. Ich hatte Achtung vor mir, ich spüre sie nicht mehr. Mir ist gleich, was aus mir wird. Ich seh' keinen Stern mehr. Dein Wille und nicht der meinige" (PDV 2:101). But it is more than woman gaining control, or worse yet, man abdicating his control, it is the fact that the men, as clients, start to lose their individuality. We see this not only in the scene where Schneewittchen complains that one of the patrons wants her to love him, but also in the conversation between Peter and Minehaha when she has trouble remembering what a particular client looked like.

Peter: Hast du es so schlecht gehabt, seit ich nicht mehr bei dir gewesen?
Peter: Ich war am Freitag gekommen.
Minehaha: Richtig, es war die Nacht von Sonntag auf Montag, da schlief der Graf Schulze bei mir.
Peter: Hat er einen blonden Schnurrbart?
Minehaha: Ich kenne ihn nicht so genau.

Here, despite having slept with this man, when asked if he has a mustache, she can't remember and says simply that she doesn't know him very well.

Although Wedekind touches on the brutal realities of how many of these young women came to be prostitutes, each telling of an initial rape—one is chloroformed, another
is lured to a stranger’s room—he undermines their traumas by then having the girls sing the following song which describes rape as an initiation into pleasure.

Ich war ein Kind von vierzehn Jahren,  
Ein reines, unschuldvolles Kind,  
Als ich zum erstenmal erfahren,  
Wie süß der Liebe Freuden sind.

Er nahm mich um den Leib und lachte  
Und flüsterte: Es tut nicht weh --  
Und dabei schob er sachte, sachte  
Mein Unterröckchen in die Höh’.

Seit jenem Tag lieb ich sie alle,  
Des Lebens schönster Lenz ist mein,  
Und wenn ich keinem mehr gefalle,  
Dann will ich gern begraben sein. (PDV, 2:119)

More disturbing than the fact that Wedekind places the words to this song in the mouths of these women, however, is the conclusion of the song, wherein the woman wishes for death once she is no longer suited for bringing pleasure to men. This conclusion implies that without sexual appeal, the sexually active woman has no viable function in society and therefore has no need for continued existence within society.  

Woman as Death and Devil

We see this same theme of physical violence as a means for awakening (and simultaneously controlling) female sexuality picked up again in Tod und Teufel, where Elfriede feels no sensual cravings until Casti Piani attacks her physically. Although there is

---

88 What Diethe finds particularly disturbing here is the strong tone of menace in this song—the age of the girl, the man’s assurance that sex does not hurt, and even the woman’s forthright acceptance of death once her beauty fades—that is beaten back by the pervading tone of joy. She notes that words such as süß, lachte, and schönster Lenz all give support to the idea that the girl in the song enjoyed being seduced (72).
no sexual coercion involved in this attack, there is nevertheless suggestion of it in Elfriede’s use of the word *Vergewaltigung*. “Es ist das erstmal in meinem Leben, daß ich eine derartige Vergewaltigung erfahre!” (Werke 2:674).Echoing back to the bliss Wendla felt after being raped and even the joy the girls of *Das Sonnenspektrum* sing of, this brutal act gives Elfriede a new outlook on life. She now understands Casti Piani’s perspective on sexuality, she admires him, and she professes love for him. But even in her declaration of love, Wedekind portrays her as deviant. Hers is not the invigorating desire for pleasure we have seen with the previous prostitutes, but rather the subservient form of pandering Wedekind found so repulsive in bourgeois marriages. Elfriede also lacks the necessary Schamgefühl, as Casti Piani tells her, and more importantly, the instinct of a Tigerin—a creature he describes as follows: “Das Weib verführt, wen es will. Das Weib verführt wann es will. Es wartet nicht auf Liebe” (Werke 2:678). Despite his impotence, Casti Piani still yearns for the kind of woman who will challenge him, the woman he must fight to control.

It is obvious in Wedekind’s works that he advocates some sort of sexual freedom and uses his works as a forum to criticize certain repressive aspects of Wilhelmine culture. Even so, he, like Weininger and Krafft-Ebing too,39 is very much caught up in and even advances

39While Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis* did much to advance the study of sexual disorders, his own biases are clearly presented when, in agreement with the dominant perspective which saw women as lacking sexual desire, he states: “[w]oman, . . . if physically and mentally normal, and properly educated, has but little sensual desire. If it were otherwise, marriage and family life would be empty words”(8). A few lines later he goes so far as to vigorously endorse the double morality of his times. “The unfaithfulness of the wife, as compared with that of the husband, is morally of much wider bearing, and should always meet with severer punishment at the hands of the law. The unfaithful wife not only dishonors herself, but also her husband and her family, not to speak of the possible uncertainty of paternity”(9).
the misogynist discourses of his times as he continues to define woman relative to her biological functions and her servitude to man. While he only implies this servitude in Mine- Haha, it is in Sonnenspektrum that Wedekind now explicitly has the Madame tell Elise: “[M]erke dir, es gibt eben nur einen Weg in dieser Welt, um wirklich glücklich zu sein, das ist, daß man alles tut, was man kann, um andere so glücklich wie möglich zu machen” (Stücke 375). But these young women have not chosen this career because of an overwhelming desire to please men. As Wedekind has already begun suggesting, at least some have opted to become prostitutes to satisfy an overwhelming sexual need within themselves.⁹⁰ That this craving is so great it cannot be stilled, however, is only made clear in Tod und Teufel where Wedekind now reveals the more depraved, corrupt aspects of female sexuality. As a sign of utter degeneration, the “Freudemädchen” in this work now prostitutes herself not for the sake of sexual pleasure but rather because of her inability to attain pleasure. In the prostitute Lisiska, female sexuality has become a ravenous monster. No longer able to satisfy her own needs, Lisiska is driven to increasingly deviant acts as she searches for sexual fulfillment. Not only can she no longer experience pleasure, more importantly and more where Wedekind’s emphasis lies, she can no longer give pleasure. In an effort to still her own sexual torment, she now forces her customers into undesired acts

---

⁹⁰Although Wedekind was aware that many women prostituted themselves out of financial necessity, in his literary works he generally privileged erotic desires over the financial need. Even in his own life, as his diaries divulge, he viewed the plight of prostitutes with an almost scientific distance: listing, on the one hand, their miseries and their sufferings, but on the other, exploiting these women himself.
of brutality, thereby robbing them of any chance to enjoy sex. This is best exemplified in the following exchange between Lisiska and her client.


*Herr König:* Ich bin auf solche Worte nicht gefaßt... Ist das ein heittrer Willkomm für den Gast? -- Du sprichst als büßtest du im Fegefeuer Schon hier die Strafen für genößne Lust.

*Lisiska:* Sie fragen, Ob ich noch Erröten kann? So schlagen Sie mich doch, Dann ist's getan!


---

91 Here too Wedekind seems to echo case studies out of Psychopathia Sexualis. Under the category of Cerebral Neuroses Krafft-Ebing lists the subcategory Hyperaesthesia as a cerebral anomaly which falls within the domain of psychopathology. Defined as an abnormal increase in sexual desire, this anomaly is accompanied by signs of “frequent and violent impulses for sexual gratification... in which irresistible hypersensuality leads to the gravest and indisputably pathological sexual aberrations...[and is] encountered in that category of human beings whom we class among the degenerates infected with hereditary taint” (46-47).
As this conversation reveals, the brothel is no longer a *Freudenhaus*, but rather, in Lisiska’s words, “[das] Gegenteil!” The vitality and pleasure that unhindered sexual expression was supposed to bring about has not come to fruition, as Lisiska makes clear. “Die Lust, das Ungeheuer, / Tobt ewig ungezähmt in dieser Brust! / Meinen Sie, . . . [ich] [w]äre je in dies Haus geraten / Wenn . . . / Freude mich könnte befrein?” (*Werke* 2:684).

What we see in this depraved image of the “*Freudenmädchen*” is not just Wedekind’s increasing doubt relative to the regenerative function of eroticism in a commercial world, but more importantly, Wedekind’s own masculine anxiety relative to unfettered female sexuality. As will become clear, the growing threat of autonomous (as well as sexually active) women coupled with the increasing inability of the male to control these women produces this image of female decadence.\(^92\) Once the prostitute’s sexual needs reach pathological dimensions, she is compelled to command male sexuality in an effort to satisfy her own cravings. By trying to maneuver and manipulate the male, however, she threatens a bourgeois patriarchy which Boa notes “asserted the right of men to demand of women that they answer to a multiplicity of . . . male desires” (emphasis mine) (“Murder” 95). Once she shifts her sexual attentions to herself and demands that the male please *her*, Wedekind and society at large likens her to an infection that has reached epidemic proportions. No longer just the potential carrier of social disease, the prostitute (i.e., the autonomous, sexually-active woman) has now become *the* social disease.

---

\(^92\)Rose notes that Wedekind repeatedly documented the danger uncontrolled sexuality posed to male dominance, and thereby the social rationale for socially stringent rules governing sexuality (156-57).
CHAPTER 3
IMAGES OF WEAKENED MASCULINITY

In the previous chapter we investigated Wedekind’s images of eroticism as they first evolved and then devolved in the figure of the Freudenmädchen. Although Wedekind did not focus exclusively on the female gender when critiquing a social morality which hindered and deformed the natural expression of human sexuality, he did limited himself to the female body when he exemplified the life-enhancing aspects of sexuality. However, while he depicted this body as the pathway through which man could reconnect to his own physical and instinctual nature, he also depicted it as the pitfall that could lead to man’s subsequent ruin. For Wedekind, as we will see, sexual urges had to be finely balanced and female sexuality, in particular, had to be watched and controlled so that male sexuality would not be adversely affected. If women lacked sensuality, as seen with Elfriede von Malchus, the male gender became irrelevant. If women were hypersexual, as seen with Lisiska, men became one in a faceless series of sex partners. In both cases, the harm done the men was not merely a loss of individuality, but more important, a loss of meaningful masculinity. In portraying the interactions between men and women, Wedekind not only defined which types of women he perceived as dangerous to men, but consequently which types of men were most at risk. Where the previous chapter delineated what Wedekind understood to be healthy and
understood to be healthy and unhealthy sexuality in women, this chapter will analyze similar images relative to male sexuality. As we look first at a positive and a negative representation of masculinity in the two main male characters of Frühlings Erwachen and then turn to the interaction between the sexes in the Lulu-plays, a blueprint or road map for manhood will emerge that will help us better understand what Wedekind envisioned as healthy and unhealthy masculinity.

The Femme-Male and the Macho-Male in Frühlings Erwachen

While in the works investigated so far, we have seen how Wedekind relegates his female characters solely to the biological if they are to be perceived as healthy, the same does not hold true for his male characters. In addition to a robust sexuality, Wedekind’s virile male characters portray intellectual and physical drive, determination, and strength. This is best exemplified in the way Wedekind juxtaposes the figures of Melchior and Moritz. As we saw in Chapter Two, in response to questions concerning the changes occurring in their adolescent bodies, Melchior initiates his own sexual education by studying anatomy books. His friend Moritz, on the other hand, wallows in anxieties and fears barely able to discuss this phenomenon let alone research it. We have also seen the more practical side of Melchior as he counters Moritz’ romantic fantasies with pragmatic questions. But there are many more contrasts between the two that allow one to see the concept of manhood Wedekind held up for admiration and the type he did not. Moritz is physically weaker, he is the poorer student (in fact, the worst of his class), he cannot handle the pressures society demands of its male members, and as a consequence, is often given to crying spells. Rather
than being athletic and outgoing, he spends his time with unusual musings. Several times throughout the work, he talks of fancying himself the headless queen of his grandmother’s fairy tales. While the queen-image not only correlates Moritz to the feminine, and Melchior even tells him “[d]u bist wie ein Mädchen” (Dramen 1:104), the fact that this is a headless queen also relegates him yet further outside the masculine realm by indicating a lack of rationality. Indeed, as we see throughout this work, headlessness becomes a leitmotif that is continually correlated with Moritz. On the sexual level, his lack of masculinity is first stressed when he imagines that sex would be so much sweeter if one could assume the supine feminine position and again later when the girls refuse the candy he offers them, because it has become soft and warm while lying in his pocket. While in this particular episode the softness suggests the flaccidness of a penis, his lack of firmness and fortitude is also emphasized at the end of the play psychologically when we learn Moritz cannot live up to society’s expectations and thus takes his own life. Ironically, although he actively brings about his own death, the fact that he shoots himself in the head, in that part of the body which was the most useless to him, assigns him once again outside the intellectual, logical domain.

In contrast to Moritz, we learn from the professors that Melchior is one of the best students and could even be Primus if he so chose. He is physically strong, as attested to by the girls who admire his swimming abilities and refer to him as a young Alexander. Whereas the girls describe Moritz as a Schlafmütze, Melchior is described as having “einen
wundervollen Kopf” and “eine schöne Stirne” (Dramen 1:108).93 When Wendla gets lost in the woods, it is Melchior, in the role of a true Pfadfinder, who is able to lead her back to town. It is not just that he knows his way back, but indeed that he will forge his own path as he tells her: “wir schlagen den Weg durch die Runse ein” (Dramen 1:112). Where Moritz worries about whether he will be promoted to the next level, Melchior’s thoughts are occupied with existential issues, as the discussion about Wendla’s motivations for helping the poor reveals. When he is incarcerated, we do not see him succumbing to institutional pressures, but indeed, fighting against them as he plans and then makes his escape from the school for wayward boys.94 In stark contrast to the “sweetness” of Moritz, in Melchior one notices the tendency toward a rational coldness, as his reaction to the Gretchen story in Faust reveals. “Das Kunstwerk gipfelt doch schließlich nicht in dieser Schändlichkeit! -- Faust könnte dem Mädchen die Heirat versprochen, könnte es daraufhin verlassen haben, er wäre in meinen Augen um kein Haar weniger strafbar. Gretchen könnte ja meinenthalben an gebrochenem Herzen sterben” (Dramen 1:119-120). Beyond this lack of compassion and empathy, his character is also defined by a potential for brutality which is first portrayed in his dream of beating the family dog and then later reinforced in the forest encounter with

93That he has a “good head on his shoulders” is a physical as well as intellectual accolade.

94The determination and motivation seen here in Melchior will be picked up again later in the Hugenberg character of Die Büchse der Pandora. That Wedekind upheld Melchior’s type of character as his concept of a “real man” is not only emphasized through the link he makes between the two youths, where he has Hugenberg also breaking out of a home for wayward boys, but also in Alwa’s description of Hugenberg as the hero-type missing from the modern world. “Der Junge hat das, was unserem Zeitalter fehlt. Er ist eine Heldenmatur… Er wäre so einer, der mir in meinem ‘Weltbeherrschers’ Modell stehen könnte”(Werke 1:335).
Wendla when Melchior tells her: “Ich will nichts, was ich mir nicht habe erkämpfen müssen!” (Dramen 1:120). With this clinical egocentrism, that echoes the Nietzschan superman, Wedekind begins forging the link between Melchior and the Masked Man he will later encounter. That he will become one of those lonely Übermenschen of which Nietzsche speaks, and live the each-for-himself type of life the Masked Man exemplifies, becomes clear in the subsequent rape scene. Despite the clear violation and violence of this act, Melchior feels compelled to make sure Wendla does not mistake this event for a romantic liaison. “O glaub mir, es gibt keine Liebe! -- Alles Eigennutz, alles Egoismus!” (Dramen 1:128). Here, as Strich notes, eros has nothing to do with love. Despite the fact that eros is portrayed in this scene as a selfish, self-motivating deed initiated only for self-gratification, Strich understands Wedekind’s egocentric focus as the only pathway through which man learns to regain the individual rights society wished to repress and remove from him. “Wie Nietzsche so vertritt Wedekind entgegen seiner Zeit und ihrer sozialen Forderung das Recht auf sich selbst; und er schöpft dieses Recht aus dem Geist des schaffenden Eros selbst. Denn diese ist sein eigentümlichste und eigentümlichstes Erlebnis: daß der Eros nicht gleich der Liebe ist und gar nichts mit Altruismus zu tun hat” (Strich 185).

In contrast to the masochistic, self-effacing image of masculinity Wedekind presents in Moritz, in Melchior we see a strong, even sadistic, version of manliness. Despite the preponderance of these characteristics, however, Melchior has yet to grow fully into his manhood. Although he understands the concepts of puberty and sexual intercourse on an intellectual level, he is not prepared for the intensity of the physical response nor the accompanying loss of reason his first sexual encounter with Wendla evokes. Unable to act,
he reacts—first with aggression, then with tears, and then finally by fleeing the source of his confusion. Although Wedekind depicts Melchior as initially unable to control his own sexual responses let alone those of Wendla, with this fight-or-flight reaction Wedekind nevertheless shows how the primal impulse for sex becomes the stimulus that triggers other inherent drives—in this case, the instinct for survival. By the second encounter with Wendla, we see a maturing in Melchior as he attempts to restrain not only himself but Wendla as well. Of greater importance than the growing mastery of his own sexuality, however, is his determination to master female sexuality. While he is still unable to make Wendla follow his verbal commands, his subsequent rape of her allows him to exert himself as a man of action and one whose words are not to be taken lightly. In sharp contrast to the first confrontation, in this scene Melchior no longer runs away from the sexual threat of Wendla. Instead, as he now confronts and conquers it, we see a resolve emerging in Melchior to dominate the natural impulses—in himself and in her.

The images of masculinity Wedekind delineates in the figures of Moritz and Melchior are not simply his own envisioned concepts of manhood, but rather the extreme views of masculinity abounding in the discourses of the day. Moritz is the epitome of the lost soul, of man at the turn-of-the-century, as Wendla’s description elucidates. “[E]r glaube an nichts — nicht an Gott, nicht an ein Jenseits — an gar nichts mehr in dieser Welt” (Dramen, 1:108). Juxtaposed to this “non-man” is Melchior—a vital, energetic youth who thinks for himself and only of himself. Unlike Moritz, whom Höger notes was dependent on his parents, school, and his friends, Melchior needs no one. “Melchior ist, existiert als Mensch, ist nicht abhängig von anderen” (Höger 27). While Melchior may share Moritz’ lack of
belief in a stable, ethical world, he distinguishes himself from his friend in that he still maintains a strong belief in himself and thus epitomizes the will to live—both characteristics which Wedekind suggests will be reinforced and refined later under the tutelage of the Masked Man.

**Sexual Deviance in Wedekind’s Lulu-Plays**

While in *Frühlings Erwachen* one still sees Wedekind delineating a positive form of masculinity as well as its negative counterpart, nowhere does one see more strongly than in his Lulu-plays how Wedekind reacts against the contemporary times and the weak men it produced. Intended, according to Wedekind, to expose the hypocrisies of modern society, the Lulu-dramas play with bourgeois concepts of femininity and masculinity. In portraying his female protagonist as “ein Sinnbild ungebändigter Natur” (Hilmes 155) and simultaneously as “a dream woman . . . who will be whatever men want her to be” (Boa, *Circus* 55), Wedekind pits Lulu’s instinctual nature against the fraudulent moralities of the modern world. In the conflicts that arise between her sexuality and the repressive social norms, Wedekind reveals and simultaneously undermines images of woman that real women were expected to emulate. Concurrently, through satirical caricatures of the various images of masculinity the bourgeois also inscribed onto late nineteenth-century men, Wedekind likewise exposes the frailties of these projections as well as the men trying to live up to them.95

95 Although Bovenschen correctly notes that Wedekind assimilates various myths of womanhood into his Lulu dramas, she overlooks the fact that he does the very same thing with myths of masculinity.
In order to emphasize that his main character is to be understood more as a force of nature than as a mere human being, Wedekind stresses the mysterious, suprahuman qualities of Lulu by giving her as little history as possible. Other than her name, which we are told "klingt . . . ganz vorsüdfaltich" (Monstre 36), we know nothing significant of her background.96 For all intents and purposes, Lulu’s life begins when she first meets Dr. Schön. As Wilhelm Emrich recapitulates: “Lulu wurde in ihrem zwölften Lebensjahr von Dr. Schön, dem Chefredakteur einer Zeitung, nachts zwischen zwölf und zwei Uhr vor einem Carehaus auf der Straße aufgegriffen, als sie ihm seine Taschenuhr stehlen wollte. Statt sie der Polizei zu übergeben, sorgte er für ihre Ausbildung und nahm sie in seinem Haus auf” (211-12). Other than some very brief descriptions of her schooling in a couple of later versions, Wedekind gives us no further information on Lulu’s life with Schön until he marries her off to one “respectable” member of society after another. By portraying Lulu forced into unsuitable marriages, Wedekind submits his critique on this institution and society in general as he deconstructs the various masks worn by the “pillars of the community” as well as the masks they superimpose upon women.

i. Images of Bourgeois Femininity and Weakened Masculinity in “Erdgeist”

In the first Lulu-play entitled Erdgeist,97 the deconstruction begins with Lulu’s first husband, the wealthy but aging Medizinalrat Goll. Here, in her role as a child-bride, Lulu

---

96While the original manuscript does suggest Schigolch as Lulu’s father, Wedekind drops this detail in the later versions of Erdgeist, thus adding even more mystery to her.

97Erdgeist, on stage for the first time in 1895, is the first version of the original work that censors allowed to be performed.
represents the image of woman naïve and innocent enough to be molded into whatever her husband desires. Unlike adult women who had carnal knowledge and dared make their own demands upon men, the appeal of this type of woman, as Dijkstra notes, is that she is “an unthreatening creature conjoining compliance and amorous abandonment. . . . suggest[ing] to the nineteenth-century male not only innocence but also the absence of any resistance to the particulars of masculine desire” (190-92). 98 Indeed, as Dijkstra continues, “[t]he very purity of the child seemed to preclude the threat of a sexual challenge” (185). It is precisely this image of the child which Wedekind portrays and which is further exemplified in the relationship between Lulu and Goll’s housekeeper who not only dresses and undresses Lulu each day, as a mother would a child, but also bathes her, watches over her, and reprimands her in parental-like fashion.

The contradiction to this image of adolescent innocence, however, is that no matter how childlike and closer to nature this type of woman was envisioned, she had instinctual drives that had to be controlled and guided by the male. 99 With Goll portrayed as too old to actually consummate sex anymore, the most he can do is enjoy his young bride in a voyeuristic manner. Recognizing, however, that his wife requires more than mere visual

98 This is reiterated by Goll himself when he tells Schöning, “ich liebe, wissen Sie, das Unfertige--das Hülflose--dem ein väterlicher Freund noch nicht entbehrllich geworden . . . Es weiß Einen wenigstens nicht zu controllieren” (Monstre 11)

99 According to the criminal psychologist Lombroso, like the child, woman did not have the reasoning ability to tell right from wrong and therefore had the same propensity for lies as did the child (Female Offender 182). P.J. Proudhon, the French sociologist and journalist, too stressed woman’s “greater penchant for lewdness.” Because nature had given her “a weaker ego,” he maintains, “liberty and intelligence . . . struggle less fiercely in her against the animalistic tendencies” (qtd. in Dijkstra 211).
appreciation, Goll must keep constant watch over Lulu to protect his own interests. Although Goll’s pleasures stem from his ability to manipulate Lulu’s sexuality, his insecurities paradoxically also arise from his awareness of this sexuality. In as much as Lulu is a prisoner of his gaze as well as his control, so too does he become a prisoner of this very same gaze when his doubts and fears force him to keep up what Breitenberg calls a “specular vigilance” (148) over his bride. Trapped by his own insecurities and distrusts of Lulu’s inherent nature, his desire to possess leads to a state of himself being possessed. As Erich Emrich observes, “indem er sie derart zu seinem Objekt macht, wird er selbst zu ihrem Objekt. Argwöhnisch muß er sie bewachen. Aber der Bewachende ist an die Bewachte gebunden. Der Herrschende wird zum Opfer der Beherrschte. Seinen Besitz kann er in Wahrheit niemals besitzen” (213).

In playing with the image of an innocent woman-child, Wedekind not only exposes the patriarchal attitude that wants woman to remain pure while simultaneously pliable to male desires, he exposes the frailties of those men, who, once awakening the baser qualities in women cannot control them. In this 1895 version of Erdgeist, Goll’s downfall comes, not through any willful manipulations on the part of Lulu, but rather because he is a prisoner of his own self-doubts and inability to reign over them. Indeed, this becomes abundantly clear when Schön arrives at the atelier of the painter Schwarz, where Goll is having Lulu’s portrait painted, and invites Goll to spend the afternoon at the theater. Nervous at the thought of leaving Lulu unsupervised, Goll is equally concerned he not give this impression to the other men for fear they would believe him too weak to control the fidelity of his wife. Goll’s death by heart-attack, although accidental, is triggered upon his return from the theater when his worst fears are realized and he catches Lulu in a compromising position with the painter.
Although in this particular version of the play, Wedekind portrays Lulu as the innocent victim of Schwarz’ advances, the mere fact that she succumbs to another man serves to emasculate Goll emotionally thus triggering his death. Despite her infidelity, Lulu is not completely to blame for Goll’s demise. As the representative of society, it was expected Goll would have been able to impose his norms onto the forces of nature within Lulu. That he was incapable of this bespeaks not only his own downfall, but equally that of a society which was becoming increasingly decadent and ineffectual.

In Lulu’s marriage to Goll, Wedekind portrays the epitome of female objectification. With the suggestion that Goll, in his old age, is physically impotent and therefore unable to perform the sex act, Goll instead obtains his pleasures by making Lulu the object of his voyeuristic gaze. Dressing her in various costumes and demanding that she perform before him, Goll obtains his pleasure as much from making her his puppet as he does in being the puppet master. That he is the master and she consequently the masterwork (or the master’s work) is further stressed when Goll dresses her up as a Pierrot-figure and has her portrait painted. Here, as she poses for the portrait Goll has himself envisioned, the physical Lulu, and not just her image, is presented as an object of art to be viewed for pleasure. This is exemplified when Goll asks Schöning to view her from various angles as she poses for her

100 While Lulu’s role as Pierrot is not within the scope of this study, Emrich does note that it is precisely this costume which defines her true role in this work. “Pierrot ist seinem Ursprung nach der scheinbar einfältigste, niedrigste, von allen geschlagene Diener, der aber gerade auf Grund seiner ungetrübten Einfalt und Unschuld unausgesetzt seine Herren entlarvt, bloßstellt und überlistet, die Herrschenden beherrschts und an der Nase herumführt” (213-14). For a more indepth analysis of this figure, see Hibberd’s “The Spirit of the Flesh: Wedekind’s Lulu” as well as Naomi Ritter’s “The Portrait of Lulu as Pierrot.”
portrait. "Kommen Sie hierher. Ich finde sie von hier aus noch schöner" (Monstre 13). This emphasis on Lulu as an art object rather than a living being is reiterated further when Schöning suggests Schwarz paint her as if she were a still life. "Behandeln Sie sie als Stillleben" (Monstre 13). Thus through Goll first and then through the society painter, Schwarz, Lulu is changed from a living being to a performative art object, to plasticine art, and then finally to mere two-dimensional portraiture.101

After Goll’s death, Schönh marries Lulu off to her seducer, Schwarz. Ironically, in this second marriage, Lulu is supposed to represent society’s image of the virgin-bride who, as the upholder of society’s virtues, is expected to have no sexual urges of her own. No longer the prized possession of a man’s erotic desires, Lulu is now simply one of many objects Schwarz accumulates to reflect his success as a society portraitist. His appreciation of her is no greater or lesser than his appreciation of the other opulent, aesthetic objects found in his bourgeois home. Whereas in her marriage to Goll, Wedekind placed special emphasis on the various costumes Lulu was made to wear as well as the songs and dances she had to perform, in this marriage, he now describes in minute detail the luxury of her domestic surroundings. While still a possession, as she had been with Goll, with Schwarz Lulu is not necessarily his most prized possession, but now merely one of the many “things” that reflect the wealth of his upper-middle-class life.

101 In an interesting twist on the Dorian Grey story, it is not the unchanging nature of Lulu’s portrait which serves to exemplify the ravages of time taking place on her physical body, but rather the changing frames and then eventually the framelessness which reflect this. Just as it is first Lulu’s surroundings that decay in order to foreshadow her own impending decay, so too is it that which surrounds her portrait that first falls into disrepair prior to the actual destruction of the canvas.
Unlike Goll, who recognized the potential allure of Lulu's sexuality, her second husband, Schwarz, is totally oblivious to it. His seeming disinterest in sexual relations once they are married supports society's contention that, within marriage, sex was meant for propagation only. Unlike Goll, who at least recognized her talents for the erotic and was himself an erotic creature, Schwarz has no comprehension let alone appreciation of Lulu's qualities, as she bitterly complains to Schön.


While Wedekind portrays Schwarz as lacking the imagination and desire to appreciate his wife's sexual prowess, and in this 1895 version of Erdgeist as even being afraid of women, in the manuscript Wedekind depicts him, in fact, as relegating Lulu's sexuality only to the realm of reproduction as he dictatorially insists she will birth one child after another for him.

"Du magst wollen oder nicht -- du selbst wirst meine Schätze mit jedem Jahr um ein Kleinod bereichern . . ." (Monstre 31). This stance too, however, is in keeping with the concept that sex within the bourgeois marriage was only for purposes of propagation.102

His lack of a strong sexual drive is, however, not his only defect. That Schwarz depends on Lulu for his artistic success as well as to fulfill his concept of the proper

102See, among others, Schopenhauer who notes in his Parerga und Paralipomena that woman's only natural purpose in life was the "Propagation des Geschlechts" (655).
bourgeois lifestyle is yet another deficit. The weakness this dependence brings with it, however, is emphasized much more in this 1895 version of Erdgeist as he says “[i]ch habe nichts mehr, seit ich dich habe. Ich bin mir vollständig abhanden gekommen . . .” (Stücke 109). In the manuscript, while she is vital to his work as well as his social standing, it is not so much Schwarz’ dependence on Lulu which Wedekind stressed as it is his arrogant self-assurance. This conceit is aptly expressed in the scene where Schwarz patronizingly assures Lulu of her importance to him.


In the published version, Lulu functions more as a muse, inspiring the images Schwarz does not believe he could create without her. In the manuscript, however, it is his painting of her that has made him famous, and so Schwarz views this as a reflection of his own artistic skills. While he acknowledges her importance, he egotistically assumes that he has created her, that she cannot exist without him, and that it is only through him that she is able to blossom. Like Goll, he views Lulu as his masterwork. Unlike Goll, however, his crucial mistake is that he underestimates her when he infers she needs him more than he does her.

Despite the fact that she was previously married, in his self-complacency, arrogance, and even immaturity, it never occurs to Schwarz that his wife would not have come to him a virgin. Given his own lack of desire, it is even more inconceivable to him that Lulu would have sexual needs of her own. Schwarz lives so much in his own fantasies of the purity of
womanhood, that Lulu herself sarcastically comments to Schön how little her husband knows her. “Er kennt mich nicht, aber er liebt mich!” (Stücke 116). Her wish that Schwarz see other women is not a concern that he find the kind of satisfaction the typical bourgeois wife was assumed too virtuous to supply, but rather that he himself gain the experience necessary not only to appreciate what he has in her, but more importantly, so that he himself become a more skilled lover.  

103 The extent of Schwarz’ own inexperience is reflected in the manuscript in Lulu’s comment: “Ich glaube—du hast noch nie—geliebt” (Monstre 25) and perhaps furthermore in her comment “Sie sind kein Mann” (Monstre 27) and in the 1895 version of Erdgeist in Schön’s question: “Haben Sie jemals in Ihrem Leben ein Weib geliebt?” (Stücke 91). 105 Indeed, as David Midgley observes, “Schwarz remains the figure who has ‘never really lived,’ who lacks authentic experience and emotional maturity” (208). This is even confirmed by Schwarz as he calls himself “eine alte Jungfer” and then explains “mir fehlt der rechte Muth zum Leben ---- zum Lieben (Monstre 29). That he actually fears sex is expressed in the 1895 version when he says “[i]ch bin dem Glück nicht gewachsen. Ich habe eine höllische Angst davor” (Stücke 106).

---

103 With this suggestion, we see the Freudenmädchen as not just a giver of sex, but an instructor of sex, an aspect Wedekind has already introduced in Das Sonnenspektrum in the figure of Minehaha and will reintroduce in Pandoras Büchse with Lulu herself.

104 Whereas in the manuscript Lulu makes this comment to Schwarz privately, by the 1895 version, her comment “Ein Mahler ist doch auch eigentlich gar kein Mann” (Stücke 96) has a much greater wounding effect in that it is added in unison with Schön’s and Goll’s denigrating comments about Schwarz’ lack of artistic capabilities.

105 In response to his desire to assume the masochistic (i.e., “feminine”) sexual role, Lulu will ask this same question of Prince Escerny and thus provide the link between his own lack of masculinity and Schwarz’ deficiency.
In the hopes of keeping Lulu safely married and satisfied, Schön decides to enlighten Schwarz as to the richness he has in his wife. In his “man-to-man” talk with Schwarz, he insists the painter take Lulu for what she is.

Ich kann dich in deiner Blindheit nicht so weiter leben sehen ... Bei einer Herkunft, wie sie ... hat, kannst du unmöglich mit den Begriffen der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft rechnen ... Das Mädchen verdient eine anständige Frau zu sein ... Ich sage es dir, damit du siehst, daß du es nicht mit moralischer Verworfenheit zu tun hast. Das Mädchen ist im Gegenteil außergewöhnlich gut veranlagt ... Du kannst kein Pflichtgefühl fordern, bevor du nicht deine eigene Aufgabe kennst.¹⁰⁶ (Stücke 119)

But this is exactly what Schwarz is unable to do, since he “still cling[s],” as Rose notes, “to the bourgeois values of love, fidelity, and truth” (176). Like Goll, however, “his moral collapse” (211), as Midgley coins it, is related more to the exposure of his inadequacy to assert authority over his wife than it is to the loss of bourgeois values. Unlike Goll, who recognized both his own and his wife’s sexual drives as vital forces, Schwarz is too cerebral and therefore even more removed from Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral” than was Goll, who merely sought to confine Lulu’s sexuality to himself. Like his predecessor, though, Schwarz’ downfall comes again only indirectly through Lula, when his illusions of her purity are shattered. As Hilmes notes: “[i]n dem Augenblick, in dem ihn Dr. Schön über die wirkliche Lage aufklärt, ... wird [er] damit zum Opfer seiner eigenen enttäuschten Phantasien. Die verhängnisvolle Ent-Täuschung beruht dabei auf einer vorgängigen

¹⁰⁶ Contrary to this stance, in the manuscript Schönung, while still reprimanding Schwarz for his own failings, advises him to shape Lulu into the wife he already imagines her to be. “Wenn sie nicht das ist, was du dir vorgestellt hast, dann mach sie dazu! – Mach dich für deinen Fehler verantwortlich! ... Sie ist dein Eigenthum! – laß sie das fühlen” (Monstre 46, 48). Here, as Midgley points out, Schönung’s argument is constructed in such a way as to reach its climax in an assertion of the proprietorial rights accorded by the marriage contract (211).
Selbsttäuschung, nählich der blinden Fixierung auf das Bild der reinen Frau” (160). Unable to come to terms with her as a sexual creature, let alone one who has been having an affair behind his back, he commits suicide\textsuperscript{107}--an act which Schön sees as a moral flaw in him. Indeed, as Boa notes, the greater cruelty of Schwarz’ death versus Goll’s “indicates a more vicious attack on Schwarz’s sentimental moralism than on Goll’s consciously exploitative hedonism. Lulu’s preference for Goll indicates that she shares her creator’s judgement on this matter, and reflects the general thrust of Wedekind’s attack on morality” (Circus 83).

The greater condemnation of Schwarz’ position as well as his posturing is also emphasized in Schön’s outrage at the suicide as he decries Schwarz as “der Narr” and then continues his tirade with: “[d]as ist der Dank für das, was ich für ihn getan habe! Wirft mir in einer Sekunde mein ganzes Leben in Trümmer! . . . im Ton der heftigsten Empörung Er hatte kein moralisches Gewissen!” (Stücke 125).

While Hibberd is correct in observing that each of these male characters represents a variation of “Geist” (350), he neglects to note that in the figure of Goll Wedekind portrays society’s attempts to repress and control female sexuality and that in Schwarz, Wedekind illustrates the complete disavowal of this sexuality. It is in her third husband, Schön, however, that Wedekind’s sharpest criticism comes across. In this figure Wedekind depicts the hypocrisy of a society that knowingly and readily forces women into either the role of Madonna or prostitute. Although Schön has no qualms about having an affair with Lulu

\textsuperscript{107}In a manner similar to Moritz of Frühlings Erwachen, Wedekind once again gives the male character enough agency to end his own life if not enough courage and determination to live this life. His death too echoes that of Moritz. Where the former shoots himself in his head thereby signaling the uselessness of his mind, Schwarz slits his throat, separating head from body and thus intellectual from corporeal.
during her marriage to Schwarz, once he realizes this intrigue could become public knowledge and threaten his own engagement, he attempts to end it. Thus, in this figure Wedekind criticizes what Rasch calls “[e]ine Gesellschaftsmoral, die sexuelle Aktivität zugleich erstrebt und verdammt, genießt und verachtet, heimlich praktiziert und öffentlich diffamiert” (411). Although Schön recognizes Lulu’s sensual nature and has been exploiting it for his own pleasures, he refuses to marry her because of it. While he concedes the duplicity of this stance, he nevertheless chooses to maintain it. Unlike her previous two husbands who either did not recognize her carnal side or recognized only that, Schön is capable of seeing Lulu as both an erotic being and a bourgeois housewife. Despite his ability to integrate these supposedly opposing concepts of woman, and to even convince Schwarz of the advantages of such a spouse, Schön does not want such a woman for his own wife and thus relegates her back to the realm of the purely sexual. In sharp contrast to Goll’s and Schwarz’ downfalls which were due to the destruction of their own preconceived notions of women, Schön’s now comes about as Lulu deliberately acts to vindicate herself against him. Spurned by his rejection as well as his attempts to objectify her in front of his fiancée, Lulu refuses to keep the impropriety of their relationship secret. It is she who now points out that although Schön exhibits all the qualities of the Gewaltmensch, as Schwarz has called him, he nevertheless is enslaved to her sexuality.

Wo ist Ihre Energie? -- Sie sind seit drei Jahren verlobt. Warum heiraten Sie nicht? -- Sie kennen keine Hindernisse. Warum wollen Sie mir die Schuld geben? . . . Seien Sie doch ein Mann. -- Blicken Sie sich einmal ins Gesicht. -- Sie haben keine Spur von Gewissen. -- Sie schrecken vor keiner Schandtat zurück. -- Sie wollen das Mädchen, das Sie liebt, mit der größte Kaltblütigkeit unglücklich machen. -- Sie erobern die halbe Welt. -- Sie tun, was Sie wollen
Just how much Schön is bound to Lulu’s sexuality, however, only becomes clear when she dictates to him the letter which breaks off his engagement. While the phallic, and therefore emasculating, nature of this gesture is obvious, the fact that Schön is an important newspaper man who makes his living by the pen (i.e. by this instrument of his mind), gives this act even greater significance. By controlling his pen, Lulu demonstrates to Schön that she controls every aspect of his personality—his sexuality as well as his intellect and his willpower. Unable to keep up appearances, Schön can no longer make an advantageous marriage. As his pretentious posturing crumbles before Lulu’s greater sexual power, he consents to marry her, but for her this acquiescence comes too late. Because he, of all men, could recognize and appreciated the vitality of her nature, but chose nonetheless to let society’s norms dictate his actions, his weakness is to be all the more despised as he lives in what Emrich calls a “dauerndem Selbstwiderspruch” (218). “[S]ein ‘Geist’ ist im Grunde nichts anderes als der Geist . . . [der] Gesellschaft selbst, deren Ideale er zwar als ideologische Tarnungen durchschaut, deren Wirklichkeit er aber um so rücksichtsloser lebt

108By portraying Schön as sexually enslaved to Lulu, Wedekind depicts him as one of those weakened men Krafft-Ebing describes in his discussion on sexual dependence. “In the sexual demands of man’s nature will be found the motives of his weakness towards woman. He is enslaved by her, and becomes more and more dependent upon her as he grows weaker and the more he yields to sensuality”(9). The decrepitude to which Schön will later fall victim is not only reflected in the way he allows Lulu to address him here already, but once again, in Krafft-Ebing’s observations. “Generally speaking the following masculine qualities impress women, viz., physical strength, courage, nobility of mind, chivalry, self-confidence, even self-assertion, insolence, bravado, and a conscious show of mastery over the weaker sex” (14). That Schön already shows himself lacking in these characteristics only serves to further stress his ensuing downfall and subsequent demise.
und verkörpert" (Emrich 212). Contrary to the situation with her two previous husbands, Lulu's marriage to Schön will now be one of deliberate destruction as she actively proceeds to shatter his bourgeois affectations and the facade he would live behind. It is at this point that Lulu changes. No longer the innocent childlike bride who allowed herself to be the plaything or the muse of her husbands, Lulu now intentionally makes men her playthings as she toys with their affections and their lives. After several intrigues instigated to humiliate and crush the remnants of Schön’s self-esteem, Lulu shoots and kills him.

Because this turn of events is so out of character with the image of Lulu portrayed up until this point, many scholars have attributed this transformation to an overwhelming sense of rejection and loss that shatters her innocence and evokes in its place a wrathful, vengeance-seeking woman instead. The fact that Schön has precipitated this change by having betrayed Lulu's trust and faith in him, allows critics like Rasch see Lulu's vindictiveness as something inscribed on her through outside forces rather than something inherent in her nature.

Sie rächt sich freilich für die Ermiedigung, die Schön ihr zufügt, indem sie seine sexuelle Abhängigkeit von ihr ausnutzt, ihn zwingt, sie zu heiraten, und ihn dann quält und betrügt. Aber das gerade ist nicht eine Reaktion ihrer Triebhaftigkeit, sondern ihre menschliche Antwort auf die schnöde Behandlung, die ihr Schön zuteil werden läßt. Ihre Liebe, durch die Demütigung in Haß und Verachtung umgeschlagen, bleibt bestehen als personale Bindung, die als solcher durchaus überanimalisch ist. (412)

Indeed, the 1895 version justifies such an interpretation as the final lines of the closing scene show Lulu, who has just shot Schön in self-defense, then falling to her knees in anguish and

---

109See Chapter Four for the various interpretations of Lulu’s motivations.
proclaiming: “[i]ch habe ihn erschossen, weil er mich erschießen wollte. Ich habe keinen Menschen auf der Welt geliebt als ihn” (Stücke 156).

ii) Sexual Deviance in “Die Büchse der Pandora”

As the title of the companion play suggests, by this second play, the healthy sexuality Wedekind professed to portray in Lulu has degenerated into a pathetic, disease-ridden emblem of corruption. Unlike the I.ulu of Erdgeist, whose commodification still fell under the rubric of bourgeois marriage and thus had an air of respectability to it, in this non-bourgeois realm the Lulu of Pandora will deteriorate to a common streetwalker. That Lulu’s sexuality has become corrupted and now merely serves to mirror the decadence all around her can be seen by the new company she keeps. This play begins as Lulu makes her prison escape and flees to Paris.  

Set in an affluent aristocratic salon, the second act opens with Lulu entertaining the upper echelon of society: the Marquise Casti-Piani, the Countess Geschwitz, the financier Puntschu and sundry other elite whose stations are not made clear. While, on the surface, all are seemingly respectable members of society gathered together for some lighthearted gambling, one soon notices the dominance of commercial interests and the fact that each of these individuals sustains their livelihoods by trading in goods which are not the product of their own labor. Casti-Piani, we quickly learn, sells secrets to the police. The banker Puntschu earns his living as a stockbroker living off others’ investments. The circus strong man and Lulu’s bodyguard, Rodrigo, is a blackmailer, and the Gräfin Geschwitz a painter who has inherited her wealth. Although from seemingly different

---

110 Not in the original Monstretragödie, the addition of this first act bridges the gap left by the splitting of the original play into two distinctly separate plays.
backgrounds, two things tie all these characters together—the dire need for money they all have and that each commodifies sex in someway. In addition to spying for the police, Casti-Piani is a *Mädchenhändler* who sells young women to foreign brothels. The latest shares that Puntschu tries to sell come from a railroad company named *Jungfrau*—a wordplay on the virgin peak this railway threatens to destroy. Rodrigo is a kept man who allows his girlfriend to sell herself in order to support him. The Gräfin Geschwitz is a lesbian who squanders away her wealth on the seduction of young women. Whereas the source of Magelone’s former wealth is not clear, she is hinted at being what Peacock calls a “demi-mondaine type, the luxury concubine of Parisian and London society” (109). Like the rest, she too has fallen on hard times and now considers selling her daughter’s virginity to the highest bidder. It is into this setting of false facades, aristocratic decadence, and sexual perversion that Lulu, now married to Schön’s son Alwa, squanders the last of her own financial resources.

Ironically, although each of these characters is portrayed as having a certain amount of power and prestige, they also reflect the late-nineteenth century’s pessimistic lack of vitality. While all of them have had the motivation necessary to rise to the top of their representative fields, none have the stamina or acumen to remain there. Casti-Piani, despite amassing a fortune trafficking in women, must still work for the police in order to prevent his own incarceration. Puntschu, whose livelihood and success depends on his financial prowess, places all his money, and that of his clients, in a company which soon goes bankrupt. Geschwitz, as already mentioned, does not accumulate new wealth, but rather spends her “old money” frivolously; and Rodrigo, the strong man, who is nevertheless supported by women, is, as Boa so aptly phrases it, “a parody of Nietzschean power and
social Darwinist fitness. He is a strong man gone to seed, is unconscionably stupid and will never master the world of a Casti-Piani” (Circus 92).

While Wedekind reveals the precarious social standings of these individuals through their financial weaknesses, the true degeneration of each is more aptly expressed through their sexual decadence. Beginning as early as the last act of Erdgeist, Wedekind introduces the deviant Prince Escerny—colonizer of African lands, owner of numerous slaves, who, despite his tremendous wealth and imperialist tendencies wishes himself to be colonized, to be placed into the masochistic role of subordination and humiliation. Casti-Piani, while seemingly familiar with the ins and outs of prostitution, has nevertheless contracted syphilis and as we learn in Tod und Teufel is himself no longer able to function sexually. 112 Puntschu lusts equally after Magelone’s daughter, Kadidja, as he does after the groom, Bob. Geschwitz is a lesbian who competes vainly with men for Lulu’s affections, and Rodrigo, who allows his girlfriend to prostitute herself in order to support him, is willing to also prostitute himself, if the price is right. Sexuality, corrupted by finance and exemplified by aristocratic decadence, has become depraved and degenerate and is subsequently no longer able to sustain its revitalizing function.

---

111 As Midgley observes, the addition of the Escerny character in the 1895 version of Erdgeist and its companion play Die Büchse der Pandora, served “to relieve the other male characters of those extreme sado-masochistic tendencies which they had born in the manuscript” (219). Indeed, as he continues, “Escerny presents himself, in soliloquy, as the embodiment of aristocratic degeneracy and kinkiness (‘Verschrobenheit’)” (219).

112 In an ironic twist on his form of employment or perhaps an allusion to his own sexual dysfunction, Tilly Wedekind relates that the name Casti Piani is Latin for secret modesty. “Casti-Piani, was lateinish ist [bedeutet] . . . ‘die heimlich Keuschen’”(78).
This corruption does not stop with the social elite, however, but is also found in the streets of London to which Lulu must flee once Casti Piani betrays her to the Paris police. It is here, in the depths of squalor, that Lulu is finally forced into the life of a common street whore as she now supports not only herself, but Alwa and Schigolch as well. Although Alwa is Lulu's last connection with the life she led in Erdgeist, even in him Wedekind now portrays the decadence of the world in which Lulu currently lives. As an artist, Alwa embodies the uselessness of late-nineteenth century art. His weakness is portrayed even more through the decay of intellectual abilities brought on by the contraction of syphilis. It is also through this sexually transmitted disease, that Wedekind expresses once again the difference between the elemental strength of Lulu and the ineffectual natures of individuals like Casti-Piani and Alwa. While both men suffer the adverse affects of infection, and Alwa even more so than Casti-Piani, Lulu remains merely a carrier of the disease, and is herself left completely unaffected.\textsuperscript{113} Additionally, in sharp contrast to his father who was still the family's breadwinner as well as a man Höger describes as “erotisch potent und . . . geistvoll . . ., sodaß Lulu ihn allen anderen vorzog” (121-22), Alwa has become a kept man bemoaning his losses and spending his time in delirious dreams of bygone days.

While Alwa is Lulu's last contact to her former more extravagant existence, it is through Schigolch, the other male Lulu must now support, that she is connected to this seedier side of life. Although in the original manuscript Wedekind suggests a paternal

\textsuperscript{113}That she, as a physical specimen, is so much stronger than all the rest is evidenced further in her escape from prison. Disguising herself in the cholera-soiled clothing of another inmate who has just passed away, Lulu does not contract the disease that killed others all around her.
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connection to Lulu, there is nothing familial or fatherly about Schigolch. Not only does he now capitalize on Lulu’s sexuality financially, as he has throughout her life, there is the suggestion that he has also made use of this sexuality for his own physical desires. Pulled back into the baser world of her incestuous father, Lulu is linked even more to the depravity of perverse sexuality as she now must sell herself to members of this lower, less refined stratum of society. Her first client, a Herr Hunidei, is described as “ein Mann von hühnenhafter Gestalt” (Stücke 216). Not only does his name sound hunnish, as Boa notes, but his body too suggests a brutish power. While we cannot be sure of his occupation, his himmelblauen Augen as well as the religious pamphlet he carries allows one to assume he is a man of the cloth. Because of the sinful nature of this visit, Herr Hunidei says nothing nor does he want Lulu to. “He wants,” as Boa states, “no communion with a soul, only intercourse with a body” (Circus 135). In an ironic twist that shows the unspeakable nature of what he does, as well as the fraudulent nature of contemporary Christian morality, Wedekind mutes this man of the Word. The utter decrepitude of his calling is reflected even further in Schigolch’s statement: “Der scheint mir ganz von Gott verlassen zu sein” (Stücke 217). As the upholder of Christian virtues, he perhaps more than all the rest, bespeaks the sterility of society’s rules and regulations and thus belies its progress.

Her second customer, Kungu Poti, is an African prince. Despite his royal status, emphasis is placed completely on his animalistic qualities. While Wedekind dresses him in the Western attire of a gentleman, in “hellem Überrock, hellen Beinkleidern, weißen Gamaschen, gelben Knopfstiefeln und grauem Zylinder” (Stücke 222), this “cultured” overlay does not conceal his primitive crudeness as his more personal qualities of speech
and behavior reveal. He grunts like an animal, curses, drinks directly from the bottle, and complains that his six wives constantly criticize his lack of hygiene. "[I]ch liebe nicht meine Frauen. Immer soll ich Bad nehmen, Bad nehmen, Bad nehmen . . ." (Stücke 223). He is so crude that he lacks all manner of polite interaction. This is seen specifically when he first attempts to cheat Lulu out of the money due her for her services, and then when he tries to forcefully take what he wants. While his attempted rape of Lulu echoes back to Melchior's rape of Wendla and thus reinforces the idea that he too is a man who determines his own way in life, Kungu Poti is prevented from carrying out this act. In one last valiant effort to express his own manliness, Alwa intercedes. But he is no match for Kungu Poti. He who is all brain and little brawn, as Boa phrases it, meets his death at the hands of the African who is all brawn and little brain.

Alwa becomes the very kind of weakling in the Naturalist manner he himself scorns, a decadent intellectual who cannot act. Sexually inadequate and physically weak, he falls easy prey to the brutal primitivism of Kungu Poti. Along with the Nietzschean symptoms of the decadent, too much mind and aestheticising passivity, Alwa bears the Ibsenite mark of venereal disease, providing a mechanistic explanation for his weakness. A potential artist in Earth Spirit, he is now a dilettante comparable to some of Thomas Mann’s early anti-heroes. (Circus 93)

The death blow directed toward Alwa’s head, not only symbolizes in itself the ineffectual nature of the overly refined and acculturated intellectual, but herewith also the utter decay of a Western society no longer able to withstand the brute force of those “primitives” it was still trying to colonize. Indeed, in a discussion with Rodrigo, Alwa all but states this himself as he acknowledges lacking the moral courage to take on a “wild” adventuresome lifestyle. “In meinen Verhältnissen habe ich außer dem Tod nichts mehr in dieser Welt zu fürchten —
im Reicht der Empfindungen bin ich der ärmste Bettler! Aber ich bringe den moralischen Mut nicht mehr auf, meine befestigte Position gegen die Aufregungen des wilden Abenteurerlebens einzutauschen" (Stücke 183).

Lulu’s third client, Dr. Hilti, is a lecturer at a Swiss university. While this position affords him a certain level of social status, it gives him no financial independence. For this reason he becomes engaged not for love, but in order to obtain the two million his fiancée is worth. Like Schwarz before him, he is inexperienced in sexual matters. In contrast to Schwarz, however, Dr. Hilti seeks to gain this experience. It is, however, not his sexual desires that bring him to Lulu, but rather only the intellect desire to expand his knowledge. Viewing sex from a cerebral perspective rather than a physical one, Boa observes that he “prepare[s] for his wedding night as for an examination” (Circus 103). The virginity, held up as the ultimate prize of a woman’s virtue, is seen here in Dr. Hilti, as in Schwarz before him, as a black mark against manhood, reflecting not purity, but rather deficiency, a lack of drive and desire and more importantly, a lack of vitality.

Medical Discourses in the Lulu-Plays

Just as Erdgeist addressed the defects of the pillars of bourgeois society, Pandora first bespeaks the inadequacies of the aristocratic elite and then points further to the flaws contained in the lower classes of the Western world. In Pandora, where the issue is no longer a dissecting of images of bourgeois marriage, Wedekind now extends his parody to include the whole of society--its spirit, mind, and body, as it were. In Kungu Poti Wedekind addresses mankind’s baser physical needs--especially the need for food and sex, in Herr
Hunidei, mankind’s spiritual aspirations, and then finally in Dr. Hilti, mankind’s intellectual capabilities. In each, however, Wedekind depicts a distortion of these aspects as well as a lack of those characteristics represented by the other two, thus allowing none of the men to represent a well-rounded individual. Interestingly enough, of these three male figures, the African is the only character to come anywhere near the instinctual drives and urges that define Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral.” Indeed, in Die Büchse der Pandora, this is the one character to which Lulu is the most closely related first through her own instinctual nature, but then also through her ability to dance and in particular to dance the “Niggertanz.” Despite his predominance of instincts and even his physical strength, however, Kungu Poti’s primitive crudeness, as well as his skin color, denies him true access to Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral.”

Although racism cannot be explicitly attributed to Wedekind himself since there is no evidence of this in either his private writings or his public works, he wrote in a cultural milieu and time where it was believed there were distinct differences between races and that

114 That Wedekind was reiterating popular discourses of his times and not necessarily expressing a personal opinion can be seen in an excerpt taken out of Karl Vogt’s Lectures on Man. “The grown up Negro partakes, as regards his intellectual faculties, of the nature of the child, the female, and the senile White. He manifests a propensity to pleasure, music, dancing, physical enjoyments . . .” (192). As the coming chapter will reveal, Wedekind forges this link between woman and the more “primitive” races even further when he depicts Lulu as possessing the same inherent traits of cunning and imitative instinct that Vogt and his contemporaries attributed to the Negro. More importantly, she will also be shown to share those criminal tendencies associated with the darker races who were more often correlated with animals than with humans and when acknowledged as human, categorized with women, children, or worse yet, social deviants and criminals (see Lombroso’s Criminal Man).
the white European race was, in general, the most advanced and civilized.\textsuperscript{115} Wedekind’s exhortation against the overly-refined, gentrified nature of society was projected not onto those cultures of the world believed to be less advanced, but rather onto his own culture. Wedekind’s concept of a new “human” morality was not meant to be a return to the less refined world of a Kungu Poti. He did not advocate living like “noble savages,” but rather admonished his own white world to regain the energy and vitality still found in the lower races without abdicating the power and control held by the white race. That Kungu Poti appears to come closest to Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral,” however, is in itself a reprimand and a reflection of the degradation to which Wedekind believed the Western world, and Western man in particular, had fallen.

While one sees already in the racial descriptions reiterations of contemporary discourses, it was more in his multifarious portrayals of sexuality, and in particular deviant sexuality, that Wedekind best reflected the medical findings of the day. It was not by accident that Wedekind’s images of sexuality fit so closely with the mainstream of medical opinion. With both his father and his older brother physicians, medical discourses were not

\textsuperscript{115}It is interesting to note that in drawing a continuum between that race which was at the lowest end of the humanoid continuum and that which was at the highest, Vogt did not indicate the white European male as the epitome of mankind, but more specifically, the German male. In setting the stage for his analysis, Vogt says: “[w]e select for this purpose the two extreme human types, namely, the Negro and the German...”(172). Despite establishing the Europeans, and specifically the Germans, as the most advanced race, when making cranial comparisons, Vogt nevertheless sees the European female as having greater affinity to the males of the lower races than to those of her own race. “[T]he type of the female skull approaches, in many respects, that of the infant, and in a still greater degree that of the lower races; and with this is connected the remarkable circumstance that the difference between the sexes, as regards the cranial cavity, increases with the development of the race, so that the male European excels much more the female than the Negro the Negress”(81).
unfamiliar to Wedekind. Aside from family members in the field, Wedekind also had friends from his student days who had entered the medical profession. One friend, Elias Tomarkin, had become a bacteriologist, another, Leopold Fröhlich von Brugg, a psychiatrist who had once allowed Wedekind to accompany him as he toured a mental institution (GB 1:131). The topic of sexual diseases and deviances were also not unfamiliar to Wedekind as one can see from the holdings in his library. In his diaries he makes several references to reading Krafft-Ebing’s famous work on sexual deviance, Psychopathia sexualis, and also indicates reading Felix von Niemeyers’ work and specifically the chapter on syphilis. Wedekind owned a copy of Hermann Ploss’s Das Weib, which Boa observes offered Wedekind a cross-section of medical and anthropological opinion, quoting, among others, the very influential pathologist Paul Möbius (Circus 185). Additionally, in a notebook Wedekind lists Lombroso’s The Man of Genius as one of his most cherished texts (Kutscher, W 81).

---

116 In his biography of Wedekind, Kutscher indicates that Armin, the older brother, often took Wedekind along with him to the university lectures on gynecology, thus giving him even more access to the latest rhetoric of medicine (W 28). In their work Frank Wedekind, geb. 1864 in Hannover, which deals to a great extent with the father’s biography, Carsten Niemann and Brigitta Weber note that the elder Wedekind was not only a practicing surgeon but in all likelihood helped with the delivery of Frank and his other siblings. They further note that aside from his self-designation as “Dr. der Medizin, Chirurgie und Geburtshilfe”(39), his dissertation “Die Schnellgeburt” would also seem to indicate a level of expertise in the area of gynecology.

117 See Wedekind’s letter of January 9, 1886 to his father.

118 According to Boa, Wedekind owned the 1887 edition of this work, which from the second edition onwards included a section on Jack the Ripper (Circus 184-85).
Among his acquaintances he counted Karl Vogt, the famous craniologist who was not only a school friend of his father’s (GB 1:29-30), but also a long-time friend of Emma Herwegh, one of several older women to influence Wedekind’s literary development. In fact, it was through the encouragement of Frau Herwegh that Wedekind takes up personal contact with Vogt and later even has one of his article’s accepted by him (GB 1:172). Through his connection with yet another older woman, Frau Gotthelf, Wedekind comes into contact with Leopold von Sacher Masoch, the Austrian lawyer and writer best known for the erotic perversions he describes in his literary works which later bear his name. In a fashion similar to Herwegh, Gotthelf too tries to promote Wedekind’s career by advising him to send Sacher-Masoch his Frühlings Erwachen. Finally, through a letter to his brother Armin, written in 1892, we know that during his sojourn in Paris, Wedekind also had occasion to become acquainted with the physician and writer Max Nordau, who at that time was working on his famous two-volume study Entartung (GB1:229).

---

119See Wedekind’s letter of August 6, 1881 to Adolph Voeglin.

120 Aside from Karl Vogt, Emma Herwegh, as Kutscher notes, was acquainted with some of the most prominent men of the day among whom were counted Orsini, Garibaldi, Mazzini, and Fabricit.

121Letter written to his mother on July 30, 1887.

122It was, however, his mother’s childhood friend Olga Plümacher, whom Wedekind referred to as his “philosophische Tante,” who probably had the most influence on him as she introduced him to the writings of Schopenhauer, Eduard von Hartmann, and Nietzsche.

123Despite the inclination to want to count Freud among those influential to Wedekind’s literary development, Wedekind was not familiar with his studies until well after the turn-of-the-century. Wedekind’s own biographer, Kutscher, too stresses this and advises against drawing correlations between Wedekind’s work and the research of Freud. “So
While it has long been noted that Wedekind’s whole _œuvre_ seems to come from personal life experiences as well as those of friends and family, much of what he develops in his dramas also comes from the sources mentioned above, and in particular from case studies found in Krafft-Ebing’s _Psychopathia sexualis_. This becomes especially clear when one investigates the forms of sexual deviance found throughout his _œuvre_ but in particular in his Lulu-plays. In looking specifically at the male characters of _Erdgeist_, one is struck by the overwhelming examples of deficiency, distortion, and depravity that echo the case studies discussed by Krafft-Ebing. Lulu’s first husband, Goll, is a prime example of a pedophilic voyeur whose sexual arousal comes from observing young girls in seductive positions. While it is never clear whether this has always been Goll’s penchant, this along with his other idiosyncratic tendency for employing the whip, suggests his voyeuristic inclination might be the result of age-related impotence. This is aptly expressed in Krafft-Ebing’s description of the mental disturbances that come with this type of loss.

> [I]mpotence impairs health, mental freshness, activity, self-confidence and imagination. The damage stands in proportion to the age of the subject... The sudden loss of the virile powers often produces melancholia... In cases where the reaction is less pronounced, the victim is morose, peevish, egotistical, jealous, narrow-minded, cowardly, devoid of energy, self-respect and honour. (13)

verlockend es ist, die Brücke zwischen Wedekind und Freud... zu sehen, so vorsichtig sollte man sein. ... Sein [Wedekind’s] Werk, entstanden in einer spezifischen geistigen Atmosphäre, die Freud geteilt haben mag, folgt eigenen Gesetzen” (W 272). Rather than Freud, it was in fact the writings of Hartmann, recognized today as the forefather of studies in the unconscious, which impacted Wedekind.

124In fact, the closer one looks at Wedekind’s _œuvre_, the more striking it becomes, as Kieser too observes, that it seems to be almost a recounting of the various case studies found in Krafft-Ebing’s seminal work (Biographie 270).
More important than these emotional reactions that echo Goll’s psychological state is the sadistic reaction to this loss of virility that references Goll’s obvious pleasure for using the whip. “If the sadist is psychically or spinally impotent, as an equivalent of coitus, there will be noticed . . . flagellating (of women [or] . . . whipping of school children)” (53). Indeed, Krafft-Ebing continues, sexual attraction to children is itself a sign of age-related dementia.

The first objects for the attempts of these senile subjects of brain atrophy and psychical degeneration are children. This sad and dangerous fact is explained by the better opportunity they have in succeeding with children, but more especially by a feeling of imperfect sexual power. Defective sexual power, and greatly diminished moral sense, explain the additional fact of the perversity of the sexual acts of such aged men. They are the equivalents of the impossible physiological act. (58)

While we have noted earlier that Goll’s choice of young girls clearly arises out of his fear of adult women who might place their own sexual demands upon him, it is also in keeping with the above hypothesis that this fear could just as easily be understood as arising out of his own inability to satisfy adult women.

While Schwarz does not suffer from a sexual dysfunction, per se, we know that his seeming lack of interest in sex also finds its impetus in fear of women. This fear is in all likelihood exacerbated not only by his own inexperience in sexual matters but more so when he then discovers that Lulu has a voracious sexual appetite which he cannot begin to satisfy. The innocence and reticence for sex that Schwarz projects onto Lulu in order to avoid the sex act, echoes very closely Weininger’s thesis that men assign to women their own “male” morality in order to mask female depravity. Aside from wanting to imagine women as purer than nature created them, however, Weininger also sees this projection as a means for men to assuage their own fears relative to women. “Der Glaube an die Sittlichkeit des Weibes
... [sei] die ‘Introjektion’ der Seele des Mannes in das Weib. ... Die Furcht vor dem Weiße, das ist die Furcht vor der Sinnlosigkeit” (325, 399). Thus Schwarz’ fear and aloofness relative to sexual matters is, like Goll’s before him, what Hilmes refers to as “eine Krise des herrschenden männlichen Selbstbewußtseins” (32).

With Schön, Wedekind portrays yet a third type of impotence. Represented initially as a very powerful, virile man, Schön’s impotence does not stem from age as we have seen with Goll or out of fear as with Schwarz, but is instead the result of a morphine dependence. While this information is dropped from the later versions of the Lulu-plays, in the original manuscript we are given to understand that Schön’s (or Schöning’s, as he is called here) addiction interferes not only with his sex life, as the following scene reveals, but affects his overall will to continue dominating and controlling Lulu as well.

*Lulu:* Willst du denn nicht wieder mal . . .
*Schöning:* Was denn?
*Lulu:* Was denn anders. -- Du mußt mich binden und peitschen.
*Schöning:* Umsonst!
*Lulu:* Bis Blut kommt. -- Ich schrei nicht. -- Ich beisse auf mein Taschentuch.
*Schöning:* Es ist Hopfen und Malz verloren.
*Lulu:* (läßt ihre Hand über sein graues Haar gleiten) Aber warum vergiebst du mir denn dann nicht?
*Schöning:* Das ist das Morphinum.-- Weil ich dabei zu Grunde gehe. . . . Ich war immer wie ein Vater zu dir. -- Jetzt erst recht. (Monstre 68)

While Schöning’s inability to take up this role clearly points to his drug-induced impotence, the fact that it is Lulu and not Schöning who attempts to initiate this exchange, further underscores his loss of manhood. Whereas this scene also points to the sadistic qualities that Schöning once shared with Goll in that they both had a penchant for whips, Schöning’s
motivation is not the same as his predecessor’s. Schöning’s preference for this form of sexual intercourse did not stem from an inability to perform the sexual act, as had been the case with Goll, but rather was simply a means for bringing added pleasure into the act. Thus, by using the whip for pleasure and not as the penis substitute for which Goll employed it, Schöning’s sadism does not carry with it the same stigma.

While Krafft-Ebing identifies several forms of sadism, he sees only those occurring as a result of diminished virility as deviant. The less severe forms of sadism, on the other hand, he downplays by justifying them as a course of action men must employ to break through women’s natural reticence for sex. Even more alarming than his projecting the reason for sadism onto the women themselves, is Krafft-Ebing’s subsequent conclusion that women, in fact, desire and get pleasure from this brutal act.

It seems probable that this sadistic force is developed by the natural shyness and modesty of woman towards the aggressive manners of the male, especially during the earlier periods of married life and particularly where the husband is hypersexual. Woman no doubt derives pleasure from her innate coyness and the final victory of man affords her intense and refined gratification. (81)

Krafft-Ebing supports this position further by giving biological credence to the sadistic behavior, which he notes occurs more often in men than in women.

---

125 “Sadistic acts may be . . . differentiated according to their nature; either taking place after consummated coitus which leaves the libido nimia unsatisfied; or, with diminished virility, being undertaken to merely stimulate the diminished power; or, finally, where virility is absolutely wanting, as becoming simply an equivalent for impossible coitus, and for the induction of ejaculation” (87).

126 The extent to which Wedekind references Krafft-Ebing here can be seen specifically in Rodrigo’s comment that women do not distinguish between love and beatings and that they, indeed, go hand-in-hand. “Sei es Liebe, seien es Prügel, danach fragt kein Weiberfleisch; hat es nur Unterhaltung, dann bleibt es stramm und frisch” (Werke 1:335).
In the intercourse of the sexes, the active or aggressive rôle belongs to man; woman remains passive, defensive. It affords man great pleasure to win a woman, to conquer her; and in the ars amandi, the modesty of woman, who keeps herself on the defensive until the moment of surrender, is an element of great psychological significance and importance. Under normal conditions man meets obstacles which it is his part to overcome, and for which nature has given him an aggressive character. (85)

Endowed with aggressive tendencies which nature has given man precisely for the purpose of conquering woman, and then instigated further by woman’s deliberate pretense of sexual reticence, Krafft-Ebing sees man forced to take on the role of sadist simply to initiate that act for which nature created men and women.

That Wedekind, in the above scene, is once again reiterating Krafft-Ebing’s findings, is evidenced not only by the sado-masochistic elements in Schöning’s and Lulu’s sexual “play,” but likewise in the fact that Lulu exemplifies precisely that type of woman Krafft-Ebing contends yearned to be chastised and dominated. Given Lulu’s own desires in this arena, the true extent of Schöning’s impotence can now be seen in the fact that he not only exhibits a decline in physical desire, but also a lack of emotional and psychological motivation. Unlike Lulu’s previous two husbands, in Schöning we now observe a double-impotence, so to speak, as he now illustrates the worst of both Goll and Schwarz—the inability to have sex, on the one hand, and the inability to desire it, on the other.

Although Krafft-Ebing denotes both sadism and masochism as deviant, depending on their extremes as well as in which gender they occur, he attributes the greater corruption to masochism. “While sadism may be looked upon as a pathological intensification of the masculine sexual character in its psychical peculiarities, masochism rather represents a

126
pathological degeneration of the distinctive psychical peculiarities of woman” (201). That he defines sadism as an *intensification* of masculine characteristics but masochism as a *degeneration* of the feminine qualities shows a clear preference for sadism, at least where it is expressed in the male gender. Where masochism does occur in the male, it is considered to reflect a regression back to mankind’s primordial bisexuality—a feminizing or an unmanning, as it were. More egregious for Krafft-Ebing, however, and therefore more threatening was the psychological emasculation since it was symptomatic of the loss of all independent will-power that accompanied this deviance (134).

That Wedekind reproduced even Krafft-Ebing’s biases can be seen in his treatment of Prince Escerny. In contrast to Schöning, who embodied a sadistic type of sexuality in his whip-yielding form of intercourse and thus he epitomizes what Krafft-Ebing refers to as the ultimate in masculinity, in Prince Escerny we see just the opposite—a desire to reject aggressive masculinity for the ultimate subordination. Although this type of submission was

---

127 Although Krafft-Ebing saw extreme femininity as a form of degeneration in women in that they became overly passive and masochistic, in *The Female Offender*, Lombroso and Ferrero held that it was woman’s role in evolution to become more and more feminine. Where they both agreed, however, was in maintaining that the more dangerous sign of degeneration in men was not excessive masculinity (i.e., sadism and aggression), but rather greater femininity.

128 Still echoing Galen’s theories which placed the male at the most advanced end of the humanoid continuum, both Vogt and Darwin warned that effeminacy in men reflected a form of atavism, a reverting back to mankind’s hermaphroditic origins. For Proudhon, this concern went beyond the individual male to incorporate all of society, which he contended had only two possible developments: progress (in the form of masculine aggression) or degeneration (through destructive effeminacy). “A nation, after having risen with virile energy, can become effeminate and even collapse... [however,] while a race can become effeminate, it can also make itself more virile through its work, its philosophy, and its institutions” (qtd. in Dijkstra, 211).
considered permissible and to be expected in women, since, so Krafft-Ebing, it was in keeping with their passive nature, it was considered highly perverse and irregular in men.

[I]t is easy to regard masochism in general as a pathological growth of specific feminine mental elements,—as an abnormal intensification of certain features of the psycho-sexual character of woman,—and to seek its primary origin in that sex. It may, however, be held to be established that, in woman, an inclination to subordination to man . . . is to a certain extent a normal manifestation. (Krafft-Ebing 196)

For Krafft-Ebing, male masochism was a lacking of masculinity and therefore yet another form of impotence. “By this perversion his sexual instinct is often made more or less insensible to the normal charms of the opposite sex—incapable of a normal vita sexualis—psychically impotent” (131). That Wedekind too represents masochism as correlated with a lack of masculinity and even apathy for the opposite sex, as Krafft-Ebing claims, can be

---

Ironically, although Krafft-Ebing sees masochism as a stigma in men, for women he sees it as a perfectly natural part of their character. “in woman voluntary subjection to the opposite sex is a physiological phenomenon. Owing to her passive rôle in procreation and long-existent social conditions, ideas of subjection are, in woman, normally connected with the idea of sexual relations. They form, so to speak, the harmonics which determine the tone-quality of feminine feeling” (195). More important than her own natural inclination, is Krafft-Ebing’s continued reiteration that women actually want strong, sadistic men and that it is the male’s forcefulness that actually triggers female eroticism. “[A]n attentive observer of life may still easily recognize how the custom of unnumbered generations, in connection with the passive rôle with which woman has been endowed by Nature, has given her an instinctive inclination to voluntary subordination to man; he will notice that exaggeration of customary gallantry is very distasteful to women, and that a deviation from it in the direction of masterful behaviour, though loudly reprehended, is often accepted with secret satisfaction. Under the veneer of polite society the instinct of feminine servitude is everywhere discernible. . . . Among peoples of a lower class of culture the subjection of woman is extended even to brutality. This flagrant proof of dependence is felt by woman even with sensual pleasure and accepted as a token of love. It is probable that the woman of high civilisation looks upon the rôle of being overshadowed by the male consort as an acceptable situation which forms a portion of the lustful feeling developed in the sexual act. The daring and self-confident demeanor of man undoubtedly exercises a sexual charm over woman” (195-96, 211).
seen in the association he makes between Escerny and Schwarz. When in reaction to the Prince’s request that he be fettered helplessly at her feet, Lulu responds “Sie sind in Ihrem Leben noch von keinem Mädchen aufrichtig geliebt worden!” (Stücke 134), one is reminded of similar statements made earlier to Schwarz by both Lulu and Schön.\(^\text{130}\) In this manner, Wedekind reinforces the link between Schwarz’ seeming disinterest in sex (what Krafft-Ebing refers to as Anaesthesia Sexualis—the absence of sexual feeling) and Escerny’s masochism, which Krafft-Ebing labels as insensitivity to the opposite sex. A further connection is made between Schwarz’ own ineptitude and Escerny’s inexperience when the latter comments: “Ich gestehe ein, daß es mir an Geschicklichkeit gebracht. Ich war vielleicht im Verkehr mit Frauen nicht gelehrt genug” (Stücke 134). He, like Schwarz before him, is a man who has made little effort to find female companionship, and more importantly, even less effort to assume the “masculine” role in his relationships.

Although Wedekind defines Lulu as eros incarnate and Prince Escerny even calls her “das verkörperte Lebensglück,” the men in Lulu’s life are not made happier nor revitalized through their attachments to her. Quite the opposite, each invariably dies or suffers severely after sexual contact with her. While in this chapter we have noted that their miseries lie for the most part with the destruction of their own illusions of womanhood as well as the exposure of their own masculine inadequacies, the fact that they are not rejuvenated through their association with Lulu makes her function as a life-affirming force of nature very problematic. In the following chapter, we will investigate more fully what Wedekind meant

\(^{130}\)See Footnote 12.
when he designated Lulu his “Urgestalt des Weibes” and how he envisioned her role in or as his “menschliche Moral.”
CHAPTER 4

A REEXAMINATION OF WEDEKIND’S “MENSCHLICHE MORAL”

For years now, there has been much debate among scholars as they have attempted to understand what Wedekind envisioned under his notion of “menschliche Moral.” The great disparity in interpretations is due largely to the vague, enigmatic nature of this concept. Despite maintaining that his new “morality” could be conveyed best through a liberated sexuality, Wedekind’s expression thereof in his works, but particularly in the Lulu-plays, was left ambiguous and contradictory.\(^{131}\) While all Wedekind’s prostitutes emblematize his concept of eroticism and, as we have seen in Chapter Two, their fates reflect first his strong enthusiastic belief in the redemptive qualities of a liberated sexuality, but then later also

\(^{131}\) Just how ambiguous this concept was already during Wedekind’s time is revealed in the observations of theater critic Kurt Martens that even the actors in the first staging of Erdgeist were at odds to understand how to perform their roles. “Wedekind hatte seine Not mit den Schauspielern, weil sie der ganzen Sache ziemlich ratlos gegenüberstanden” (213). It was, however, not just the actors who had problems interpreting this piece. As Martens contends, Wedekind’s own inexperience in dealing with theater productions also created many difficulties that left everyone involved with this work struggling to understand what he wanted. “Die Bedingung dieser Uraufführung war, daß Wedekind . . . es noch nicht verschämte, den “Ideenvergang” des Stückes unter den an der Aufführung Beteiligten ‘ins rechte Licht zu setzen’” (216). Ironically, a hundred years later, when the original version is finally brought to stage, nothing has changed, as theater critic Hellmuth Karasek’s commentary about Zadek’s 1988 production confirms. “‘Lulu’, besonders in dieser frühen Fassung, die Wedekind als ‘Monstretragödie’ bezeichnet, ist ein grelles Stück, bei dem man nicht weiß, wann und ob man weinen oder lachen soll. Glücklicherweise weiß das auch Zadek nicht” (180).
reveal his disillusionment with the possibility of its incorruptibility within modern society, it is in Lulu, his most famous prostitute, that this notion of revitalizing instincts takes its most prominent but simultaneously most confusing form.

While we have seen in the previous chapters that eros plays a key role in Wedekind’s idea of a new “morality,” in Chapter Three we have also seen the severely debilitating effects of this eroticism, especially with respect to male sexuality. Although scholars have, for the most part, been in consensus when accepting Lulu as the personification of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” they remain in debate when it comes to her function and purpose under this guise. This is to be expected, however, given the Janus-faced nature of Wedekind’s eroticism. Wedekind’s notion of “menschliche Moral” is not only hard to conceptualize because it is something he describes as outside of and above society, it is harder still to imagine implemented because it is nevertheless suppose to occur within society. In the foreword to the second Lulu-play, Die Büchse der Pandora, Wedekind states: “Es handelt sich in dieser Tragödie um den Unterschied zwischen bürgerlicher Moral, zu deren Schutz der Richter berufen ist, und menschliche Moral, die sich jeder irdischen Gerechtigkeit entzieht” (qtd. in Emrich 210). While it is obvious that Wedekind envisions his “menschliche Moral” as something beyond social reproach, exactly how he visualizes it implemented in his works, or even in real life for that matter, is still not clear. With the very concept around which his protagonist’s role pivots left ill-defined, it is quite understandable that scholars would themselves be at a loss and even at odds when it comes interpreting the Lulu-plays. Indeed, as one scholar observes, “[t]o say that she [Lulu] represents nature as opposed to society helps but little to explain the mystery as long as the
notion of naturalness involved in that contrast remains ill-defined and of dubious moral value” (Hibberd 338). Since not only the concept of “menschliche Moral” but even the figure of Lulu is left vague, this character, and consequently both Lulu-plays, have evoked very diverse readings from scholars. A sample of just a few such readings gives one the idea of just how disparate the interpretations are as perceptions of Lulu run the gamut from seeing her, on the one extreme, as an innocuous childlike expression of passionate nature created to imbue life back into mankind, to those on the other end that picture her instead as the personification of raw animalistic sexuality, voracious and destructive in nature.

**Critical Interpretations of the Lulu-Plays**

Starting with that end of the spectrum that sees Lulu possessing a more innocent nature is Wilhelm Emrich, authoritative Wedekind scholar since the late fifties. According to Emrich, Lulu is an *unschuldiges Kind*, an unreflective creature who follows her natural instincts. Although Emrich sees her as the “Epitome of Love,” like love, she remains a mystery.

Das, was Lulu ihr “Selbst” nennt, das sie von allen anderen Frauen “Unterscheidende”, läßt sich weder in eine geistige noch in eine seelische, psychologisch bestimmmbare Kategorie fassen. Es läßt sich überhaupt nicht bestimmen. . . . Sie scheint also eine unbedingte Sphäre zu repräsentieren, die sich in keine bedingte Realität und begrenzte menschlich Vorstellungswelt einfangan läßt. (208-09)

Continuing his description of her, Emrich’s definition becomes as turgid as Wedekind’s own. “Es gibt für Lulu keinen allgemein verbindlichen Wert mehr. Die Unbedingtheit ihres

---

132 See Robert Jones’ and Leroy Shaw’s critical bibliography for an annotated analysis of the works published on Wedekind to date.
Anspruches ist an keine Idee, kein sittliches Postulat, kein Gesetz, keinen Glauben mehr gebunden. Das sittliche Postulat ist sie selbst, ihre undefinierbare ‘Natur’. . . Auch ihre Liebe ist nicht zu artikulieren’ (209). While seemingly defining Lulu by explaining she is indefinable, something or someone which cannot be categorized, Emrich does pick up on the impossibility of Wedekind’s concept that sees Lulu above and outside of society while simultaneously forced to exist within society. Because Emrich believes Lulu is caught in a world where her true nature is not allowed to blossom freely, he sees society twisting and damaging the life force within her. ‘[A]ls Vertreterin der wahren Moral . . . [verfällt notwendig auch Lulu] den Pervertierung der bürgerlichen, da die als konkret existierendes Wesen selbst auch immer ein gesellschaftliches Wesen ist’ (211).

Wedekind’s own biographer and another seminal expert, Artur Kutschker, also sees Lulu as an innocent. Focusing more on her destructive potential than does Emrich, however, Kutschker sees Lulu as a creature who unwittingly wreaks havoc when provoked through outside forces. Despite the emphasis on her violent qualities, Kutschker sees the disastrous effects of Lulu not intentionally willed by her but rather triggered either through repressive social mores, or more where the emphasis of this study lies, by the weaknesses and inadequacies of the men in her life. ‘Ein Böses an sich ist in ihr [Lulu] nicht vorhanden, es entsteht eigentlich erst durch den Mann, das heißt, durch des Mannes Unzulänglichkeit und Schwäche, wächst dann allerdings ruckweise, bedrohlich. Sie aber weiß nicht, was sie tut. Mit großen runden Kinderaugen folgt sie unbekümmert ihrer Natur . . .’ (121). Along similar lines, in his 1984 article “The Spirit of the Flesh: Wedekind’s Lulu” J.L. Hibberd sees Wedekind emphasizing Lulu’s sexual nature but in a definitely positive manner as he likens
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her to a more realistic Eve than to the unattainable “temple of spiritual virtues” represented by the ethereal Mary (344). Although Hibberd stresses her rejuvenating aspects, he, like Emrich and Kutscher, also notes the catastrophic clashes Lulu has with society. “She is body, matter, instinct; she is irrational and antisocial; she is beauty, the triumph of nature, the spirit of the flesh. She is essential to the survival of vitality and to creativity, but is also, at least under certain circumstances, destructive. She is temptation, but the joy and knowledge she offers are not sinful” (346).

In sharp contrast to the above arguments, and coached almost as a personal attack against Wedekind himself, Peter Michelsen does not see Lulu as a naive expression of nature, but rather as an reflection of Wedekind’s own vile expectations of women. In his 1975 article entitled simply “Frank Wedekind,” Michelsen contends that Lulu does not personify a higher moral nature, as Wedekind claims, but rather just the opposite—that she is the embodiment of the author’s own baser lusts. He not only rejects premises that see Lulu as naive and innocuous, but in quoting Emrich directly, dismisses any interpretation that sees her as an individual, potentially real woman let alone a woman of love.

Wenn es von Lulu heißt, daß ihr “Leben die Liebe” ist, so impliziert diese Liebe--von den Interpreten wird das oft verkannt--gerade nicht den “moralischen Anspruch, als Person, als Individualität geliebt zu werden”. Lulu beschwert sich zwar über Schwarz: “Ich bin ihm nichts als Weib und wieder Weib. . . . Er kennt keinen Unterschied”; doch fördert sie damit die Schätzung ihrer selbst nicht etwa als “Persönlichkeit (die sie nicht ist), sondern als die höchste potenzierte Verkörperung dessen, was die animalisch-geschlechtliche Begabung der Gattung ausmacht.” (54-55)

He continues this description by then delineating what Lulu is and what she is not. [D]as reine Naturwesen . . . [besteht] aus nichts als Fleisch und Vulva” (55). “Dieses Erd- und
Elementarwesen ist kein ‘Geist’: es ist Trieb, Geschlechtstrieb” (56). To support this contention, he quotes a passage out of Wedekind’s own diary where the dramatist describes his ideal woman. “Ich suche nicht X. Ich suche das Weib. In jeder Gestalt soll es mir willkommen sein. . . . X repräsentiert für mich ein ganzes Lebenselement, Diplomatie, nicht Liebe ist das Leitmotiv. Sie ist Opfer, nicht Gottheit. Sie erfüllt ihren Beruf und geht” (qtd. in Michelsen 13). Thus Michelsen points out “Lulu ist die fiktive Lösung eines Suchbildes, dem sich der Dichter in allen ihm begegnenden Frauengestalten konfrontiert glaubte. . . . Lulu ist die dichterische Verkörperung dieses vom Gedanken gezeugten Wunsches. Sie existiert nur in der Einbildung des Dichters” (55). But Wedekind himself seems, if not to support Michelsen’s stance, to at least contradict those of Emrich and others who see Lulu as the source of true love. Referring to Erdgeist, the first of the Lulu-plays to be published, Wedekind comments: “Es [ging] mir bei der Darstellung um Ausschaltung all der Begriffe . . . die logisch unhaltbar [seien], wie: Liebe Treue, Dankbarkeit” (Wedekind, PDV, 945).

Indeed, as Rose notes, with this statement, Wedekind in fact rejects love “as a social value alien to elemental existence” (275).

In consensus with Michelsen, who does not see Lulu as a real woman but rather a projected image, Carola Hilmes sees Lulu possessing none of those characteristics of love, fidelity, or gratitude that Wedekind rejects above, but rather as the embodiment of a femme fatale--that creature who represents, as she says, “[d]ie Schattenseiten der Sexualität” (x). While Lulu is for Hilmes “die geheimnisvolle, nicht in Besitz zu nehmende Frau, die durch ihre ‘Aura’ fesselt und durch ihre Abgründigkeit erschreckt” (x), she is simultaneously “ein Werkzeug männlicher Projektionen” (69-70) in that her sexual allure and its accompanying
dangers are Wünsch- und Angstbilder men project onto women. “Die auf die sinnliche Frau projizierten Erwartungen und Ängste äussern sich im Typus der Femme-fatale als Ambivalenz von Faszination und Bedrohung” (7). Despite noting the similarities Lulu shares with the femme fatale, and even categorizing her as such, Hilmes sees Lulu as having no true agency and therefore being relatively childlike and blameless. “Lulu ist nicht wirklich agierende. Sie scheint unbewuβt, quasi instinktiv zu handeln. . . . Ihr Handeln ist reaktiv. Sie will niemandem Böses und betreibt den Niedergang ihrer Gegenspieler nicht bewuβt. Insofern ist sie wirklich von kindlicher Unschuld” (158).

Silvia Bovenschen, in a manner similar to Hilmes, also sees Lulu as a conglomerate of man-made wishes and fantasies. She, however, gives Lulu more agency in that she sees Lulu as able to break out of and thus breaking down the male-projected images.

Lulus ursprüngliche, noch nicht denaturierte Weiblichkeit soll sich gegen die kulturellen Bilder des Weiblichen, die sie gleichzeitig repräsentiert, durchsetzen. Lulu ist Figur und zugleich Figurenträgerin: wenn Lulu ihre ‘Pandora Büchse’ öffnet, stürzen sich die glücksverheißenden, vor allem aber die bedrohlichen Ausgeburten der männlichen Weiblichkeitsphantasien auf das Publikum und die Männer im Stück. (44)

Although Bovenschen gives Lulu an agency and a self-awareness not seen in previous interpretations, she, like the other critics discussed so far, is unable to articulate a clear definition of Lulu. By explaining her role as the rejection of roles, Bovenschen leaves Lulu swaying in a no-man’s-land of negativity. “Wedeikins Begriff von Natürlichkeit meint auch die Negation all dessen, was der Frau zur zweiten Natur wurde und beständig für ihre erste gehalten wird” (45). To support her own argument, Bovenschen then cites Emrich, who too sees Lulu’s role as the negation of all roles. “Lulus Natur kann sich . . . nur als unausgesetzte
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Negation der von ihr gelebten Positionen behaupten. Lulus Natur ist daher nur negativ zu bestimmen als das, was sie nicht ist” (212). With this citation, however, Bovenschen not only unwittingly reiterates the patriarchal discourse that defined woman as the negative, that which man was not, she confines Lula to yet another male-determined projection of womanhood—that of the Rätselweib—that woman whose animalistic nature was beyond the scope of the more evolved masculine rationale. As if attempting to recoup the weakness of this line of reasoning, however, Bovenschen then attributes a positive quality to the vitality Lulu has to offer. “Daneben behauptet sich allerdings noch eine positive Vorstellung von Natur, die die Möglichkeit einer uneingeschränkten Entfaltung vitaler und individueller Kräfte einschließt” (45). As with the other critics analyzed to this point, however, we see that Bovenschen is just as much at a loss to define what this vitality is let alone explain how it is transmitted by or through Lulu.

Of all the Wedekind scholars discussed so far, it is Wolfdietrich Rasch who gives possibly the most intelligible explanation of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral” in that he juxtaposes Lulu as Naturmensch against the Bildungsbürgertum that Wedekind continually denigrates throughout his works.

In sharp contrast to Michelsen, Rasch not only sees Wedekind as revalorizing those elemental instincts which make up his “menschliche Moral,” he also gives Wedekind credit for realizing the impossibility of a social existence based solely on those instincts.
He disagrees completely with Michelsen’s reading that Lulu cannot be interpreted as an individual. “Es ist ein Irrtum, wenn Peter Michelsen Wedekinds Frauenbild, wie er es in Lulu entworfen hat, als ‘das reine Naturwesen’ versteht, ‘bestehend aus nichts als Fleisch und Vulva’. Lulu ist gewiss eine Verkörperung weiblicher Sexualität, aber doch als Frau, als menschliches Wesen” (411). Ironically, in supporting this stance, however, Rasch ignores those statements by Wedekind which reject bourgeois constructs of love, fidelity, and gratitude. “Im ganzen besteht Lulu keineswegs nur aus Triebhaftigkeit, sondern sie ist bestimmt durch eine innere Bindung an Dr. Schön, den sie liebt” (411).

The Evolution of the Lulu-Plays

While we have seen the sometimes congruous and other times contradictory nature of each of these arguments, as each scholar picks up on a particular facet of Lulu’s nature and thus reinforces the complexity of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” what makes interpreting Wedekind’s Lulu-plays all the more difficult is the multiple transitions these works underwent over the span of twenty-one years. From his first mention of wanting to
write a *Schauertragödie* in a diary entry on June 12, 1892 (Diaries 188) to the final version (*Ausgabe letzter Hand*) in 1913.\(^{133}\) Wedekind continually revised his Lulu-plays, with at least three versions containing substantial changes. Incredulously, despite all the research done on Wedekind relative to the Lulu-plays, the original manuscript, written more than one hundred years ago in 1894, did not come to light until 1968 and was only available to the general public in 1990 with Helmut Vinçon’s annotated edition.\(^{134}\) Through this very same work Wedekind’s personal notes on these plays were finally also published. Additionally, it was only in 1986, that Wedekind’s diaries were released to the public and as late as 1990 that they were translated into English by W.E. Yuill.

Due to censorship concerns, Wedekind’s publishers never allowed the printing of the original manuscript, but rather forced him to split this work into two plays.\(^{135}\) Even then, the first of the two new plays, comprising the original first three acts plus an additional act, had to be substantially rewritten before it was considered acceptable for publication and public

\(^{133}\)For an in-depth analysis of the various versions of Wedekind’s Lulu-plays, see Höger and Maclean. For a thorough examination of all the evidence relating to the evolution of the various versions of the Lulu-plays including the original manuscript, see Helmut Vinçon’s “Lulu. Dramatische Dichtung in zwei Teilen.”

\(^{134}\)Ironically, the *Uraufführung* of this original work also does not come to stage until almost one hundred years later on January 13, 1988 at the Deutsches Schauspielhaus Hamburg under the direction of Peter Zadek. As Vinçon notes in his article “Wie Wedekind’s *Lulu* entstand- und unterdrückt wurde,” even this performance is not completely true to the original manuscript as Zadek deviates somewhat from the *Urfassung.* For reviews of this production, see Helmuth Karasek, Michael Merschmeier, and Henning Rischofieter.

\(^{135}\)For a discussion of the negotiations that went on between Wedekind and Langen Verlag, see Vinçon’s “Wie Wedekinds ‘Lulu’ entstand--und unterdrückt wurde” as well as Ernestine Koch’s *Albert Langen: Ein Verleger in München.*
viewing. In February 1895 under the new title Der Erdgeist, eine Tragödie the first of Wedekind’s Lulu plays finally went to press. In 1898 Wedekind added the now famous Prologue to the second edition of this play, whose title was now shortened to Der Erdgeist. In 1903 Wedekind attached, as a motto, an excerpt from Schiller’s Wallenstein’s Tod. While most of the changes Wedekind made from one edition of Erdgeist to the next were, as Vinçon notes, usually minor tinkerings made in order to improve stage productions.

---

136 For a detailed analysis of the censorship tribulations connected with the various versions of the Lulu-plays, see Peter Conrad’s “Frank Wedekind -- Justitias Deckel für die ‘Büchse der Pandora’” and Reinhard Becker’s “Die Büchse der Pandora ist geöffnet.”

137 Given that the original handwritten manuscript carried the notation “Buchdrama,” Erhard Weidl argues that Wedekind did not initially conceive of this work as a piece to be performed on stage. It was only with this first printing, which now carried the notation “Bühnenmanuskript,” that he maintains Wedekind reconsidered this (100).

138 While Midgley notes that the Prologue was composed for the tenth performance of the play in 1898, (215) it was not published until the second edition of Der Erdgeist in 1902 (215). A year later, in 1903, the article “der” was dropped from the title and the play was now called simply Erdgeist (Vinçon, FW 144).

139 ‘Bei den z.T. von Auflage zu Auflage vorgenommenen Bearbeitungen der Tragödie ‘Erdgeist’ handelt es sich vor allem um Änderungen, die auf Wedekinds Bühnen-erfahrungen--er avanciert allmählich zum erfolgreichen Theaterautor--beruhen” (FW 137). As a letter written to Beate Heine on March 18, 1903 attests, however, Wedekind actually did exorcize quite a bit from the original. “Ich habe vieles darin gestrichen und vielem einen natürlichen Klang zu geben versucht, so daß sich nun vielleicht auch irgend eine andere Bühne dafür erwärmen wird. Bis jetzt hat nämlich, trotz des Berliner Erfolgs, noch nicht ein einziges Theater auf das Stück angebissen” (GB 2:96). While these changes may not have been substantial content-wise, as Vinçon maintains, Hahn notes that they were substantial in number with a total of 161 deletions or changes (Werke 1:705).
Wedekind also added and deleted characters, continually reworked other characters, and most importantly made numerous changes to Lulu’s character.\textsuperscript{140}

The companion play, which now dropped the addendum “Eine Monstretragödie” to be called simply \textit{Die Büchse der Pandora}, became a three-act play adding a new opening act but keeping the original fourth and fifth acts as its Acts II and III. Because Wedekind made barely any changes to this work, it did not come into print until 1902. Even then, in response to the extreme pressures from the censors, Wedekind’s publisher, Langen-Verlag, refused to publish it and Wedekind turned to Insel Verlag instead.\textsuperscript{141} While this play’s performance remained prohibited in Germany until the abolition of censorship in 1918,\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Die Büchse der Pandora} was scheduled to be performed in Josefstadt, Austria as early as 1905. As a

\textsuperscript{140}For an in-depth analysis of the changes the characters underwent, see Midgley. For a line-by-line analyses of the differences in the various versions of the Lulu-plays, see Vinçon’s annotated edition of the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{141}Despite being printed by Insel, the first edition never hit the stands but was instead confiscated by the censors (see Vinçon, “Unterdrückt” 16). Ironically, in 1913 Wilhelm Weigand, writer and member of the censoring board, recommends a laxening of the censorship against Wedekind not because he felt the board’s measures to be too harsh, but instead because he notes that the extreme censoring reactions against Wedekind actually worked in his favor as a form of free publicity drawing even more unwanted attention to the Lulu-plays. “Ich stehe seit langem auf dem Standpunkt, daß man Wedekind durch ein Verbot nicht zum Märtyrer machen sollte. Wenn die Neugier des Publikums gestillt ist, findet der gesunde Sinn, der sich zuletzt doch immer wieder geltend macht, diese Stücke mit ihrer angeblichen Problemhaftigkeit langweilig, und dann bekommen wir endlich Ruhe” (qtd. in Meyer 282).

\textsuperscript{142}There was a private showing performed in 1902 in the Intimen Theater of Nürnberg under the direction of Emil Meßthaler (Vinçon “Unterdrückt” 17), but it would be another sixteen years before the play would be open to the general public. As Hahn notes, however, once the censorship ban was lifted, \textit{Die Büchse der Pandora} experienced an extraordinary number of performances. “Nach der Aufhebung der Zensur 1918 erreicht die “Büchse der Pandora” sensationelle Aufführungszahlen: 1918/19 9 Premieren mit 934 Vorstellungen, 1919/20 25 Premieren mit 235 Vorstellungen” (Werke 1:707).
decree written on March 15th notes, however, permission was subsequently revoked because of the scandalous nature of the play. In 1906 in response to the continuing pressures against this work, Wedekind added a foreword entitled “Vernichtungsurteil” wherein he attacks the small-mindedness of the censoring board. Despite this forward, however, Wedekind did remove much of the offensive dialogue from the 1906 edition of *Die Büchse der Pandora*. While he kept the original rebuttal against the censors, in 1910 Wedekind retitled this forward “Prolog in der Buchhandlung” and added an admonition to the rest of society as he delineated the roles of the author, reader, publicist, and state’s attorney. Despite his ceaseless attacks against censorship, however, Wedekind continued to remove the more offensive material from *Die Büchse der Pandora*, as his letter of September 30, 1910 to publisher Leopold Jeßner reveals. 143 1910 was also the year that Wedekind once again made substantial changes to *Erdgeist* as he extended the Prologue to include the Animal Trainer’s instructions to Lulu. Finally, in 1913 the Lulu-plays underwent yet a third substantial change. As the new title *Lulu. Tragödie in fünf Aufzügen mit einem Prolog* reveals, this version comes closest to the original manuscript in that it reconnects both plays back into one sans the newer acts that were included when the original was first split in two. Where this work still deviated from the manuscript, however, was in its closing act. Instead of portraying the gruesome details of Lulu’s death, this new version merely alludes to Lulu’s death and moreso has her yearning for it in a sexually suggestive manner. Despite all his rewrites, this version, like all the others, was still considered too scandalous to be printed or performed.

143 In this letter Wedekind writes: “Ich habe eine neue Ausgabe der ‘Pandora’ veranstaltet, in der sich kaum ein Wort mehr findet, an dem die Zensur Anstoß nehmen könnte” (GB 2:248).
in Germany and was therefore only released from the *Aufführungsverbot* in 1918 (Hibberd, 336).

**The Lulu-Plays Reexamined**

In addition to the ambiguous nature of Lulu as well as the numerous changes Wedekind was required to make to his *Lulu*-plays, a third issue which has evoked much scholarly debate, consternation, and even confusion, has been the radically divergent images of Lulu as they were originally presented to the public in *Erdgeist* and *Die Büchse der Pandora*.

i. *Erdgeist*

In the 1895 version of *Erdgeist*, although Lulu is presented as a sexual creature, she is unreflective in her sensuality and follows her desires with a candid simplicity. While we see an evolution or maturing in her character as she appears—sexually at least—to go through the stages of life from childhood to adulthood, Lulu never expresses any signs of true self-reflection. In Chapter Three we noted that as Goll’s wife, Lulu was the epitome of the woman-child and as such treated like a child. Aside from her treatment by others, however, her own mannerisms and behavior too evoke a sense of adolescent naivety. In telling Schön of her carriage ride to the atelier, her response is not that of a mature adult. Instead, the level of excitement and wonder she conveys, evokes much more the image of a child and a little one at that. “Denken Sie, wir fuhren im Trab über die neue Kaibrücke. Ich habe selber

---

144 While this was not open to the public until 1918, Wedekind did present a version of this reunited play as early as April 1905 to a private audience. For a review on this staging, see Theodor Hampe.
kutschieren" (Werke 1:243). She additionally exhibits a childlike uninhibitiveness in the way she
reveals personal information about herself to Schwarz. Even when she tells him how she
dances for Goll, she does so with an air of total incomprehension not only to Goll’s motives
but equally to Schwarz’ disgust and shock thereof. When she finds herself alone with
Schwarz, Lulu reacts like a child scared to be left in the company of a stranger.\(^{145}\)
Interestingly enough, it is only when Schwarz begins to make sexual advances towards her,
that we see Lulu shift momentarily into a more mature mode as her awareness of his motives
comes to the fore.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad \text{"Sie sind nervös . . . (Will ihre Hand fassen.)} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad \text{(wirft ihm den Schäferstab ins Gesicht): Lassen Sie mich in Ruhe! (Eilt zur Entreetür.) Sie bekommen mich noch lange nicht!} \\
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad \text{Sie verstehen keinen Scherz.} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad \text{Doch, ich verstehe alles. Lassen Sie mich nur frei. Mit Gewalt erreichen Sie gar nichts bei mir. Gehen Sie an Ihre Arbeit. Sie haben kein Recht, mich zu belästigen. (Flüchte hinter die Ottomane.) Setzen Sie sich hinter Ihre Staffelei. (Werke 1:251)}
\end{align*}\]

Despite her momentary insight, in the very next instance Lulu reverts back to her childlike
nature when Schwarz corners her for a kiss. Rather than pushing Schwarz vehemently away
or giving in to him languorously or even passionately, as one would expect of an adult
woman, Lulu kisses Schwarz the way a child would an uncle or a family friend, makes a
brief comment about him smelling like tobacco, and then goes back to playing with his
watch.

\(^{145}\)While Wedekind drops the following exchange from the later versions, in the
manuscript he still has Lulu express her astonishment and even nervousness at being left
alone. "\[\text{Schwarz: Was ist Ihnen – Sie sind bleich? / Lulu: Das erste Mal, daß er mich mit jemand Fremdem allein läßt . . .} \]" (Monstre 18).
Schwarz: Gib mir einen Kuß, Eva!
Lulu: (nimmt ihn am Kinn und küßt ihn, wirft die Uhr in die Luft und fängt sie auf): Sie riechen nach Tabak.
Schwarz: Warum sagst du nicht "du"?
Lulu: Es würde unbehaglich. (Werke 1:253)

When Goll suddenly reappears, pounding at the locked door, Lulu’s reaction is one of childish illogic as she assumes Schwarz could protect her through hiding her. "Verstecken Sie mich! O Gott, verstecken Sie mich! . . . . (vor Schwarz niedergesunken, umfaßt seine Knie): Er schlägt mich tot. Er schlägt mich tot" (Werke 1:253).

In her subsequent marriage to Schwarz, Lulu no longer displays the childlike qualities she exhibited as Goll’s wife. Instead, she now takes on the opulent, self-absorbed role of the bourgeois housewife. Most of the day she lounges around the house reading, sleeping, or pampering herself. But while Lulu lives a life of luxury, this is a monotonous existence for her. In the mornings she and Schwarz discuss mundane matters like the local gossip or they take turns reading the mail to each other. Even their more intimate exchanges reflect a lack of excitement. Although married only six months, they already display the habitual responses of a couple married much longer. That there is no spontaneity or even infatuation in their personal interactions can be seen in the customary “little peck on the cheek” Schwarz gives Lulu as he gets ready to go to work.

Schwarz: Und jetzt zur Arbeit. (Nimmt Pinsel und Palette auf, küßt Lulu, geht links die Stufen hinan, wendet sich in der Portier um.) Eva!
Lulu: (läßt ihr Buch sinken, lächelnd): Befehlen?
Schwarz: (sinkt vor der Chaiselongue in die Knie, liebkost ihre Hand): Du trägst die Schuld.
Lulu: (ihm die Locken streichelnd): Du vergeudest mich. (Werke 1:260)
Despite this momentary exchange which suggests a hint of passion, Schwarz' attentions are much more empty compliments than true ardor. When the doorbell interrupts them, Schwarz is easily diverted from his focus on Lulu and upon his return does not pick up where he left off with her, but instead takes up his art supplies and in fact does then leave for work. "Schwarz: (zurückkommend... Pinsel und Palette aufnehmend.) Es ist auch die höchste Zeit, daß ich endlich an die Arbeit gehe. (Nach links ab.)" (Werke 1:261). That Lulu is bored is not only clear through her discussion with Schigolch where she talks of Schwarz falling asleep on her when she is in an amorous mood, but also in the way she wistfully longs for the days when she danced.

Her sense of neglect and need for attention is further emphasized when Schön arrives. In his attempt to break off their illicit relationship, Lulu reacts in a very unsteady, nervous manner that reflects her attempts to ignore his demands.

*Lulu:* Sie können getrost "du" sagen; er ist nicht hier.
*Schön:* Ich danke für die Ehre.
*Lulu:* Ich verstehe nicht.
*Schön:* Das weiß ich. *(Ihr einen Sessel bietend.)* Darüber möchte ich nämlich gerne mit Ihnen sprechen.
*Lulu:* *(sich unsicher setzend):* Warum haben Sie mir denn das nicht gestern gesagt?
*Schön:* Bitte, jetzt nichts von gestern. Ich habe es Ihnen vor zwei Jahren schon gesagt.
*Lulu:* *(nervös):* Ach so. Hm.
*Schön:* Ich bitte dich deine Besuche bei mir einzustellen.
*Lulu:* Darf ich Ihnen ein Elixier ...
*Schön:* Danke. Kein Elixier. Haben Sie mich verstanden?

*(Lulu schüttelt den Kopf.)* (Werke 1:265)
Although Lulu does indeed grasp what Schön is telling her, she does not want to understand. It is only when Schön then makes the mistake of threatening her in order to convince her he is serious, that we see Lulu shift positions as she now calls his bluff. With this move, it becomes clear that Lulu’s character has evolved in that she is no longer the innocent childlike woman who allowed the men to dictate the terms of her life.

Schön: Gut. Sie haben die Wahl. -- Sie zwingen mich zu den äußersten Mitteln -- entweder sich Ihrer Stellung angemessen zu benehmen ...
Lulu: Oder?
Schön: Oder --- Sie zwingen mich -- ich müßte mich an diejenige Persönlichkeit wenden, die für Ihre Aufführung verantwortlich ist.
Lulu: Wie stellen Sie sich das vor?
Schön: Ich ersuche ihren Mann, Ihre Wege selber zu überwachen.

(Lulu erhebt sich, geht links die Stufen hinan.)

Schön: Wo wollen Sie denn hin?
Lulu: (ruft unter der Portiere): Walter!
Schön: (aufspringend): Bist du verrückt?! (Werke 1:265)

Whereas it is clear in the above discussion that Lulu does not want to lose her contact with Schön, Wedekind stresses Lulu’s desperation and fear of rejection even more in the original version of this dialogue as seen in the manuscript.

Lulu: Wenn ich jemandem auf dieser Welt gehöre, dann gehöre ich Ihnen! Sie haben alles für mich gethan! Ich habe alles von Ihnen!--Nehmen Sie es! Nehmen Sie mich als Magd, wenn Sie wollen ...
Schöning: --Ich habe dich erziehen lassen; ich habe dich verheiratet; ich habe dich zweimal verheiratet; nun möchte ich nur noch, daß du eine anständige Frau wirst ...
Lulu: Was kümmert mich das--eine anständige Frau!
Schöning: Wenn du findest, daß du mir Dank schuldig bist, dann zeig es mir.
Lulu: Machen Sie mit mir, was Sie wollen; wozu bin ich denn da! Nur das nicht! Nur das nicht! Werfen Sie mich nicht weg! (Monstre 43)

In this version, it is also she who specifically tells Schwarz that Schöning has rejected her. Schwarz: (den Pinsel in der Hand, von rechts) Was ist denn da ... / Lulu: Er verstoßt mich! Er hat mir tausend Mal gesagt ... / Schöning: Schweig! Schweig! Schweig! / Lulu: Mir tausend Mall gesagt--gestammelt, es gäbe keine Liebe wie meine...” (Monstre 43)
While Lulu no longer bears the characteristics of a child, it is her second husband Schwarz who now, ironically, takes on these attributes in his lack of sexual worldliness. While Schön tries to explain his friend’s reticence for sex as a reflection of his naïveté, “Er ist ein Kindergemüt” (Werke 1:226), Lulu makes it clear she does not want a child; she wants a man. In her own frustration and bewilderment, she pleads with Schön to help Schwarz become sexually mature. 147


From this statement it becomes obvious that Lulu’s affair with Schön is, to some degree, necessitated out of conjugal desires her husband does not fulfill. While she has tried to entice Schwarz herself and even employed methods that would have worked with Goll, her efforts have been for naught. That Lulu does not behave in an irrational manner but instead softly pleads with Schön to help her, adds to the impression in this scene that she has turned to him not because her sexual appetite is voracious, but rather because she is indeed being neglected by Schwarz who is truly as banal as Lulu describes. When she finally admits that she often dreams of her days with Goll, Schön’s comment “der war allerdings nicht banal”

147 As the typical bourgeois housewife, Lulu was expected in this marriage to profess no sexual longings of her own. Her wish, however, that her husband exhibit a sexual appetite was in keeping with contemporary contentions that held women secretly yearned for strong, sexually aggressive men (see Krafft-Ebing, 196). And while it was held that childlike innocence was a desirable characteristic and considered a virtue in women, the same reticence for sex was considered a lack of worldliness and even a deficiency when displayed in men.
(Werke 1:267) supports her contention that Schwarz is lacking in sexual prowess as well as sexual drive.

Unlike Schwarz, who is oblivious to all, Schön understands and appreciates the sexual qualities that Lulu has to offer. But it is not just because Schön knows her so well that Lulu feels a connection to him she has not felt with the others. She also feels a level of indebtedness to him for lifting her out of a childhood of poverty and deprivation. As Hans-Jochen Irmer observes “Lulu erblickt in Schön ihren Retter und Beschützer, ihren Meister” (135).


Despite the gratitude she professes, once Lulu understands that Schön truly does want to break off relations, she acquiesces with only one request—that Schön point out to Schwarz how he is neglecting her. But Schön wants no part of this. While Lulu has declared the reasons for her emotional connection to him and then nevertheless agreed to break off contact if he help her, Schön throws all of this, ruthlessly and callously, back into her face.

Verheiratet sein, wenn man dich zu jeder Stunde des Tages bei mir ein und aus gehen sieht? -- Warum zum Teufel ist Dr. Goll nicht auch wenigstens ein Jahr noch am Leben geblieben! Bei dem warst du in Verwahrung. Dann hätte ich meine Frau längst unter Dach! (Werke 1:268-69)

A second brutal insult occurs later at the theater when Schön not only objectifies Lulu in front of his fiancee but then additionally takes a stance of moral indignation as he maliciously attempts to degrade her by referencing her indecent past.

_Lulu:_ O Gott -- ich weiß sehr wohl, was aus mir geworden wäre, wenn Sie mich nicht davor bewahrt hätten.
_Schön:_ Bist du denn heute vielleicht etwas anderes?? . . . . Du bist dazu geworden, trotz allem, was ich für deine Erziehung und dein Wohl geopfert habe! . . . . Ich habe, Gott ist mein Zeuge, seit ich mit der Welt und dem Leben ringe, noch niemandem so geflucht!

_Lulu:_ Das kommt von meiner niederen Herkunft.
_Schön:_ Von deiner Verworfenheit!!
_Lulu:_ Mit tausend Freuden nehme ich die Schuld auf mich! Sie müssen sich jetzt rein fühlen. Sie müssen sich jetzt für den sittenstrengen Mustermenschen, für den Tugendbold von unerschütterlichen Grundsätzen halten . . .
_Schön: (stöhnend):_ Oh! Oh! du tust mir weh!
_Lulu:_ Mir tut dieser Augenblick wohl -- ich kann nicht sagen wie! (Werke 1:293-96)

As the above exchange reveals, it is after this second “slap in the face” that the image of Lulu portrayed in Erdgeist begins to change. No longer willing to allow Schön to continue pawning her off onto one husband after another, Lulu now actively works to break his will and force him into marriage. Schön does concede, but shattered by her greater determination, he then turns to morphine as we have seen in the previous chapter. Having first lost his will to Lulu’s onslaught, he now also loses his sex drive. Reminiscent of her marriage to Schwarz, Schön now too begins to neglect Lulu sexually. And just as with Schwarz, Lulu for her part turns once again elsewhere for sexual attention. Unable to accept
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in his own marriage what he himself was willing to do to Schwarz' marriage, however, Schön tries to force Lulu to commit suicide. When she refuses, he attempts to murder her himself. This final act of Erdgeist ends as Lulu turns the gun against Schön and kills him in an act of self-defense.

ii. Die Büchse der Pandora

In order to see a logical connection between Erdgeist and the second Lulu-play, many scholars have interpreted the first play as a critique of marital relations that repress sexuality and Pandora as a critique of commercial interests that pervert sexuality. This connection is precarious at best, but understandable since Wedekind presented these two works as companion plays. There is, however, no clear-cut transition from the innocent, unconscious nature exhibited by Lulu in Erdgeist, even after the insults piled on her by Schön, and the completely degenerate image of her that follows in Pandora. In this second play, Lulu is a calculating, conniving, blackmailing women whose sole purpose in life is to exploit others for personal gain. She is conscious of her sexual allure and uses it to her advantage as she lies, cheats, and steals to get what she wants. When her interests are threatened, she even orders murder.

From the very start of this play we see a Lulu completely different from the one portrayed in Erdgeist as she uses and abuses those around her for her own benefit. Incarcerated for the murder of Schön, Lulu has Alwa, Schigolch, and others working to

---

148 Referred to from here on as simply Pandora.

149 See in particular Hector Maclean and Midgley.
break her out of prison. Although Lulu’s freedom is at the expense of Geschwitz in that the latter agrees to exchange places with her in prison and furthermore is even willing to contract cholera in order to carry out the escape plan, Lulu remains coldly indifferent to her sacrifice. Because he expects to marry Lulu and reap the financial benefits of a wealthy wife, Rodrigo also plays an important role in her escape. But as with Geschwitz, once Lulu is free, he too becomes extraneous to her needs. We even see Lulu deliberately and maliciously toying with the affections of Alwa, the one male with whom she has always felt safe.

Just how devious Lulu is, however, only becomes clear in Act II. Through a confrontation with Geschwitz, who is free once again, we discover that Lulu feigned feelings of passion for her in order to get her cooperation in the prison escape. In an effort to divert her, as well as Rodrigo, who is now attempting to blackmail Lulu for her betrayal of him, Lulu turns to Schigolch for help. Misleading him with the assurance of money, she concocts a plan to have him murder Rodrigo and make Geschwitz an unwitting accomplice. As the following exchange reveals, however, Schigolch wants more than just money from Lulu.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Lulu}: & Besorg es ihm! Ich bitte dich, besorg es ihm! . . . . \\
\textbf{Schigolch}: & Und dann, mein Kind? Was dann? \\
\textbf{Lulu}: & Dann gebe ich dir das Geld für deine Geliebte. \\
\textbf{Schigolch}: & Das nenne ich aber geizig. \\
\textbf{Lulu}: & Was du sonst noch magst! Was ich habe! \\
\textbf{Schigolch}: & Bald sind es zehn Jahre, daß wir uns nicht mehr kennen. \\
\textbf{Lulu}: & Wenn es weiter nichts ist? Aber du hast doch eine Geliebte. \\
\textbf{Schigolch}: & Meine Frankfurterin ist nicht mehr von heute. \\
\textbf{Lulu}: & Aber dann schwöre! . . . . Schwöre, daß du es ihm besorgst! \\
\textbf{Schigolch}: & Ich besorge es ihm. (Werke 1:360-61)
\end{tabular}

Although it has been suggested that Schigolch is her father, his desire to once again take up an incestuous relationship does not trouble Lulu in the least. In fact, as the above discussion
makes clear, Lulu considers this but a trivial request. Her main concern is that the murder be carried out. But Lulu knows that Schigolch is as untrustworthy as she and so in a manner reminiscent of the evil witches of fairy tales, Lulu demands that Schigolch bring her proof when the deed is done. "Morgen bring mir seine goldenen Ringe, die er in den Ohren trägt" (Werke 1:360).

For her part, Lulu must lure Rodrigo and Geschwitz to Schigolch's place. While Lulu truthfully informs Rodrigo she is broke and has no money left to pay his blackmail, she tells him Geschwitz desires him and will pay him for his attentions. To Geschwitz she says something similar about Rodrigo's feelings, but since the Countess is a lesbian, Lulu must extrapolate this lie further in order to convince her to sleep with Rodrigo. To this end, she tells Geschwitz that Rodrigo plans on turning her, Lulu, into the authorities if he cannot have Geschwitz. Unlike Rodrigo, who willingly prostitutes himself for the financial gain he hopes to receive, Geschwitz consents to this only because of her feelings for Lulu. Once again, Lulu gives no credence to the sacrifice Geschwitz makes for her, nor the fear and disgust it evokes in the Countess. Quite to the contrary, she cruelly tells her that sexual contact with Rodrigo might cure her from her own deviant lifestyle. Despite her expressed revulsion of Geschwitz, Lulu again assumes a line of deceit as she once more professes feelings of passion for Geschwitz in order to insure her compliance.

*Lulu:* Ich bin dein, mein Liebling, wenn du den Springfritzen bis morgen beruhigst. Er will nur seine Eitelkeit befriedigt sehen; du mußt ihn beschwören, daß er sich deiner erbarme.

*Die Geschwitz:* Und morgen?

*Lulu:* Ich erwarte dich, mein Herz. Ich werde die Augen nicht aufschlagen, bevor du kommst. Ich sehe keine Kammerfrau,
ich empange keinen Friseur, ich werde die Augen nicht aufschlagen, bevor du bei mir bist.

Die Geschwitz: Dann laß ihn kommen. (Werke I:365)

In Pandora, Lulu’s subsequent fall from socialite to common street whore is not portrayed as an unjust tragedy, but rather as exactly what she deserves. Indeed, one cannot miss the note of poetic justice when Lulu is murdered in a sex crime. She, who has misused her own sexuality for criminal purposes, now herself becomes its final victim.

Conflicts in Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral”

As we mentioned previously, Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral” is not only hard to define, as we have begun to see by looking at the two Lulu-plays, it is also very problematic. Although Lulu, as the supposed personification of Wedekind’s new vitality, has not succumb to the diseases that have incapacitated others, by the last act of Pandora she has fallen into the depths of poverty and despair and now finds herself living among the dregs of society. In this squalorous state, existing on the very brink of death, Lulu no longer functions, nor seems to represent, Wedekind’s higher morality. While many scholars see this deterioration of Lulu as the impossibility for a true “menschliche Moral” to exist in the modern capitalistic world whose sole purpose is to seek financial gain, the release of Wedekind’s personal papers as well as the original five-act manuscript entitled Die Büchse der Pandora: Eine Monstretragödie in fünf Akten problematizes such interpretations and begs for a reexamination of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral.”

Pandora, although censured for many years, underwent very few changes from the last two acts of the original manuscript. It seems, therefore, almost paradoxical that the
image of Lulu projected in this second play would be so completely different from the one projected in Erdgeist. If one looks back to the original manuscript, however, one sees a different Lulu than the one finally allowed on stage in the first Lulu-play. In the Monstretragodie, Lulu is anything but the naïve, childlike nature Wedekind professes he intended her to be. She is instead the incarnate of a femme fatale. With Schwarz, she is not the innocent victim of his advances, but to the contrary, it is she who deliberately seduces him through her own suggestions and provocations. In a very premeditated manner, Lulu sets about enticing Scharz first by describing the dancing she must perform for Goll each evening and then by describing in minute detail the lascivious clothing she wears at home.

\[\text{Lulu:}\]

\[\text{Schwarz:}\]
Das ist ja das reine Bordell!\(^1\)

\[\text{Lulu:}\]
Es ist gemütlich so -- besonders im Winter -- wenn der Salon hübsch warm ist -- -- man kann athmen . . .

\[\text{Schwarz:}\]
Das können Sie doch sonst auch.

\[\text{Lulu:}\]
In diesem Pierrot auch -- mir ist so wohl darin . . . . (einathmend) -- Sehen Sie . . .

\[\text{Schwarz:}\]
Lassen Sie das!! -- (springt auf, wirft Pinsel und Palette bei Seite und geht erregt auf und nieder). (Monstre 20-21)

\(^1\)While Lulu's clothing description echoes back to the outfits worn by the prostitutes in Das Sonnenspektrum and thus draws a correlation between her and these types of women, it is Schwarz' remark about the bordello that reinforces this link.
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Having thus begun to arouse Schwarz, the chase that then ensues, is a game of cat-and-mouse for Lulu as she continues to tease and provoke Schwarz.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad (\text{sich ihr nähern}) \text{ Behalten Sie Ihre Stellung...} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad \text{Setzen Sie sich zuerst hinter Ihre Staffelei... (sie flüchtet, da Schwarz sie umfassen will hinter die Ottomane)} \\
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad (\text{will rechts um die Ottomane}) \text{ Sobald ich Sie erst bestraft habe!} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad (\text{am unteren Ende}) \text{ Dazu müssen Sie mich erst haben!} \\
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad (\text{sucht sie von links zu erwischen}) \text{ Das werden Sie gleich sehen...} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad (\text{nach rechts ausweichend}) \text{ Wissen Sie das?-- (ihn neckend) Gus-gus...} \\
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad \text{Bei meiner Seligkeit... (tappt rechts um die Otomane)} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad (\text{Nach links ausweichend})... da-da-da-da! \\
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad (\text{am oberen Ende}) \text{ Das bezahlen Sie mir!...} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad \text{Die Himmelskinder jagen über das Schlachtfeld! -- (rechts, bei den Staffeleien, Schwarzens Bewegungen folgend) -- Ich habe Ihnen ja gesagt -- daß Sie mich nicht bekommen --} \\
\text{Schwarz:} & \quad (\text{hervorkriechend}) \text{ Bleiben Sie nur von den Bildern weg!} \\
\text{Lulu:} & \quad \text{Ich wollte gleich mit einem Rudel Hunde davon sausen... (Monstre 22-23)}
\end{align*}
\]

After Goll has caught them and subsequently died from shock, Lulu marries Schwarz. Despite the fact that she is having an affair with Schöning, Lulu is hysterical when she learns her new husband cannot satisfy her sexually. While the extent of her hysteria is downplayed in later versions, despite Alwa’s reference to her as “eine hysterische Künstlersfrau” (Stücke

\[151\]Commenting on how censorship changed the Lulu-plays, Midgley notes that once this scene was removed after the first edition of 1895, Schwarz’ advances appear much more the result of his own spontaneous arousal than any conscientious machinations on Lulu’s part (213).

\[152\]While Midgley correctly notes that Wedekind is referencing Heinrich von Kleist’s Penthesilea in Lulu’s triumphant cry at the height of this chase, the savagery that Midgley claims to see here is not the same as what one sees with Kleist’s protagonist. The tortured suffering exhibited by Penthesilea will be completely lacking in the cold, unfeeling misuse of others that will become Lulu’s modus operandi.
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214), as is her intense need for sexual gratification, both are made focal points in the manuscript. It is interesting to note that although Lulu supposedly represents Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” Wedekind once again references Psychopathia Sexualis as he not only gives Lulu the anxious symptoms of the hysterical housewife Krafft-Ebing describes in his section entitled “Hysteria,” but also depicts her in the act of automasturbation—a common symptom Krafft-Ebing associated with this malady.153 “In the hysterical the sexual sphere is often abnormally excited. . . . Shameless prostitution, even in married women, may result. In a milder form the sexual impulse expresses itself in onanism” (K-E 493). While Krafft-Ebing labels this abnormal excitement as a defect in the woman, under his section entitled “Hyperæsthesia,” he notes that this behavior can also be brought about if the woman does not find sexual satisfaction at home.

A particular species of hyperæsthesia sexualis may be found in females in whom a most impulsive desire for sexual intercourse with certain men imperatively demands gratification. No doubt “unrequited love” for another man may often affect the married woman who does not either psychically or physically (impotentia mariti) experience connubial satisfaction . . . . This pathological love of married women for other men is a phenomenon in the domain of psychopathia sexualis. (K-E 77-78)

Despite the fact that Schwarz is unable to satisfy Lulu sexually, Schöning’s comment “Du sehst dich nach der Peitsche zurück” (Werke 1:268) makes it clear that the fault lies not only with Schwarz, but with Lulu too. Interestingly enough, with this statement, Wedekind

153This scene was, naturally, very quickly stricken by the censors.
appears to claim that Lulu is not only the personification of insatiable sexuality but even moreso a sexuality that begs to be controlled and dominated.154

Despite the increasing emphasis on Lulu’s need for sex in the previous acts, it is in Act III that the culmination of her depravity is most stressed and that her role as the symbol of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral” becomes the most unstable. Having married Schöning only to then have him become as useless as Schwarz due to a morphine-induced impotence, Lulu finds herself once again experiencing sexual neglect. What is different with her new situation, however, is that Lulu no longer has affairs discretely. Whereas the previous acts show her merely possessing a voracious sexual appetite, by Act III Wedekind now clearly depicts Lulu as a femme fatale-type. Having taken several lovers not only to satisfy her own intense cravings, but simultaneously to bring injury to Schöning for the insults and degradation he has heaped upon her, Lulu sets out to seduce his son, Alwa, as her final act of vindication. She sets the stage for this vengeance by bringing all her lovers together where she knows Schöning will be spying on her. That she sets this illicit game within her and Schöning’s home functions as a double betrayal, not only against Schöning himself as a man unable to control the fidelity of his wife, but also against the sacred privacy of the household, the safe place and haven of the husband. This act of revenge is, however, not just focused on Schöning, but indeed on all men. By titillating one lover after another only to then assign each some menial task which requires them to watch the game she is about to

154 This need to be controlled and dominated is stressed already earlier at the death of Goll, when Lulu comments “Er dressirt mich nicht mehr!” (Monstre 26) and again later while reminiscing with Schigolch about bygone days when she nostalgically says “Du hast mich dressirt” (Monstre 36).
play with Alwa, Lulu cuckholds all her current lovers. Once the unsuspecting Alwa enters, we see Lulu’s true nature unfold. As she maliciously and deliberately arouses him only to continuously reject him, Lulu succeeds in driving Alwa to his knees in total masochistic submission and humiliation. Portraying her power not only over man but also over his manhood, her ultimate victory comes as she assumes the pose of a sadistic seductress. Clamping Alwa’s head between her knees in order to restrain his forward movement, Lulu reaches down and grasps him by his hair as he finally loses control and ejaculates prematurely. Schöning, who has been spying on Lulu, as she well knows, now also loses control and charges in. Wedekind’s stage directions and the words he triumphantly assigns Lulu finish off this scene: “Sie geht die Treppe hinan, lehnt sich in halber Höhe rückwärts gegen das Geländer, die Füße kreuzend, die nackten Arme auf der sammtgepolsterten Rampe. Über die Bühne wegsprechend--Das ist der schönste Augenblick meines Lebens.”

Although it has been argued that Lulu is not, herself, a destructive force, and that it is only through her irrepressible sexuality that society’s “Scheinmorale” are exposed and destroyed, this is not the case in the Monstretragödie. Despite the fact that Wedekind portrays Lulu as more openly aggressive in her search for sex in the manuscript, the machinations he depicts taking place in this scene have nothing to do with sexual gratification. Indeed, her pleasure stems not from any direct physical contact here, but

155 In discussing the characteristics of a femme fatale, it is interesting to note that Hilmes not only describes almost verbatim this very scene, but also Lulu’s motivations. “In den Geschichten von Salome, Judith und Delila ist die Instrumentalisierung der Sinnlichkeit ganz offensichtlich. Alle drei Frauenfiguren setzen ihre erotische Attraktivität ein, um ein bestimmtes Ziel zu erreichen, das außerhalb der Sinnlichkeit liegt und auch mit ihrem eigenen Begehren nicht unmittelbar zusammehängt. In einem Akt der Rache reagieren sie auf die emotionale Verweigerung und die Herabsetzung ihrer Person” (68).
instead from the way she is able to belittle the men around her, exposing all their frailties and weaknesses. As Midgley observes, “her exaltation is purely wanton and destructive” (214). Based on the images of Lulu presented in the first three acts of the Monstretagödie, but especially on the image in the scene above, the degenerated image of her that follows in the Pandora play now makes perfect sense as one sees a different Lulu in the Monstretagödie than the one permitted in the censored versions of these plays.

A New Perspective

Given the strict censorship as well as reticence on the parts of theater directors to stage these plays, Wedekind had to make radical changes to the original Monstretagödie. While the changes Wedekind made to later versions toned down the obvious demonizing aspects of Lulu’s character as well as her blatantly perverse sexuality, an analysis of the titles

of the two companion plays, the circus Prologue, and the Wallenstein motto will reveal aspects of the revised editions that still problematize interpretations that see Lulu as Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral.” For a German-speaking audience at least, the title Erdgeist conjures up images of that terrifying, incomprehensible being in Goethe’s Faust who emerges from the bowels of the earth. While it is not obvious in Goethe’s work whether this spirit is good or evil, despite its connection to Mephistopheles, the addition of the following lines from Schiller’s Wallenstein in Wedekind’s work emphasizes the evil aspects or what Hibberd calls the impossibility of moral purity in a world ruled by a treacherous evil spirit (337).

Mich schuf aus gröberm Stoffe die Natur,
Und zu der Erde zieht mich die Begierde.
Dem bösen Geist gehört die Erde, nicht
Dem guten. Was die Göttlichen uns senden
Von oben, sind nur allgemeine Güter;
Ihr Licht erfreut, doch macht es keinen reich,
In ihrem Staat erringt sich kein Besitz.
Den Edelstein, das allgeschätzte Gold
Muß man den falschen Mächten abgewinnen,
Die Unterm Tage schlimmgeartet hausen.
Nicht ohne Opfer macht man sie geneigt,
und keiner lebet, der aus ihrem Dienst
Die Seele hätte rein zurückgezogen. (Stücke, 85)

While many scholars interpret this evil spirit as commercial interests that warp or destroy the pure sexuality Lulu supposedly represents as this earth spirit,¹⁵⁷ such interpretations do not take into account the title of the companion play nor the original conception of Lulu as

¹⁵⁷See in particular Lorenz and Boa.
revealed in the manuscript. Rather than being an ambiguous force of nature, as these scholars have maintained, "Erdgeist is," as Peacock counters, "not 'the wild, beautiful animal', 'das Unbewuβte', 'der Instinkt', and so on; it is der böse Geist, the seduction and corruption of the human ideal" (107).

That Lulu is indeed representative of this evil spirit is not only reflected in the name of the second play, Die Büchse der Pandora which recalls the myth of Pandora and all the diseases and ills she spilled out onto mankind, but also in the first play, Erdgeist, when Schön describes Lulu as not only the bearer of sickness, but as the sickness itself. "Du hastest mir als unheilbare Seuche an" (Stücke 153). This emphasis on disease is reinforced further when Schön also correlates her to the plague that so devastated Europe throughout the centuries. "Der reine Augiasstall. Das mein Lebensabend. Man soll mir einen Winkel

---

158 One must keep in mind, however, that many of these scholars did not have access to the original manuscript and were therefore unfamiliar with the extreme changes the Lulu-figure underwent over the course of twenty-one years.

159 For changes in Pandora's meaning from Goethe's humanized conception of a "monotheism that worships Eros as its supreme divinity" to Wedekind/Berg's embodiment of an amoral principle in the guise of a "demonology of sex," see Erich Heller.

160 Just as Goethe's Erdgeist carries ambiguous elements within it, so too does the myth of Pandora which simultaneously defines her as both an innocuous woman whose curiosity unleashes plagues upon mankind, but then also as the plagues themselves. As Edith Hamilton notes, according to legend, Zeus created Pandora in order to punish mankind for forming an alliance with Prometheus. "He made a great evil for men, a sweet and lovely thing to look upon . . . When this beautiful disaster had been made, Zeus brought her out and wonder took hold of gods and men when they beheld her. From her, the first woman, comes the race of women, who are an evil to men, with a nature to do evil. Another story about Pandora is that the source of all misfortune was not her wicked nature, but only her curiosity" (Hamilton 88).

161 For further correlations between Lulu and disease see Footnote 10 in Chapter Five.
zeigen, der noch rein ist. Die Pest im Haus. . . . Der Schmutz -- der Schmutz” (Stücke 143-44). In addition to the mythological reference, the term “Büchse” was already during Wedekind’s time a crude double-entendre for the female genitalia. This play on words, then, was an additional suggestion that the manner in which women, and Lulu in particular, bring corruption to mankind is through their sexuality. Following the same line of argument, Rothe notes “nicht etwa hat Lulu die Büchse in ihrem Besitz, sondern sie selbst ist die Büchse” (FW 55).

Of much greater interest than these titles or even the Wallenstein motto, however, is the Prologue Wedekind added to the Lulu-plays in 1898. In this new introduction, Wedekind has an animal trainer introduce various exotic animals to his audience. One of the stanzas, as many scholars have noted, alludes to Wedekind’s contempt for the Naturalist playwrights of his day. "Was seht ihr in den Lust- und Trauerspielen?!—/ . . . / Der eine

---

162 The connection between Pandora and Erdgeist goes even further, as Boa notes. “Pandora was an earth spirit too, fashioned from clay by Hephaestus” (Circus 61). Tilly Wedekind too stresses the connection between the Earth Spirit and Pandora. “[V]ermutlich hat er sich etwas dabei gedacht, als er eines seiner Stücke Die Büchse der Pandora nannte und das andere Erdgeist, was an das griechische ‘Gaia’ gemahnt, den Namen der Erdgöttin, die wiederum eine andere Erscheinungsform der Pandora ist” (297-98).

163 Concurring with Rothe, Höger suggests a new title for this work. “Das Stuck heißt also in Wirklichkeit ‘Die Scheide’” (103).

164 Despite contending that Wedekind added the Prologue as an afterthought, Michelsen stresses the deciphering character of this addition. “For though the Prologue to Erdgeist was added by Wedekind as an afterthought, it must, as Prologue, be an attempt to assist an audience to place the play in a relevant conceptual framework” (338).

165 As Alan Best notes, however, these lines reflected much more than Wedekind’s contempt for Naturalist theater. “Though opposed to Naturalism as a dramatic technique, Wedekind was even more opposed to Gerhart Hauptmann, the leading exponent of this
Held kann keinen Schnaps vertragen, / Der andre zweifelt, ob er richtig liebt, / Den dritten
hält ihr an der Welt verzagen, / Fünf Akte lang hört ihr ihn sich beklagen, / Und niemand,
der den Gnadenstoß ihm gibt.” (Stücke 88). Against these domesticated and sickly types,
which Rasch indicates, do not find themselves just on stage, “sondern ebenso im
bürgerlichen Publikum” (410), the following lines jutapose the wild and vigorous. 166 “Das
wahre Tier, das wilde, schöne Tier, / Das--meine Damen!--sehn Sie nur bei mir.” (Stücke
88). Although Lulu, presented as that beautifully wild animal, can be seen here as
representative of mankind’s lost vitality, the manner in which she is introduced makes her
vitality and thus her representation very problematic. While Midgley correctly notes that
Wedekind depicts all his characters as animals and therefore does not see the bestial nature
of Lulu as any different than that superimposed onto the other characters, he overlooks the
fact that the particular animal form Wedekind gives Lulu is that of the snake—that creature
which in biblical tradition links woman through her sexuality, and specifically her
destructive sexuality, to evil. More so than the type of animal Wedekind assigns to Lulu, it
is Wedekind’s introduction of Lulu by an animal trainer which Hilmes finds even more

movement, and he used the Prologue for an attack upon him. Hauptmann had abused
Wedekind’s confidence in his drama Das Friedenfest (The Coming of Peace, 1890),
where Hauptmann depicted the contentious relationship between father and son that
actually led Wedekind in the autumn of 1886 to strike his father and leave home” (12).
As his wife Tilly relates, it was in part this betrayal by Hauptmann that also sparked
Wedekind to write Frühlings Erwachen. “Eigentlich hat Frank, verärgert und angereggt
durch Hauptmanns Friedenfest, bald darauf Frühlings Erwachen geschrieben, worin er
nun selbst seine Eltern darstellte und gleichfalls, wie vorher Hauptmann, tatsächlich
stattgefundenen Gespräche verwendet hat” (94).

166 As Strich states, “Sozialismus, Frauenemanzipation, Vererbungstheorie und seelische
Problematik hatten die naturalistische Dichtung zu einer ‘pedantischen Gouvernante’
gemacht. Wedekind aber stellt dem Naturalismus die Natur entgegen” (180-91).
troubling and suspect. "Daß sie als Schlange bezeichnet wird . . ., ist dabei ebenso
verdächtig wie ihre Ankündigung durch einen Tierbändiger paradox" (155). Although the
dompteur presents Lulu as his greatest prize, he also warns against her, decrying her as a
serpent created to cause disaster, to seduce, and to murder. Additionally, he alerts the
audience to her dissimulating and deceptive nature.

Sie ward geschaffen Unheil anzustiften,
Zu locken, zu verführen, zu vergiften—
Zu morden ohne daß es einer spürt.
Mein süßes Tier, sei ja nur nicht geziehrt!
Nicht albern, nicht gekünstelt, nicht verschroben,
. . .
Du hast kein Recht, uns durch Miaun und Fauchen
Die Urgestalt des Weibes\footnote{While it is appropriate that Wedekind use the term "Weib" here since he is denoting one of the sexes, this term takes on additional connotations in the late-nineteenth-century Wilhelmine world as Dolf Sternberger notes. "Es ist die Zeit, in der, abseits von Frau und Dame, 'das Weib' schlechthin begriffen werden sollte, in der dieses Wort einen ganz neuen Klang . . . nämlich den eines gleichsam stets nackten, schillernden und glitzernden Naturwesens, eines prähistorischen Tieres, der Schlange oder Katze nahe und verwandt" (117).} zu verstauchen, (Stücke 89)

Although Wedekind portrays Lulu here as wild and dangerous, he also portrays her as a
possession of the animal trainer, the one individual who can curb and control her, if not tame
her. Thus, it is not true wildness with which Wedekind tantalizes the audience, but as
Michelsen observes, only its pretext. "[N]icht eigentlich die Freiheit der Bestie, nur die
Vorstellung daran sollte ja die satten Sinne kitzeln; das wilde wohl, aber das dressierte Tier,
das der starke Mann mit der Peitsche . . . bändigt und in Bann hält, war auch Wedekinds Idol
vom Weib" (59). It is this image, then, the semi-wild-woman controlled by the whip-
wielding man, that problematizes Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral” most and this image that will be analyzed further in the following chapter.

Since we have already discussed how the two plays’ titles as well as the Wallenstein motto and the 1898 Prologue function as ciphers for unraveling the mysteries of Lulu’s character, mention must now be made of the name Wedekind chose for his protagonist. Much has been written about the allusions and meanings behind the various names the different male characters inscribed onto Lulu. Nelly, as her first husband Goll refers to her, evokes, so Hibberd, “an abbreviation for Helen . . . suggest[ing] her beauty but also her threat to the peace of her husband and of men in general” (342). Additionally, since this name also summons memories of the Trojan War, it simultaneously stands for the chaotic principle of this war which had its impetus in female sexuality.  

While Lulu’s second husband means to imply the innocence of original woman when he refers to her as Eve, this name too carries connotations of death and destruction as it evokes she who caused man’s fall from grace. Mignon, Schön’s appellation for her, not only recalls the charm and mystery of the woman-child in Goethe’s Wilhelm Meister, but as Rose suggests, also the “unsophisticated, the puzzling, and the demonic” (37). While each of these names can be

168 As Hibberd too observes, Wedekind’s indebtedness to Johann Bachofen can be seen here in the link the latter makes between Helena and Pandora. “Nicht dazu ist Helena mit allen Reizen Pandoras ausgestattet, damit sie nur Einem zu ausschließlichem Besitz sich hingebe” (447).

169 While Boa draws another correlation between Lulu and Mignon when she stresses that Lulu too cannot be made to dance upon command (Circus 62), this contention is in direct contradiction to the relationship Lulu has with Goll, who does indeed command her to dance each evening. The individual who cannot command this of her is Schön, who does not want her to dance so much for his own pleasure as that of his fiancée. And interesting correlation that Irmer draws is between this name and the one Schwarz gave Lulu.
understood to reflect what each man wants to see in Lulu, they also denote Lulu’s character as something in flux, constantly shifting and changing. Thus as Michelsen contends, this elusive quality in Lulu’s character echoes Wedekind’s concurrence with contemporary discourses and in particular with Schopenhauer who believed that women were Raubtiere—shifty creatures, not only deceitful and disseminating by nature, but animalistic in tendency. "[W]ie den Löwen mit Klauen und Gebiß, den Elefanten mit Stoßzähnen, den Eber mit Hauern, den Stier mit Hörnern und die Sepia mit der wassertrübenden Tinte, so hat die Natur das Weib mit Verstellungskraft ausgerüstet, zu seinem Schutz und Wehr. . . . Die Verstellung ist ihr daher angeboren" (SW 679). 170

Since each name also carries within it the same ambiguity seen in the titles of both plays, however, they do little to aid in interpreting Lulu’s true function within these plays.


170 That Lulu is conscious of and actively manipulates this ability to disseminate is clear when she states “Wenn ich mich besser aufs Theaterspielen verstände, als man auf der Bühne spielt, was hätte aus mir werden wollen?” (Stücke 130). Alwa as the writer of the Lulu-plays also comments on her proficiency at switching roles. “Ich wüßte doch, daß Sie sich darauf verstehen, Kostüme zu wechseln” (Stücke 129).
It is in looking at her original name, the one Wedekind gave her,¹⁷¹ and in particular at Rose’s analysis thereof, that one potentially gains more insight into Lulu’s character.¹⁷²

The name Lulu probably derives from the Babylonian-Assyrian demon Lilit or Lilu; in Hebrew legend the first wife of Adam was named Lilith. A harlot-demoness, she embodied uncontrolled sexuality, which in Judeo-Christian religious traditions was equated with evil power. Lilith also exhibited a rebellious independent concept of herself: in the twelfth century midrash Numeri Rabba she refuses the missionary position during sexual relations, saying, “I also was made from dust, and am therefore your equal.” She is the very opposite of the innocent virgin, submissive wife, and good mother. (173)

It is in this name, finally, that the ambiguity of Lulu’s character disappears. Having named her after a demon goddess of voracious sexual appetite, Wedekind depicts Lulu as a woman who refuses to submit, sexually or in any other way, to male authority. As Kutscher observes, “Lulu ist . . . nicht das Weib, sondern das zerstörende Prinzip im Weibe, eben ihre Sexualität an sich” (W 123). Although Wedekind professes having envisioned Lulu as the archetype of womanhood—the essence of original sexual vitality, it has become increasingly clear that he sees this sexuality as something out of control, something bestial that must be brought under the cultural whip of civilization. Interestingly enough, Wedekind also portrays this sexuality, as represented by Lulu, as desiring and longing for control, first when Schöning comments, “Du sehst dich nach der Peitsche zurück” (Monstre 40) and then again

¹⁷¹This is also the name Lulu reclaims for herself in the original manuscript when Schöning tries to define her. “Schöning: Dein Fleisch heißt Selbstüberwindung. Lulu: Mein Fleisch heißt Lulu” (Monstre 66).

¹⁷²Although Irmer already makes the connection between Lulu and Lilith as early as 1970, he does not superimpose onto her the same evil as seen in the quotes Rose presents. In fact, he sees her as an innocent who is unaware of her powers of seduction. “Lulu ist zwar Lilith, aber eine Lilith von kindlicher Unschuld” (133).
later when he tells Schwarz, “Sie will die Peitsche!” (Monstre 44). Wedekind stresses this desire even more by the 1895 version when he adds the line “Laß sie Autorität fühlen! Sie verlangt nicht mehr, als unbedingt Gehorsam leisten zu dürfen” (Werke 1:273). 173

While control is something for which Lulu may indeed yearn, this is not something the men in the Lulu-plays have been capable of wielding over her. Reflecting various forms of late-nineteenth century decadence themselves, these men do not have the strength of spirit or of will to bring Lulu under their power. Despite their weaknesses, however, this chapter has shown that Lulu’s vitality, touted by many as so rejuvenating, has in fact been destructive rather than constructive as it accentuates precisely those flaws and weaknesses seen in the men around her. With Lulu’s sexuality shown to be lacking the revitalizing qualities seen previously in the young girls of Mine-Haha and Sonnenspektrum, it is no longer possible to accept Lulu as the symbol of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral.” Bearing this in mind, Chapter Five will now look to the role of the dompteur to understand how the issue of control functions within Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral” and what possible role Lulu’s character actually plays within these parameters. Bearing this in mind, Chapter Five will now look to the role of the dompteur to understand how the issue of

173 Of course, true to form, in the original version Wedekind also adds a touch of sadomasochism as he there portrays Lulu relishing physical chastisement.

Lulu: Willst du denn nicht wieder mal . . .
Schöning: Was denn?
Lulu: Was denn anders. -- Du mußt mich binden und peitschen.
Schöning: Umsönst!
Lulu: Bis Blut kommt. -- Ich schreie nicht. -- Ich beiße auf mein Taschentuch. (Monstre 223)
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control functions within Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral” and what possible role Lulu’s character actually plays within these parameters.
CHAPTER 5
THE ROLE OF THE DOMPTEUR

It is obvious from Wedekind’s works that his intention was to destabilize the falsifying values of a society which hid its decadence behind pretentious moral codes. As we have seen, however, it was through female sexuality—and in particular insatiable sexuality—that Wedekind tried to attain this goal. While Chapter Three delineated how Lulu’s irrepressible sexuality exposed and undermined the distorted images of masculinity and femininity that a corrupt society had sought to superimpose onto it’s men and women, Chapter Four problematized Lulu’s own vitality and her role as the bearer of a new life-affirming energy. Once the rejuvenating aspects of her sexuality were discredited, understanding Lulu as the personification of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral” became equally invalidated. With Lulu thus rejected as the embodiment of Wedekind’s new way of life, this chapter will now analyze what role Lulu, and in particular female sexuality, did indeed play in Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” and what other character, if any, might better symbolize the concept of regained vitality Wedekind sought to describe and to realize.

A Reexamination of Lulu’s Function

Having already established Lulu’s nature in Chapter Four, a closer examination of the Prologue of the Lulu-plays will afford us more insight not only into her role within these
works, but likewise the role of the male characters. While the Prologue is set up to echo a
circus ring with an animal trainer presenting his menagerie of dangerous, exotic animals, we
quickly learn that the majority of these beasts are mere Haustiere living a comfortable,
domesticated existence. "Haustiere, die so wohlgesittet fühlen, / An blasser Pflanzenkost ihr
Mütchen kühlen / Und schwelgen in behaglichem Geplärr, / Wie jene andern -- unten im
Parterre." (PDV 1:236). Although we noted in Chapter Four that this first group of passive
animals is representative of the characters in Naturalist plays, when next a more aggressive
group of animals is presented, the manner in which Wedekind introduces them also
accentuates their loss or lack of wildness. 174

    Sie sehen den Tiger, der gewohnheitsmäßig,
    Was in den Sprung ihm läuft, hinunterkriecht;
    Den Bären, der, von Anbeginn gefräßig,
    Beim spätten Nachtmaal tot zu Boden sinkt;
    Sie seh'n den kleinen amüsanten Affen
    Aus Langeweile seine Kraft verpaff'n;
    Er hat Talent, doch fehlt ihm jede Größe,
    Drum kokettiert er frech mit seiner Blöße;
    Sie seh'n in meinem Zelt, meiner Seel,
    Sogar gleich hintern Vorhang ein Kamel! --
    Und sanft schmiegt das Getier sich mir zu Füßen,
    Wenn -- (er schießt ins Publikum)
    -- donnernd mein Revolver knallt. (PDV 1:236)

Despite much speculation about which character each animal specifically represents,

Wedekind left behind no definitive answers. At best, we can draw correlations based on

174 Although Rothe points out that these animals carry a level of instinctive aggressiveness
not seen in the previous group, he incorrectly attributes this quality to all four. "Anders
als die dramatisierten 'Haustiere' Ibsens und Hauptmanns sollen Wedekinds Tiere
undomestiziert nach den Instinkten ihrer Art handeln." (FW 100). While this holds true
for Schön's and Goll's characters as well as the animal images to which they are
correlated, it does not hold true for Alwa's and Schwarz'.
similarities found in the animal descriptions and the various males with whom Lulu had contact. Since the Prologue was attached to Erdgeist, it is reasonable to assume that the four creatures described above can be linked to the four husbands Lulu had in this particular play. Of all Lulu’s husbands, it was Schön who most closely approached her in natural vigor. In keeping with his own forceful nature, it therefore makes sense to connect him with the Tiger, since it is the most aggressive and carnivorous of those animals listed. Goll can be understood easily as the Bear, not only because of the type of death both experience, but additionally because circus bears are traditionally associated with dancing, which was at the heart of Goll’s and Lulu’s relationship. While the Ape is a little harder to decipher because it can apply to either Schwarz as painter or Alwa as playwright, it is more feasible that it is linked to Alwa simply because we are informed that this animal does not attain success--and Schwarz, as we know, becomes a famous society painter. By default then, the enigmatic

175 Like those Tigerinnen Casti Piani admires in Tod und Teufel for having the drive, determination, and above all, basic instinct to go after and take what they desired (Werke l:677-78), so too does Wedekind present Schön as a Gewaltnmenschen having similar characteristics.

176 How much their relationship revolves around the dance can be seen at Goll’s death when Lulu comments: “Es ist ihm Ernst. -- Der Tanz ist aus” (Stücke 104).
Camel must fall to Schwarz.\textsuperscript{177} What traits this creature illustrates, however, are left unknown and therefore the connection between it and Schwarz is precarious at best.

The next group of animals are much more prehistoric in nature. It is with this more primaeval lot that Lulu is introduced and grouped. While the Biblical reference to destructive sexuality is abundantly clear in the snake imagery linked to Lulu,\textsuperscript{178} when Wedekind assigns her to this group, he is also placing her among cold-blooded creatures that are not easily tamed.\textsuperscript{179} Without any semblance of warmth or tenderness in their natures, it is difficult for the viewers or readers to make any emotional connection between themselves and these reptiles and harder still to project human emotions onto them.\textsuperscript{180}

\textsuperscript{177} That the camel stands "gleich hintern Vorhang," however, could once again suggest Alwa as the playwright who stands off-stage watching his production as easily as it suggests Schwarz as a painter standing behind his easel. Given the Nietzschian influence in Wedekind’s works, however, the camel could also be referring to the three stages of mankind spoken of in Zarathustra wherein the camel embodies, so Gunter Martens, "die Stufe der Duldung und Entsaugung; die christlich-platonische Kultur und Morallehre einschließlich ihres Niedergangs und ihrer Erstarrung" (53). Despite the ambiguity these animals carry with them, of greater importance here is not so much which animal correlates with which character, except perhaps in the case of Schön, as the fact that all the major characters are stylized as captured animals who, under the whip, have been trained to perform for circus audiences.

\textsuperscript{178} Despite acknowledging the Biblical references the snake evokes, Midgley dismisses the evil connotations these bring with them and instead chooses to see Lulu as simply one among “other exotic reptiles”(215).

\textsuperscript{179} In placing Lulu into this group, one sees also Wedekind’s familiarity with Bachofen’s analysis of Greek mythology wherein the latter notes that the snake and other creeping or slimy creatures were associated with original chaos and with the female principle.

\textsuperscript{180} That she is less than human to the extent that she does not even possess a soul is suggested not only by Emrich who refers to her as “eine ‘unbeseelte Kreatur’”(208) but also in the exchange she and Schwarz have early on in Erdgeist.

\texttt{Schwarz:}  Kannst du die Wahrheit sagen?  
\texttt{Lulu:}  Ich weiß es nicht.
this manner, it is not just Lulu’s lack of humanity which is stressed here but also the slippery, elusive aspects of woman to which Schopenhauer and others alluded.

_Sie seh auch das Gewürm aus allen Zonen:
Chamäleone, Schlangen, Krokodile,
Drachen und Molche, die in Klüften wohnen.
Gewiß, ich weiß, Sie lächeln in der Stille
Und glauben mir nicht eine Silbe mehr --
(Er lüftet den Türvorhang und ruft in das Zelt:)
He, August! Bring mir unsre Schlange her!

(Ein schmerzbäuchiger Arbeiter trägt die Darstellerin der Lulu in ihrem Pierrotkostüm aus dem Zelt und setzt sie vor dem Tierbändiger nieder.)
(PDV 1:236-37)

Despite the fact that the male characters of the Lulu-plays are introduced as animals, and Schön and Goll even as predators, none of them possess the slyness or cunning to conquer Lulu’s bestial nature. Even though as the Tiger, Schön is a leader in the jungle and consequently has the potential strength and shrewdness to overpower Lulu, he too is no match for her craftiness or the ravenous sexuality of her animal instinct. Although as a

_Schwarz:_ Glaubst du an einen Schöpfer?
_Lulu:_ Ich weiß es nicht.

_Schwarz:_ Hast du eine Seele?
_Lulu:_ Ich weiß es nicht. (Stücke 106)

This lack of knowledge simultaneously stresses Lulu as a creature who acts purely on animal instincts versus thought processes. That Lulu reiterates “ich weiß es nicht” over and over again is also in keeping with the general idea that woman was an empty vessel that knew nothing until it was filled by the man. In her book _Das Buch der Frauen_ (1895), Laura Marholm writes: “[Das Weib ist] seelisch und physiologisch, eine Kapsel, über einer Leere, die erst der Mann kommen muß zu füllen. Es weiß nichts von sich, es weiß nichts vom Manne, es weiß nichts von der grossen stummen Unabhänglichkeit des Lebens—nichts wird ihm offenbar in seinen Tiefen, ausser durch das Erlebnis mit dem Mann” (3).
carnivore, Wedekind portrays Schön in the Prologue as having an appetite equal to Lulu’s, within the body of the play he is still restrained by cultural conventions. As we saw in Chapter Three, he has neither the courage to completely dismiss the bourgeois norms that confine him nor the will to bend Lulu to those norms. While his various weaknesses have already been enumerated in Chapter Three, a final example will clarify to what extent Lulu actually takes on dompteur-like characteristics in her interactions with Schön. That it is she and not Schön who is the master is first made clear when Lulu declares he does not have the strength to break free of her. She then accentuates this statement when she dictates to him the letter that will end his marital engagement. As she commands him to write the words “Ich schreibe Ihnen an der Seite der Frau, die mich beherrscht” (Stücke 142), Schön knows it is over with him. He, the powerful newspaperman, still holds the pen, but ironically he is no longer in command of what he writes. This emasculates him socially as well as psychologically and in a crude association can be seen as Schön still possessing the phallus, but Lulu now commanding its functions. Conscious that he is in essence signing his own social death sentence, Schön exclaims “Mein Todesurteil!” (Stücke 141) as he begins to write and then “Jetzt--kommt die--Hinrichtung” (Stücke 142) once he completes the task.

181 That Schön might not be as strong as Lulu is even suggested by the dompteur when he intimates that the outcome of a battle between the Tiger and Snake would not be as clear-cut as one might initially expect. “Es ist jetzt nichts Besondres dran zu sehen, / Doch warten Sie, was später wird geschehen: / Mit starkem Druck umringelt sie [the Snake] den Tiger; / Er heult und stöhnt! – Wer bleibt am Ende Sieger?!” (Werke 1:237).

182 It is also here that Midgley asserts Wedekind’s strongest statement against phony morals of society comes across. “It is in the pitting of this Earth Spirit against Schön’s pretensions of rational and conventional dominion that the potential in Wedekind’s material for the exposure of social hypocrisy and social constraints becomes fully realized”(226-27).
In showing Schön that she can evoke his desire at her will, Lulu demonstrates to him that he is controlled not only by his desire, but more importantly by her control of his desire. While Lulu has been able to conquer and humble Schön, this is but a fleeting victory. In his distress, he now turns to heroin as his new mistress. The drug dependence which ensues leaves him with the inability to function sexually. While we have already seen in Chapter Three that his impotence is not merely metaphorical but a reality of his drug addiction, it is in this scene that he specifically blames Lulu for its debilitating effects.

\[ \text{Schönig: } \text{(links vorn, hat das kleinere Etuis geöffnet und macht sich abgewandt eine Einspritzung unter die Manchette) . . .} \\
\text{Lulu: } \text{Du solltest das nicht thun . . .} \\
\text{. . . .} \\
\text{Du hattest mir versprochen -- du wolltest es nicht mehr thun . . .} \\
\text{. . . .} \\
\text{Schönig: } \text{Deshalb hatte ich es auch weggeschlossen . . .} \\
\text{Lulu: } \text{-- Du bist mir nichts mehr . . .} \\
\text{Schönig: } \text{Ich habe es ja versucht . . .} \\
\text{Lulu: } \text{Es macht dich todt . . .} \\
\text{Schönig: } \text{(für sich) Ihr dank ich es . . .} \text{(Monstre 58)} \]

183) In discussing anxious masculinity, Breitenberg notes that the way desire is expressed becomes central in the negotiation of power between the sexes. “[O]verwhelming desire effeminizes men because it makes them like women; that is, unable to exercise the self-control and reason that constitutes the male subject and differentiates him from women. [M]asculinity requires the governance of one’s desire rather than enslavement to it; . . . it demands a congruence between outward appearance and inner selfhood such that no interpretive anxiety ances” (161-62).

184) That interaction with Lulu is like contact with a contagion that ruins the body, mind, and spirit is asserted even more firmly later by Alwa when he tells her: “Wer anders als meine Frau hat mich auf das Krankenlager gebracht? . . . Wer hat mich in den Kot geschleift? -- Wer hat mich zum Mörder meines Vaters gemacht?” (Stücke 214) and also by Casti Piani “Du liebst schon zu lange . . . . Einem gesunden jungen Menschen ruinierst du nur das Nervensystem” (Stücke 192). Even more damning are comments by Alwa that appear only in the original manuscript. “Sie hat mich ausgefressen wie eine Pestbeule [. . .] Sie hat mich zu einem Versammlungslokal gemacht, in dem alle Gifte und Parasiten ihre babylonischen Orgien feiern” (Monstre 118).
Here once again, then, we see that Lulu does not have the rejuvenating effect on men Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral” was supposed to bring about, but quite to the contrary, a devitalizing one. While Schön is the only man Wedekind portrays as being anywhere near to Lulu’s equal and therefore the only real possible mate for her, even he is no true match for her—first, because he does allow social conventions to govern him, and more importantly, as his morphine addiction attests, because he allows Lulu to govern him.

The one male in the Prologue who is portrayed as able to counter Lulu is not matched up with her as a potential partner, but is instead pitted against her in a scene of violent domination as he cracks his whip over her and the other animals. By portraying the dompteur as the only human among the menagerie of animals presented in the Prologue, Wedekind confers on him a level of evolution the others as mere beasts do not have. Additionally, by making him their master, Wedekind places the animal trainer in a authoritative position over them. This distinction acknowledges him not only as a man among men, but where Lulu is concerned, also as the only type of man able to conquer and control her animalistic qualities. Although this ringmaster is in command, it is not his skill

---

185 While both Vinçon and Glaser note the strong Nietzschean influence on Wedekind’s earliest works, in this scene in particular we can see this in the way the dompteur’s actions echo the advice of the old woman in Zarathustra. “Du gehst zu Frauen? Vergiß die Peitsche nicht!” (82) Indeed, as Kieser notes in his article “Vorfrühling,” Wedekind’s poem “Der Übermensch” makes it clear that he was familiar with this particular work by Nietzsche. Furthermore, as Lorenz notes, it is not just in the dompteur-figure that we see Nietzsche’s influence, but in Lulu herself. “In Lulu stellt Wedekind das Urweib nach der Definition Nietzsches auf die Bühne, das Weib, das ein Raubtier ‘böser und klüger als der Mann’ ist’” (49).
with the whip, although this is a symbol of mastery,\textsuperscript{186} nor his physical strength which the Prologue lauds, but rather his mind as we are told that he who is "klug" can overpower those who are merely "stark."

Hier kämpfen Tier und Mensch im engen Gitter,
Wo jener höhnend seine Peitsche schwingt
Und dieses, mit Gebrüll wie Ungewitter,
Dem Menschen mörderisch an die Kehle springt;
Wo bald der Kluge, bald der Starke siegt,
Bald Mensch, bald Tier geduckt am Estrich liegt;
Das Tier bäumt sich, der Mensch auf allen vieren!
\textit{Ein eisig kalter Herrscherblick} --

\textit{Die Biestie beugt entartet das Genick}
\textit{Und läßt sich fromm die Ferse draf postieren.}\textsuperscript{187} (\textit{Stücke} 87)

As the following stanza makes clear, it is his force of will which cowers the animal and thus demands respect.

Und nun bleibt noch das Beste zu erwähnen:
Mein Schädel zwischen eines Raubtiers Zähnen.
Hereinspaziert! Das Schauspiel ist nicht neu,
Doch seine Freude hat man stets dabei.
Ich wag’ es, ihm den Rachen aufzureißen,
Und dieses Raubtier wagt nicht zuzubeißen.
So schön es ist, so wild und buntgefleckt,
\textit{Vor meinem Schädel hat das Tier Respekt!}\textsuperscript{188} (\textit{Stücke} 89)

It is also this very same will that distinguishes and separates him from those other men whom Lulu, as the epitome of sexual voracity, devours. From this we see that the function

\textsuperscript{186}As this symbol, Diethe notes that the whip weaves itself in and out of Wedekind’s plays (96).

\textsuperscript{187}Emphasis mine.

\textsuperscript{188}Ibid.
of the animal trainer is one of control, of discipline, and of domination. With Schön acknowledged as the Tiger and the Prologue now suggesting there is yet another man in the Lulu-plays who is not only more powerful than Schön but actually able to control or conquer Lulu’s seductive nature, we now turn back once more to these works to address the last male with whom Lulu has contact--Jack-the-Ripper.

**Jack-the-Ripper as Dompteur**

Just as with almost every other aspect of the Lulu-plays, Jack-the-Ripper too has been interpreted in a wide variety of manners from the ultimate decadence of mankind that squelches the last hope of a return to the vitality that Lulu offers to the other extreme of being the savior of man-kind, destroying that which would destroy civilization. While Kutscher sees Wedekind’s incorporation of this figure, and indeed the inspiration for this “Schauertragödie,” as triggered by the White Chapel murders that were so notorious in London in the late 1880s, and indeed Vinçon suggests Wedekind was researching these brutal murders when he visit a London archive, it is more plausibly through Krafft-Ebing

---

189 For the perspective that sees Wedekind portraying Jack as a perversion of society, see among others, Emrich who describes him as “brutale, enthemmte Natur . . . [der] selbst nur Ausdruck der gesellschaftlichen Perversion aller natürlichen Liebe [ist]” (223) and Lorenz who denotes him as the representative of “der lustfeindlichen vaterrechtlichen Gesellschaft” (49-50). For those who contend Wedekind meant to portray the opposite interpretation, see Rose who sees Wedekind representing Jack as “the avenger of society” (185) and M. Helena Gonçalves da Silva who notes the bourgeois spirit embodied in Jack avenges itself on Lulu and preserves the bourgeois order at “a moment of pathological nihilism” (19).

once again that Wedekind obtained the source material for this character. From his second edition of 1887 on, Krafft-Ebing includes Jack-the-Ripper in his subsection entitled “Lust-Murder (Lust Potentiated as Cruelty, Murderous Lust Extending to Anthropophagy).” Listed as Case 17, Krafft-Ebing describes Jack-the-Ripper thus:

Jack the Ripper.—On December 1, 1887, July 7, August 8, September 30, one day in the month of October and on the 9th of November, 1888; on the 1st of June the 17th of July and the 10th of September, 1889, the bodies of women were found in various lonely quarters of London ripped open and mutilated in a peculiar fashion. The murderer has never been found. It is probable that he first cut the throats of his victims, then ripped open the abdomen and groped among the intestines. In some instances he cut off the genitals and carried them away; in others he only tore them to pieces and left them behind. He does not seem to have had sexual intercourse with his victims, but very likely the murderous act and subsequent mutilation of the corpse were equivalents for the sexual act. (90-91).\textsuperscript{191}

Despite his listing in Psychopathia Sexualis and the deviant connotations that this carries with it, Jack is still portrayed as the only male able to conquer Lulu. The reason behind this is best depicted through Boa’s description of him.

Jack the Ripper has the animalesque features of a powerful, low-set physique and springy gain. . . . His deep breathing and staring red-rimmed eyes suggest animal growling and the hypnotic gaze of a beast of prey. . . . The meanest of clients, he bargains with the skill of a shopkeeper and talks Lulu into paying him. . . . (Circus 103)

Where Boa does not extrapolate, despite her characterization, is that Jack possesses both the unadulterated vitality and cunning of the animal but simultaneously also the keen acumen

\textsuperscript{191}In discussing conditions which must occur to constitute a lust murder legally, Krafft-Ebing cites Austrian and German statutes and also French physician Ambroise Tardieu’s Attentats which states: “The presumption of a murder out of lust is always given when injuries of the genitals are found, the character and extent of which are such as could not be explained by merely a brutal attempt at coitus; and, still more, when the body has been opened, or parts (intestines, genitals) torn out and are wanting” (qtd. in K-E 527).
and savvy of the businessman. That Wedekind meant these qualities to present Jack in an affirming manner can be supported additionally by referring once again to *Psychopathia Sexualis*. While Krafft-Ebing infers that a strong connection between lust and cruelty is the most extreme expression of sadism,\(^{192}\) as we have seen in Chapter Three, he assigns sadism, as the intensest expression of masculinity, a much more positive quality than he does its feminine counterpart. Furthermore, in noting that the aggressive character may be "excessively developed, and express itself in an impulse to subdue absolutely the object of desire, even to destroy or kill it" (85), but then stating that "tendencies to such outbreaks of sadism are atavistic" (85), Krafft-Ebing attributes a primitive vitality to this sexual aggression that imparts yet another positive feature when viewed from the perspective of Wedekind's "menschliche Moral."\(^{193}\) It is this primordial vitality which Jack has in common with Lulu, who like her name, has something "ganz vorsintflutlich" about her.\(^{194}\) But this connection goes beyond their shared instinctual energies as we are told in the manuscript that Lulu would like to fall into the hands of a lustmuder. "*Lulu: Ich möchte einmal einem

---

\(^{192}\)See also *Crime: It's Causes and Remedies*, a work Krafft-Ebing cited frequently, where Lombroso too cites numerous examples of greatly increased lust correlating with a desire to murder.

\(^{193}\)It is Jack's extreme aggressiveness which Weidl picks up on when he refers to Jack as "die extrem gesteigerte maskuline Quintessenz" (117) and thus contentions like Krafft-Ebing's that he is reinforcing with this observation.

\(^{194}\)While Höger too notes this correlation which he refers to Jack as "eine verwandte männliche Sexualgewalt," it is clear he sees both extremes as deviant when he describes Jack, and therefore Lulu by implication, as "eine schauerliche Abart des eigenen Triebs" (123).
Lustmörderei unter die Hände geraten” (Monstre 60). By the published version of Pandora, Wedekind develops the connection between Jack and Lulu further, giving it a fateful almost otherworldly feel, when he now presents Lulu as having premonitions of this encounter. “Lulu: (im Märchenent): [italics Wedekind's] Mir träumte alle paar Nächte einmal, ich sei einem Lustmörderei unter die Hände geraten” (PDV 1:340). In an even later version, Wedekind actually has Lulu expound on her dream.


But while Jack and Lulu may be meant for each other, as this dream implies, one must remember the roles assigned each in the Prologue. Jack and Lulu are not destined to be partners sharing their lives together, but rather Jack's function is to reign in Lulu's powers of seduction, controlling and curbing her sexuality. This becomes especially clear when one goes back to the original manuscript.

195Ironically, it is Alwa--one of the weakest men in the plays—who warns Lulu of her impending death as he tells her that her effects on him could drive him to be a lustmörder. “[Ich muß meiner Schwärmerei Ausdruck geben, wenn sie mich nicht zum Lustmörder machen soll! . . . Du spielst mit dem Tod” (Monstre 60).

196While these dreams and yearnings serve to strengthen the connection between Lulu and Jack, they also reference Krafft-Ebing who described both dreams and overpowering yearnings as symptomatic of chronic nymphomania. “Chronic Nymphomania . . . is the result of sexual hyperesthesia and exacerbations thereof . . . Even in their sleep . . . [those unfortunate women who suffer from this] are pursued by lascivious dreams” (483-84).
It is interesting to note in the above dream that Lulu does not simply mention being set loose but rather that she is set loose on the men. The implication from this phrasing is that Lulu is a wild animal who is dangerous and even life-threatening to the men around her. While in the published versions of the Lulu-plays it can be argued that the men in these works die because of their own misconceptions and delusions, this is not the case in the original manuscript, as Chapter Four has shown. In this work, Lulu is portrayed as a woman whose sexual appetite is out of control. Indeed, this is emphasized specifically in the texts on several occasions. Alwa, Schigolch, and Casti Piani in one way or another all point out Lulu’s obsession with sex. For his part, Alwa suggests she exert some self control: “Wahren Sie Ihre Selbstbeherrschung!” (Stücke 131); Schigolch notes she spends too much time in bed with men and suggests she take a novel to bed instead: “Du mußt alle acht Tage mal mit einem Roman zu Bett gehen” (Monstre 92); and then Casti Piani, while seeing her “starken Verbrauch an Männern” as profitable from the perspective of a bordello owner, simultaneously notes that she is past her heyday: “Du liebst schon zu lange” (Stücke 192). 197 Given her monstrous appetite, it is easy to see how the subtitle of this work, Eine Monstretragödie, like the titles of the two companion plays Erdgeist and Pandora, can be linked directly to Lulu. That Lulu is herself the monster and her actions monstrous is also supported not only by Schigolch’s comment “Du sollst gestraft werden -- -- wo du gesündigt hast” (Monstre 107) as he lays his hand over her genitals, but also by a dedication to “Dem Rächer” which the manuscript carried at an early stage of the composition.

197At the end of the play these words are reiterated once again by Jack, drawing yet another correlation between him and the male characters, when he says in English “You loved too much already” (Monstre 129)
While Jack has been described himself as animalistic and therefore reflecting the same kind of instinctual nature as Lulu, he is also portrayed as the big game hunter out to capture the wild beast. “It would appear that in adopting the French word ‘monstre’ to describe his drama in the manuscript, Wedekind was seeking to capture an allusion to the hunting down of a ‘monster’ as well as to the generally ‘monstrous’ nature of the events depicted” (Midgley 223).\footnote{This abundant use of the word “monster,” or variations thereof, draws yet another connection to Krafft-Ebing who makes use terms such as monströs and Monstrum frequently throughout his work.}

Beyond the fact that Jack, as Lulu’s last client, insures she will have no other men after him, of interest here is the fact that he does not sleep with Lulu himself. While this is in keeping with Krafft-Ebing’s contention that the lustmurder is not always able to carry out the sex act and therefore the brutal slaying itself functions as the intercourse, by not sleeping with her, Jack also ensures that Lulu’s sexuality will not “infect” him in the mind-robbing manner it has ensnared the other men.\footnote{The detrimental effect Lulu’s sexuality has on the male reason is duly noted throughout the Lulu-plays. Schwarz tells her that since she has entered his life he feels he has lost himself. “[S]eit ich dich habe . . . [bin] ich mir vollständig abhanden gekommen” (Stücke 109); Schön, who is trying to no avail to remove Lulu from his life, cries out in exasperation that he can’t think when she speaks. “Schweig! Ich weiß nicht, wie und was ich denke. Wenn ich dich höre, denke ich nicht mehr” (Stücke 140); and Alwa has not lost control of only his sexual responses, as we saw in Chapter Four, but also of his senses. “Du hast mich um meinen Verstand gebracht!” (Stücke 188).}

While Jack’s willpower as well as physical prowess far exceeds that of the other men, despite the fact that some scholars have argued that he too suffers from sexual deficiencies and G.W. Pabst even portrayed Jack as impotent in his 1928 film adaptation,\footnote{Wedekind in fact plays with this idea of impotence when he has Jack state “I am afraid . . . -- I ask myself, w[h]ether I will succeed or not . . .” (Monstre 130). But true to form} Wedekind also displays in Jack
a keener awareness of Lulu's danger than he depicts in the other males. By recognizing the threat Lulu's sexuality poses, Jack, in sharp contrast to the other males, is able to protect himself from its devastating effects. Nevertheless, Wedekind draws an affinity between Jack and the men whom he avenges by showing that he understands their male anxiety and therefore actively works to avoid the same fate as they.\textsuperscript{201} When he does not give in to his physical nature and thus to Lulu's control thereof, Jack not only shows himself to be a male whose willpower is stronger than his libidinal power, but also one who sets the example for future courses of action against female sexuality.\textsuperscript{202} That Jack is indeed a role model to follow can be seen in the strong correlation Wedekind draws between him, as the superior

for Wedekind, this statement is ambiguous and can refer just as easily to Jack's fear of sexual failure as it can to his fear that he will not succeed in completing his mission—the murder of Lulu.

\textsuperscript{201} As Kutscher observes, just as the title of the manuscript suggests, the main impulse of the original concept for these works also seems to establish an intimate connection between Lulu's sexuality and the miseries of those who are avenged by the knife of the psychopath (FW 1:361).

\textsuperscript{202} While Wedekind portrays Jack as a role model because he is indeed stronger than the other males in the Lulu-plays, in Schloß Wetterstein he depicts another male character exhibiting an even higher level of control and therefore at an even more advanced stage of masculinity than Jack. Unlike Schön whose will was not strong enough to force Lulu to commit suicide, and Jack who only succeeded by resorting to physical violence, in Schloß Wetterstein the lustmurder Tscharmer shows superior willpower in that he is not only able to sleep with the female protagonist, Effie, without succumbing to her charms, he is also able purely through his powers of persuasion to convince her to sacrifice her life to and for him. More so than even Jack, Wedekind portrays Tscharmer as the ultimate sadist and hence the quintessential personification of masculinity in his rebuttal of Effie's attempts to gain power sexually through the use of her pathological nymphomania. As Kutscher observes, "[s]eine Freude sei ein Weib, das sich an Hand und Fuß gefesselt vor Schmerzen winde" (W 291). Just as in the Lulu-plays and the majority of Wedekind's other works, here too we see the battle of the sexes once again pivoting around the issue of control and dominance.
male, and Schön, as the weaker, self-deluding bourgeois version who nevertheless has the potential to become like Jack. This can be seen in the very last scene when Jack, after killing Lulu, uses the very same phrase in *Pandora* with Lulu that Schön employed earlier in *Erdgeist* with her—“Das war ein Stück Arbeit” (*Stücke* 123, 229). For Schön’s part, these words were spoken shortly after he tried to rid himself of Lulu by pushing her back off onto her husband Schwarz. Jack, on the other hand, now repeats them directly after he has succeeded in eliminating Lulu completely. While Schön did not have the ability to overcome Lulu because, in the intimate contact that had developed between the two of them, Lulu had gained the sexual upper hand, Jack has the insight not to let this contact begin and therefore succeeds where Schön and the other men have failed. Jack does not allow his physical nature to control him, but rather remains in the cerebral sphere until the actual murder. By keeping his wits about him and thus controlling his own sexual urges and he is able to control Lulu’s.\(^{204}\)

\(^{203}\)The repetition of these words links Jack not only to Schön himself, but as Rose notes, to the same social interests represented by Schön (185). Boa draws this same correlation but links it more specifically to male interests within marriage. “Jack is a product of the same culture which shapes bourgeois marriage and is deeply hostile to the sexual woman” (*Circus* 116).

\(^{204}\)While Weininger does not advocate the death or murder of the female, *per se*, we see in this scene the echoes of his stance on celibacy as a means for destroying woman’s bestial nature and thus freeing her, but more importantly man, from its devastating effects. “[D]er Mann muß vom Geschlecht sich erlösen, und so, nur so erlöst er die Frau . . . . Freilich geht sie, als Weib, so unter; aber nur, um aus der Asche neu, verjüngt, als der reine Mensch, sich emporzuheben” (456-57). Weininger’s focus in saving the woman from herself is not an end in itself; however, but rather a means to and end—that being the saving of the man. “Als selbst technisch ist das Menschheitsproblem nicht lösbar für den Mann allein; er muß die Frau mitnehmen, auch wenn er nur sich erlösen wollte, er muß sie zum Verzicht auf ihre unsittliche Absicht auf ihn zu bewegen suchen . . . . Das bedeutet nun allerdings: das Weib muß als solches untergehen” (455).
Although Lulu’s death allows Jack to be seen as the more cunning and powerful and therefore the more vital of the two, the manner in which Lulu is murdered is also important in determining her function within these works. While Wedekind’s depiction of Jack is in keeping with the *modus operandi* of the real Jack-the-Ripper, the fact that he not only murders Lulu, but then also removes her sex organs goes beyond the mere recounting of brutal police facts. Unlike the real Jack-the-Ripper, Wedekind’s Jack does not merely cut Lulu’s reproductive organs to shreds or excise them neatly from her body, instead, he takes them into his possession, as Hilmes points out. “Aber nicht daß er ihr das Geschlecht und damit ihren ‘einzigen Besitz’ raubt, sondern daß er ihr Geschlecht in besitz nimmt” (163).

Additionally, by taking them for the sake of science and with the intention of bequeathing them in fact to those scientists whom Lewis notes were defining women as a pathogen (33), Jack’s actions link his interests to theirs. That it was particularly her sex organs which he removes from her stresses not only the importance these experts were giving to this particular part of the female body but indeed that they saw it as the focal point of social disruption. As Rothe observes, “Dieses ‘Unicum’, das Jack sich in anstrengender ‘Arbeit’ erworben hat, erregt nicht nur seine Freude, für die Wissenschaft ist es wertvolles, pathologisch-anatomisches Anschauungsmaterial” (FW 156). In the ultimate aggression, where the knife becomes the penis, Jack literally emasculates or “defeminizes” Lulu in retribution for all the psychological emasculating she herself has wrought. By taking Lulu’s life, Jack destroys Lulu as a living being; but by taking her vagina, that part by which society defined her, he takes her very essence and, as Boa notes, thus depersonalizes her genitals.
Additionally, once he removes that part of Lulu with which she sinned against man-kind, Jack not only reclaims dominion over the woman but by restaking male claim to her genitalia, he insures that she loses all control and claim of them herself.206 “Her demise,” as Lewis notes, “subdues sexual anarchy, represses hidden desires, and reaffirms male dominance” (33). By destroying the power that her sensuality holds over men, Jack symbolically removes the fear that this sensuality evokes in men.207 “Insofern ihre Körperlichkeit als Besitz und Macht fungierten, scheint es, als müsse man ihr diese noch zusätzlich nehmen. Man will Lulu nicht nur tot, sondern völlig zerstört. Mit ihr soll auch die Angst vor ihr sterben” (Hilmes 164). Additionally, in killing a prostitute, as Boa suggests, “Jack destroys the threat of being reduced to a cypher” (Circus 104) and thus prevents the interchangeability men we already saw emerging with the prostitutes discussed in Chapter Two.208

---

205 That the death struggle Jack initiates is actually between himself and Lulu’s vagina and not Lulu herself can be seen in his comment that he has conquered (emphasis mine) a prodigy or an unicum as it is called in the 1902 Insel version.

206 Just as in animal form Lulu was the possession of the dompteur in the Prologue, so too is that part of her which nineteenth-century phrenologists saw as the site of animal instincts in woman then likewise the possession of Jack-the-Ripper.

207 As Dijkstra observes, “[t]o execute woman was to redress the balance of nature, to exorcize the beast, and return man to his position of imperial dominance--at least in the pitiful fantasy world of the ever more marginalized turn-of-the century middle-class male” (395).

208 In a stance similar to the one in Das Sonnenspektrum where the prostitute Schneewitchen cannot even remember what her client looked like, or in Tod und Teufel when Lisiska warns her client that her love is bought and therefore cannot be trusted, Lulu’s actions too stress the insignificance of men as she easily shifts from one to another in her pursuit of sexual satisfaction.
While Lulu is not the vital life-force represented by Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” given her own destructive and debilitating effects on the men around her, she is nevertheless the means for attaining it. Lulu is not nature taking vengeance on society, as many scholars have claimed, but rather an expression of the perversion to which society has succumbed in corrupting true nature—both in men and in women. As we have seen, the men in these works die not because of the wiles of a woman, but because they have become too weak and decadent to withstand these wiles. The only way to regain the vitality necessary to survive is to destroy the embodiment of this degeneration and that is the function of Lulu’s last client, Jack-the-Ripper. It should not be surprising that, in the end, Jack-the-Ripper is the actual representation of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” because he is also the representation of Wedekind’s own misogynist views and indeed, echoes Nietzsche’s contention that natural man must become a criminal in a society which has become unnatural.\(^2^9^9\) This becomes abundantly clear when he kills not only Lulu, the sexually-active woman who acts independently of male wishes, but also the Gräfin Geschwitz, the andersartige Frau who gains her pleasure outside the heterosexual economy. It is with this

\(^{2^9^9}\) That Lulu forces Jack to become a criminal and is therefore not only deserving of but to blame for his behavior is alluded to in Erdgeist when Alwa accuses her of turning all those around her into criminals. “Mit deinen Gottesgaben macht man seine Umgebung zu Verbrechern” (Werke 1:307). It can, however, be argued that Jack already carried these tendencies within him and that Wedekind was alluding to this in giving him the following physical characteristics. Jack is a man with “blassem Gesicht, entzündeten Augen, hochgezogenen, starken Brauen, hängendem Schnurrbart, dünnem Knebelbart, zottigen Favorits” (Werke 1:386). In citing A. Baer’s “Der Verbrecher in anthropologischer Beziehung” (1893), Ruth Florack notes that the characteristics Wedekind gave Jack fit those attributed in the criminal anthropologies of the day. “In der Kriminalanthropologie der Zeit galten ‘starke, buschige Augenbrauen’ ebenso als ‘Anzeige’ für Verbrechertum wie ein ‘mangelhaft entwickelter’ Bartwuchs”(239-40)
latter death in particular that Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral” becomes the most problematic and Wedekind’s demand for sexual liberation the most contentious.

Limitations of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral”

That Wedekind is very much entangled in and even advances the misogynist discourses of his times can be seen throughout his substantial œuvre, but it is especially evident in his Lulu-plays and in his definition of the “Urgestalt des Weibes.” Like Weininger and most sexologists of his time, Wedekind continued to define woman relative to her biological functions. When, in a discussion of Erdgeist, he says: “Ich hatte das menschlich Bewußte, das sich selbst unter allen Umständen immer so maßlos überschätzt, am menschlich Unbewußten scheitern lassen wollen,” (qtd. in Emrich 214), he not merely assigns Lulu instinctual qualities, but thereby also excludes her from conscious, intellectual activity.²¹⁰ Wedekind saw Lulu as the embodiment of a natural drive; thus her existence did not require, nor even allowed for, intellectual pursuits. Indeed, like many of his contemporaries, Wedekind saw such endeavors as an aberration in women and throughout his œuvre repeatedly depicts female emancipationists in a particularly negative light as they

²¹⁰ In consensus with the majority of intellectuals of his day but in particular with Hartmann, who regarded the “genuine woman” as reflecting nature, the unconscious, and the sexual instinct (1:238), Wedekind believed that women simply did not have the capacity to think the same way as his sex. This is especially evident in his 1887 essay entitled “Der Witz und seine Sippe” wherein he contrasts women’s thought processes to those of men. “Der Umstand, daß die Frauen weniger auf der Schulbank sitzen als wir Männer, daß sie nicht so eifrig Mathematik und Grammatik paufen, scheint es mit sich zu bringen, daß auch ihr Denken ein anderes wird. In der That gestaltet es sich mehr sprunghaft, mehr instinktiv tastend, über Zaun und Gräben vom Gefühl dahingetragen, selten selbständig, ziellos, aber nicht ungebunden—während das unsrige sich mäßig fortspint in ununterbrochener Kette, in der je und je das logische Objekt des einen Gliedes zum Subjekt im folgen wird” (Werke 3:144-45).
pursue intellectual goals that repress and subsequently pervert their natural sexuality.\textsuperscript{211} We have already noted this stance in Chapter Two, where in \textit{Tod und Teufel} we saw the \textit{Frauenrechtlerin} Elfriede von Malchus actively denying her own sexuality and when eventually forced to acknowledge it, taking it to masochistic extremes. While reference to suffragettes is much more subtle in \textit{Das Sonnenspektrum}, with the Madame merely forbidding the girls to wear “blue stockings,” and there is only one slur against these feminists in \textit{Mine Haha},\textsuperscript{212} other works focus much more on the misguided nature of such women.\textsuperscript{213}

In discussing his stance on the New Woman, Hilmes points out just how opposed Wedekind was to the Women’s Movement. “Seiner Meinung nach wird die ‘Frauenrechtlerei’ betrieben von enttäuschten, zu kurz gekommenen Frauen, also weniger aus Einsicht oder gar aus Berechtigung denn aus Ressentiment und Fanatismus” (167). That these women have “come up short” is not simply a reference to their economic or political status but more so to the lack of or worse yet destruction of that which makes them feminine.\textsuperscript{214} This is depicted very clearly in a poem Wedekind released in 1899 in the journal

\begin{footnotes}
\item[211] According to Kutscher, Wedekind saw the feminist course of action as pulling women away from their true natures. “Wedekind ist Gegner der Bewegung und will diese ‘Kultur’ wieder zur Natur zurückführen” (FW 363). In discussing \textit{Kinder und Narren} extensively, Kutscher showed to what lengths Wedekind in fact went to depict the erroneous nature of suffragette thinking (FW 206ff).
\item[212] See Footnote 23 in Chapter Two.
\item[213] See in particular \textit{Die Fürstin Russalka}, \textit{Kinder und Narren}, and \textit{Hidalla}.
\item[214] Like the majority of men in his day, Wedekind too believed that women who demanded the same rights as men, tended to be a lot more like men than like other women in that they shared not only the male’s strong masculine feelings and his outlook
\end{footnotes}
Simplicissimus under the title “Soziale Gedichte: An eine angehende Lehrerin” wherein he berates a woman for sacrificing her sexual allure for the frivolous pursuit of intellectual interests. “Du bist furchtbar philströs geworden. / . . . / Lehrerin willst auf dem Dorf du werden, / . . . / Alles, was dich schmückte, ist vergessen, / Ausgebildet ist allein dein Geist, / . . . / Komm heraus aus deiner Geistesfeste / Und verläß dein düstres Seminar!” (Tante 195-96).

While his own stance on female emancipationists is clear, it is in particular in the lesbian Gräfin Geschwitz that Wedekind illustrates the conclusions of scientific discourse that sought to explain (or justify) why women had to refrain (or be hindered) from entering male spheres of activity—especially the intellectual ones. In his 1898 essay “On the Physiological Debility of Women,” the very influential pathologist, Paul Möbius, argues that the development of intellectual capabilities in women would lead to sexual deviants: “Liesse es sich machen, daß die weiblichen Fähigkeiten den männlichen gleich entwickelt würden, so würden die Mutterorgane verkrümmern, und wir würden eine häßlichen und nutzlosen Zwitter vor uns haben” (25). The fact that Wedekind agreed with such discourse can be seen in Lulu’s description of the Gräfin Geschwitz. “Du bist kein Menschenkind wie wir anderen. Für einen Mann war der Stoff nicht ausreichend, und zum Weib hast du zuviel Hirn in deinem Schädel bekommen” (Werke 1:354). Even her name, which according to Kadidja Wedekind is a contraction of “Geschlechterswitz” (qtd. in Vinçon, Monstre 187), not only

\[\text{on life, but more importantly, his interest in the female sex.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{215}}\text{It is interesting to note the subtle fear of female encroachment into male spheres that comes across in Möbius’ argument—this “creature” would not be merely useless, but “hateful” as well.}\]
emphasizes her lack of definable gender and therefore her anomalous nature, but also suggests that as such a creature she is ridiculous, a joke. That this name sounds very much like Geschwätz, as Barbara Becker-Cantarino has noted, lends even more derogatory connotations to it in its implication that women are incapable of intelligent speech. Furthermore, by initially dressing Geschwitz in male clothing, Wedekind once again references Krafft-Ebing who, discussing lesbianism extensively, observes that women suffering from this malady often had, among other symptoms, a strong desire to wear clothing appropriate for the opposite sex.  

Feeling, thought, will, and the whole character, in cases of the complete development of the anomaly, correspond with the peculiar sexual instinct, but not with the sex which the individual represents anatomically and physiologically. This abnormal mode of feeling may not infrequently be recognized in the manner, dress and calling of the individuals, who may go so far as to yield to an impulse to don the distinctive clothing corresponding with the sexual rôle in which they feel themselves to be. (336)  

---

216 Her lack of definable gender, or more specifically, her taking on of the masculine role references yet another text with which Wedekind was very familiar—Lombroso’s and Ferrero’s The Female Offender wherein they describe the taking on of masculine characteristics as an extreme form of feminine degeneration. Rather than being representative of an evolution of the female brain, such characteristics were believed to reflect the hermaphroditic origins of early mankind. Indeed, as Dijkstra points out, most nineteenth century evolutionists saw feminism as the clearest example of this form of masculinizing degeneracy (213).

217 This comment was mentioned in a discussion held with Becker-Cantarino prior to The First Woman’s Movement Conference held at The Ohio State University in 1997.

218a "Women who cross dress," as Breitenberg notes, “at least symbolically appropriate the traditionally male prerogative of self-representation and self-determination by, quite literally, fashioning themselves” (168) and thus take this control away from the men who would mold them instead.
In this figure, then, we see Wedekind not only continuing to reject women as intellectual beings, but, furthermore, continuing to promote specific discourses on sexual deviancy when he also rejects female homosexuality. This, as Hilmes notes, makes his definition of sexual freedom highly problematic. “Da Wedekind Sexualität gerade nicht auf die biologische Funktion der Fortpflanzung reduzieren will, kann er wohl kaum ein anderes Kriterium für die ‘Unnatürlichkeit’ der Homosexualität angeben als ihrer gesellschaftlichen Tabuisierung. Im Falle der Homosexualität sitzt Wedekind dem Vorteil einer Gesellschaft auf, die er an anderer Stelle aufs schärfste zu kritisieren weiß” (169). Although Hilmes notes the contradiction in Wedekind’s stance relative to his definition of liberated sexuality, she overlooks the fact that he condones the male homosexual exchange, as Chapter Three revealed. More disturbing than the possible rejection of this one form of sexual expression, however, is the fact that he rejects it only in its female form.

It is not just Geschwitz’ lesbian tendencies which Wedekind condemns, however, but perhaps more so her final resolve to become a Frauenrechtlerin.\(^{219}\) This is underscored specifically in the last scene where Jack appears to commiserate with the lot of Geschwitz and even refers to her as a “Poor beast” as he strokes her head (Monstre 128). That he is not only able to feel sympathy for her, but even empathy can be seen in his statement “We

\(^{219}\) This does not mean that Wedekind saw the two tendencies as separate from one another, though. While in Tod und Teufel Elfriede is identified first and foremost through her repressed sexuality that forces her to take the political stance of a feminist, Geschwitz is classified first through her deformation of female sexuality. It is only later that her lesbianism is linked to feminism. Nevertheless, Wedekind, like most men in his day, makes a strong connection between feminism and lesbianism, between women who wish to transgress into the political terrain of men and women who wish to transgress into the sexual terrain of men.
understand us. -- Don’t we?” (Monstre 128). Despite her own perversity, like the various men in these works, Geschwitz too has suffered at the hands of Lulu; she too has been misused and abused by her and this is what Jack acknowledges with his statement. It is telling, however, that in the final moments of her life, Wedekind portrays Geschwitz beginning to recognize her own sexual deviance, adopting, as Boa notes, the vision of heterosexual society (Circus 100). “[I]ch muß darüber nachsinnen. -- Mir ist so schmutzig, so schmutzig! . . . warum bin ich denn--verstümmelt” (Monstre 131). More revealing, however, is the fact that despite his initial tenderness toward her, the moment Geschwitz resolves to become a Frauenrechtlerin and to study law, Jack does not hesitate to murder her too. Like Lulu before her, Geschwitz now also has transgressed too far. While as

220 In the first published version of Pandora Jack’s protectiveness of Geschwitz is emphasized even more when he tries to prevent Lulu from mistreating her. “Laß sie in Ruh!—Das ist nicht deine Schwester. Sie ist in dich verliebt. (Er streichelt der Geschwitz wie einem Hunde den Kopf.) Armes Tier!” (Werke 1:387).

221 Despite the fact that Freud refers to female genitalia as representing “verstümmelte Männlichkeit, there is no evidence that Wedekind was familiar with the research of Freud until the very end of his life, as Wedekind’s wife, Tilly, asserts in her memoirs (99) and Kutscher claims in his biography (342). Thus the use of identical terminology to define woman, and in Wedekind’s case a lesbian woman, as verstümmelt reinforces not so much Freud’s own research, as it does a general idea at the end of the nineteenth century that the female was not only a lesser version of the male, as Galen had hypothesized, but more so a “mutilated, garbled” one at that.

222 In choosing to study law, Vogel contends that Geschwitz will use the means or weapons of the male-world to fight the men of this world. “Es ist . . . bezeichnend, daß sie sich vornimmt, Jura zu studieren, um als Frauenrechtlerin mit den Waff en des Geistes in der durch das Prinzip des Geistes bestimmten Welt für die Rechte der Frau zu kämpfen” (157).

223 Although this desire to become a suffragette is not seen in the original manuscript, its appearance in the published version makes for a much sharper contrast between the initial sympathy Jack felt for the sufferings of Geschwitz and his own subsequent act of
merely a misfit of society, she is not seen as a real threat, once she decides to actively fight against the patriarchal *status quo*, she too must be stopped. Although Wedekind claimed to advocate sexual freedom, with this, we now see that he placed very specific limits on it. Lulu’s death can be seen as the elimination of social decadence in the form of the hypersexual woman, and the murder of Geschwitz as the removal of the intelligent, potentially emancipated, lesbian woman. Since both are defined by their deviant sexuality, but more importantly by the emphasis on male triviality these lifestyles bring with them, neither can be permitted to remain in society.

While his advocacy for the sexual liberation of women appeared, in fact, to align Wedekind with the liberal feminists of his day, his agenda was not the same as theirs. In contrast to Lorenz’ contention that “Frauenemanzipation und Gesellschaftsreform gehen für Wedekind Hand in Hand” (39),\(^{224}\) what Wedekind denounced was not a society that repressed women, but rather one that repressed the carnal nature of woman. The sexual freedom Wedekind touts as so liberating is a privilege only of those who do not threaten the male image of masculinity—namely, children and mindless women. The lesbian woman who has no use for men and the woman who controls her own life and sexuality, are both rejected as aberrations. In a world where men feel increasingly marginalized and vulnerable, what is desired is not the woman whose narcissism stresses the precariousness of masculinity, but violence against her.

\(^{224}\)As Peacock so aptly states: “Most of those who wrote, or still write about women’s emancipation do not project an ideal woman; they foresee ideal conditions of existence for women by and large. The question of woman’s status in bourgeois society, of her ‘emancipation,’ of her equality with men, is after all not one about her character, her being, but about her status and function” (109).
rather the naïve, innocent woman who willingly and happily subjugates herself to masculine desires and masculine control.
CONCLUSION

At the time that Wedekind began his career, Germany was experiencing both a cult of masculinity as well as a crisis in masculinity. In the latter decades of the nineteenth century, imperial Germany underwent a new engendering that espoused a revived emphasis on virile masculinity. Philosopher’s like Nietzsche cried out for a new race of supermen. Bismarck’s “blood and iron” politics made Germany a European power. Industrialization produced entrepreneurs and barons of industry. And from the ranks of the military arose the Junker-styled officer. At the same time that there was this intense emphasis on masculinity, there was also a great feeling of impotence as the overarching systems of value crumbled away under the weight of commerce and science. 225 Additionally, with the growth of large urban centers, Germany, and Europe in general, experienced an exponential increase in prostitution and a drastic rise in women’s groups as never before seen. As more and more lower-class women walked the streets in an effort to find subsistence and middle-class women were becoming increasingly more vocal in their demands for equal rights and privileges, they destabilized engendered sexual and social roles thereby placing into question

225 Hilmes notes that the economic stagnation as well as disillusionment over the failed ideals of liberalism also contributed to this sense of loss and of marginalization. “Zur Krisenmentalität trugen u.a. auch die wirtschaftlichen Stagnationen und ‘Rückschläge’ der 70er Jahre sowie der Niedergang des Liberalismus im ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert bei; solche ‘Enttäuschungen’ hemmten den allgemeinen Fortschrittsoptimismus” (32).
the age-old beliefs and traditional forms of patriarchy which supported them. Caught between the alpha males who ran the nation and the New Woman who was now demanding equal rights, sexually as well as socially, the ordinary man felt increasingly alienated—first from his work, then from his home, and eventually even from his own manhood.²²⁶

Like many in his day, Frank Wedekind believed life had become an affected charade belying the vitality it once possessed. While this decadence was due in part to the overly cultured and refined aspects of his times, Wedekind saw pretentious morality, what he called “bürgerliche Moral,” as the leading cause of society’s downfall.²²⁷ To counter this decline, he proposed a new way of life which was supposed to reawaken the most vigorous of human drives. This “menschliche Moral,” as he labeled it, was not a morality per se, but rather an expression of the life force now presumed missing from his world. While Wedekind was

²²⁶ As Dijkstra observes, “to the men of the later nineteenth century the sight of women refusing to continue to play the role of the ever-submissive victim of man’s desires for mastery was evidence of a fundamental betrayal of trust. No longer able to lord it security over the women in their lives, many men had . . . become rapidly conscious of their own removal from the centers of social and economic power” (393-94).

²²⁷ In an effort to hang onto some of the norms and order of the past, Michelsen notes that religious and moral codes were now often more stringently adhered to precisely because their values were seen as threatened. “Während durch [die Naturwissenschaften] und andere ‘moderne’ Entwicklungen die religiösen und sittlichen Formen sich faktisch immer weiter entleerten, suchte man ihre Formeln wortreich zu verstärken: eine solcherart Moral nicht mehr lebende, nur noch reglementierende Pädagogik konnte in ihrer knöchernen Versteifung mit den Nöten des lebendigen Menschen nicht mehr fertig werden” (51-52). As Rasch points out, however, such adherence to bourgeois conventions frequently constricted and impoverished the existence of the individual and in many instances actually robbed him of his life-affirming vitality: “Diese Bürger gehören zu einer Spätzeit der Zivilisation; sie haben in der fortschreitenden Rationalisierung und Technisierung des Daseins, in einer Welt abgeleiteter Künstlichkeit ihrer naturhafte Lebenskraft verloren oder sind durch die bürgerlichen Konventionen beengt und verarmt” (410).
following a time-held bourgeois tradition when he advocated a return to nature, his longing for a pre-social age was not just a yearning for a life that was supposedly less complex and confining, but also a desire for a return to a time before man had lost his vitality. Like many caught up in the fervor of the Lebensphilosophie movement,\textsuperscript{228} Wedekind believed a return to and reliance on basic instincts was necessary to reinvigorate the modern world. Since he viewed sexuality as the most rejuvenating of these drives in that it held within it the primal instinct for life, Wedekind championed a more open expression thereof as a means for fostering his new lifestyle. While he advocated a more liberal sexuality, however, Wedekind was also aware of the potential hazards inherent in this drive. As Rasch points out, "Wedekind hat immer schon die Sexualität als lebenssteigernde und zugleich lebenszerstörende Macht angesehen" (421). Thus for Wedekind, relying on sexuality and especially on female sexuality as a means for rejuvenating life was a double-edged sword that had to be handled carefully and properly.

While sexuality held a prominent place in Wedekind’s œuvre, it was also taking center stage in society as it became a hotly debated issue at the turn-of-the-nineteenth-century. Prompted perhaps by the ever more vocal Women’s Movement, a new breed of physicians called sexologists came to the fore. Expanding on previous discourses which had sought and found biological reasons for keeping men and women confined to rigidly separate social spheres, these specialists came increasingly to define sexuality, and in

\textsuperscript{228}This movement, as Boa notes, was a cult of natural vitality which had its twin roots in science and metaphysics, in social Darwinism and derivatives of Schopenhauer’s philosophy of will (Circus 28). At the same time, in its focus on life-values, intuition, and instincts, Lorenz contends it was a reaction against scientific materialism and positivism (10).
particular female sexuality, in pathological terms. While Dieth points out that texts addressing “normal” sexuality were very rare during this period, how much focus was placed on deviant sexuality, and especially female deviance, can be seen from the following sample of influential scholarly works: Albert Moll’s Das nervöse Weib (1898) and Die konträre Sexualempfindung (1899), Magnus Hirschfeld’s Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen (1899-1923), August Forel’s Die Sexuelle Frage (1905) and Sexuelle Ethik (1906), and Paul J. Möbius’ Über den physiologischen Schwachsinn des Weibes (1906), to name just a few. By far the most influential of texts, however, was Krafft-Ebing’s Psychopathia Sexualis (1886). Called by Iwan Bloch “the true founder of sexual pathology” (Robinson, ix) and described by Havelock Ellis as “the great clinician of sexual inversion” (3:52), Krafft-Ebing was world famous by 1889 (Blain ix). At that time, his work was one of the most extensive documents delineating the types and causes of sexual aberrations. Borrowing heavily from research done by Lombroso, Darwin, Mantegazza, and Ploss, Krafft-

229 Hilmes notes that so much focus was given to this new medical perspective that it, along with eugenics, constituted the two major innovations of the latter decades of the nineteenth century. “Die Medizin der Perversionen und die Programme der Eugenik bildeten innerhalb der Technologien des Sexes die beiden großen Neuerungen der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts” (40).

230 It is indeed astonishing to observe that at the end of the nineteenth century in Germany, a large amount of writing was available on sexual deviancy, yet there was scarcely anything available in German on normal sexuality, and such work as was available was often downright misleading” (Dieth 21).

231 Badinter notes that this work in particular was a bestseller. “Der Traktat Über den physiologischen Schwachsinn des Weibes des Mediziners Paul Julius Möbius war ein echter Bestseller. 1900 veröffentlicht, erlebte er in der Zeit zwischen 1900 und 1908 neun Auflagen und war ein ebensolcher Erfolg wie Geschlecht und Charakter (1903)” (31).
Ebing categorized a multitude of perversions, labeled them according to physical or psychological origins, and then cited over two hundred case histories as examples. Like most of the experts in his day, however, there is a distinct patriarchal undercurrent, if not necessarily a strong misogynist bent, to his work as he not only describes female aberrations as more egregious than those of the male, but then also advocates harsher forms of punishment for the female miscreant’s behavior.

The *Frauenfrage* came increasingly under discussion with philosophers too, especially the more assertive and autonomous women attempted to become. Like many of the physicians before them, however, their contentions were also often severely flawed, displaying contradictory hypotheses and illogical arguments. Starting with Darwin’s

---

232 While not labeling Krafft-Ebing’s style as misogynist, in his foreword to the only official translation of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, Victor Robinson does describe it as “masculine and muscular” (v).

233 Despite this bias, Krafft-Ebing did maintain enough objectivity to state in the preface to his twelfth edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis* that most of the letters he received expressing concerns over sexual anomalies came from men and more specifically, from literate men of the more cultured classes. “The hosts of letters that have reached the author from all parts of the world substantiate this assumption [that a large number of people have found relief in the pages of this book]. Compassion and sympathy are strongly elicited by the perusal of these letters, which are written chiefly by men of refined thought and of high social and scientific standing. They reveal sufferings of the soul in comparison to which all the other afflictions dealt out by Fate appear as trifles” (vii).

234 The *Frauenfrage*, according to Hibberd, “could be seen as more than a matter of voting and property rights and of educational and economic opportunity; it was central to the diagnosis of the ills of modern society. It was basically the problem of the status of the flesh or of the beast in man” (340).

235 That these arguments were faulty is not something which has only recently become obvious, but indeed was recognized, at least by some, already during Wedekind’s time. In the preface to the first edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, for example, Krafft-Ebing
premise that the white European woman was more closely related to the lower races than to the male of her own race,\textsuperscript{236} these men came increasingly to define woman as primitive, bestial, and immoral the more she tried to step outside the roles and cultural visages men had assigned her. Ironically, at the same time she was being denigrated, she (or more accurately stated, the ideal of womanhood) was being upheld as morally pure, chaste, and modest.\textsuperscript{237} In *Geschlecht und Charakter* (1903), Weininger stresses that there are two types of women: the woman made for childbearing and motherhood and the voracious sexually active woman (i.e., the whore). Despite placing women on opposite ends of the morality continuum, however, Weininger continued to define both only through their sexuality.

Woman’s sole purpose was copulation—either to produce offspring or for her own vile satisfaction. Linked as she was to this basest form of instinctual nature, Weininger described her as “die ichlose, gedächtnislose, treulose Geilheit” (qtd. in Bloch, 147). Schopenhauer too considered woman’s sole purpose in life as “die propagation des Geschlechtes” (PP 2:45). Furthermore, as a *Mittelstufe zwischen dem Kinde und dem Manne*” (PP 2:42), specifically rebukes, among others, Schopenhauer and Hartmann for their incorrect and illogical analyses. “Whatever Schopenhauer, and after him E. von Hartmann, the philosopher of the unknown, discuss about sexual relationship, is so thoroughly incorrect and illogical that, so far as science is concerned, empirical psychology and the metaphysics of man’s sexual existence are simply virgin soil” (K-E 1965, xiii).

\textsuperscript{236} Darwin, whose strong influence on the thinking of this generation is well documented, presented a rather negative picture of women. “it is generally admitted that with woman the powers of intuition, of rapid perception, and perhaps of imitation are more strongly marked than in the man; but some, at least, of these faculties are characteristic of the lower races, and therefore of a past and lower state of civilization” (qtd. in Figes, 112).

\textsuperscript{237} As Diethe observes, “[t]he mainstream of medical opinion encouraged the view that a respectable lady was sexless and a sexually eager woman was sick” (3).
woman had much in common with young children and was therefore well suited to raising them. “Zu Pflegerinnen und Erzieherinnen unserer ersten Kindheit eignen die Weiber sich gerade dadurch, daß sie selbst kindisch, lappisch und kurzichtig, mit einem Worte, Zeit Lebens grosse Kinder sind” (SW 6:650). Owing to her sexual nature, however, and the Geilheit to which Weininger also alluded, Schopenhauer insisted woman be precluded from raising older children, and especially male children. “Dies zu verhindern gibt es nur ein Mittel . . . die Knaben von dem Tage an, da sie entwöhnt werden, möglichst vollständig dem Einflusse der Frau zu entziehen” (SW 6:661). Even Nietzsche, who spent little time even discussing women because of what he deemed the uselessness of their gender, saw woman’s sole purpose as the propagation and nurturing of the Übermensch. “Das Glück des Mannes heißt: ich will. Das Glück des Weibes heißt: er will. . . . Der Mann soll zum Krieger erzogen werden, und das Weib zur Erholung des Kriegers: alles Andere ist Thorheit” (Zarathustra 6.1.81). Because he sincerely believed woman had little ability to think and should therefore obey the intellectually superior male, Nietzsche considered those women who dared to pursue intellectual avenues let alone equal rights as diseased. “Der Kampf um gleiche Rechte ist sogar ein Symptom von Krankheit: jeder Arzt weiß das . . . eine ganze Gattung des bösartigen ‘Idealismus’ -- der übrigens auch bei Männern vorkommt, zum Beispiel bei Henrik Ibsen, dieser typischen alten Jungfrau -- hat als Ziel das gute Gewissen, die Natur in der Geschlechtsliebe zu vergiften” (Ecce Homo, VI:3:304-05).

Despite the intensity with which physicians and philosophers alike tried to confine woman to specifically domestic and domesticated spheres, women were becoming increasingly vocal as they spoke out against such efforts. By the latter half of the nineteenth
century, women's organizations advocating one form or another of female emancipation were making their presence unmistakably known. While industrialization and urbanization had already estranged man from his work, the New Woman was now alienating him from his home as she questioned not only her social role but by implication his as well. The household nun who at the start of the century had made man's home a haven had all but disappeared. In her place was a woman whose new found assertiveness and determination not only emphasized man's already precarious and ever weakening position but in fact destabilized it even further.

While the medical profession continued to believe that the male was the more aggressive and therefore the more sexual,\textsuperscript{238} it was precisely his greater sexual drive which physicians now saw as leading to his easy enrapTURE with and enticement by the opposite sex. In noting that "episodes of moral decay always coincide with a progression of effeminacy, lewdness and luxuriance of the nations," (6) Krafft-Ebing blamed modern-day stresses for causing an increase in sexual activity. "These phenomena can only be ascribed to the higher and more stringent demands which circumstances make upon the nervous system. Exaggerated tension of the nervous system stimulates sensuality, leads the individual as well as the masses to excesses, and undermines the very foundations of society, and the morality and purity of family life" (6). With woman no longer maintaining her position of chastity, and indeed leaning ever more toward promiscuity, she no longer served as the moral barrier

\textsuperscript{238}This, as mentioned already in Chapter One, had to do with the male brain being larger than the female brain. Hypothesizing that if the cerebellum, held to be the seat of sexual instinct, were larger in the male of the species, it naturally followed that there would also be greater sexual drive in him than in the female.
that prevented man from pursuing his more sexually aggressive tendencies. Without this restraint and given his polygamous nature, Krafft-Ebing warned that man’s sexual desires could very well overrule his intellectual processes and thereby give woman even more power over him. “In the sexual demands of man’s nature will be found the motives of his weakness towards woman. He is enslaved by her, and becomes more and more dependent upon her as he grows weaker, and the more he yields to sensuality” (15). While he denotes the loss of the male’s willpower and his subsequent inability to curb animal desire (both in himself as well as in the woman) as a hazardous side effect to overstimulation, Krafft-Ebing stresses the physical dangers as well in Case-History 128 where he discusses how the male grows weaker and weaker the more semen he loses. More serious than a general weakening of his constitution, however, was the impotence Krafft-Ebing believed would result were the individual male to fall into the hands of a voracious nymphomaniac. “Chronic conditions of nymphomania are apt to weaken public morality and lead to offenses against decency. Woe unto the man who falls into the meshes of such an insatiable Messalina, whose sexual appetite is never appeased. Heavy neurasthenia and impotence are the inevitable

239 Just as the women’s energies were not to be directed toward intellectual thought for fear of harming her sexual organs, in like manner the male was warned not to use his own sex organs too much for fear of damaging his thought processes. How important it was not to lose too much semen, was stressed by Dr. Sylvanus Stall in his work What a Young Man Ought to Know (1897). “Nature has provided us not only with the sacs for the retention of seminal fluid, but its retention is necessary in order that this vitalizing and life-giving fluid be re-absorbed into the system, and become the vitalizing and strength-giving source of added physical and intellectual power” (75).

240 While Krafft-Ebing disputes arguments that describe female nymphomania as a disease and instead insists it is a form of psychical degeneration (483), he nevertheless characterizes the male version, what he calls satyraxis, as a disease and “luckily . . . a rare disease” at that (487).
consequences” (486). While Krafft-Ebing ascribes a loss of sexual functioning to the male who comes in contact with such a woman, he sees society’s morals crumbling even more when the nymphomaniac invariably turns to prostitution in an effort to find relief. “Nymphomaniacs ... in many instances ... resort to prostitution ... in [order] to find satisfaction and relief with one man after another” (486).

Once the Frauenfrage became intense enough that science and medicine took notice, literature too began to focus on this phenomenon. In order to bring women back to what he deemed to be their “true” natures, Wedekind’s works consistently portrayed the emancipated woman as a social and sexual misfit. While this stance was in accordance with the general male consensus of his day, his advocating a more liberated sexuality for women was not. In fact, in taking this position, Wedekind appeared to stand in stark opposition to the majority of articulate men and in particular the physicians and philosophers who were so busy delineating the dangers of the sexually-active woman. In addition to suggesting that women actually be encouraged to become more sexually open, however, Wedekind’s works were also rejected for many years because they were so explicitly graphic in their portrayals

241 It is interesting to note that with this statement, Krafft-Ebing places the blame for male impotence onto the woman. Just how threatening he actually perceived her sexuality to be can be seen when he adds children to the list of potential victims. “These unfortunate women disseminate the spirit of lewdness, demoralize their surroundings, become a danger to boys, and are liable to corrupt girls also, for there are homosexual nymphomaniacs as well” (486).

242 Indeed, Roy Pascal notes that by the end of the nineteenth century the progressive German writers tended in general to run down the “progressive” woman. “The negative attitude to the emancipated woman characterizes nearly all writers throughout the period” (209).
of sexuality and sexual perversions. Suffering the same fate as Krafft-Ebing, whose work supplied so much of Wedekind’s source materials, Wedekind too endured extensive criticism for bringing the matter of sexuality out into the open.

While the explicit nature of Wedekind’s works still makes it difficult to see past the perversities he displays, as the extremely divergent interpretations discussed in Chapter Four attest, this dissertation has shown that it is precisely through the very graphic way Wedekind displays female sexuality that he emphasizes its danger. As we saw in Chapter Two,

---

243 In response to a presentation of his Marquis von Keith, the theater critic Julius Hart wrote: “In der deutschen Literatur von heute gibt es nichts, was so gemein ist wie die Kunst Frank Wedekinds” (qtd. in Kutscher 187). Another critique published in the Berliner Tageblatt stated “Musik und Stücke wie Oatha müßten dem Dichter vor die Füße geworfen werden” (qtd. in Kutscher 259). Reactions to most of his other works were similar. In fact, a large part of his œuvre was considered so scandalous and offensive that the majority of his works could not get past Germany’s censors without major revisions. In one of the hearings where Wedekind had to face charges of indecency, Becker notes that the court reprimanded Wedekind for the pornographic nature of his works and then charged him to make his plays more didactic in order to serve as a warning against sexual perversion rather than merely as a sensational presentation thereof. “Das Gericht unterstellte Wedekind, daß er mit seinem Werk den Zweck verfolge, Furcht und Mitleid zu erregen. Wenn er sexuelle Verwirrungen, das ‘Häßliche, Rohe und Abstoßende’, . . . auf die Bühne bringen wolle, so deshalb, weil er die Abgründe der Verworfeneheit ausloten und letztlich vor dem Laster warnen wolle” (131). Despite the numerous court appearances as well as all the problems he had actually having his plays produced, Wedekind was quite proud of the infamous name he was making for himself; as a letter to Richard Weinhöppel demonstrates. “Im übrigen, und das sage ich mit einem gewissen Stolz, ist im Augenblick kein Schriftstellername in Berlin verrufener als der meine” (1:280-81).

244 In discussing the reactions to Krafft-Ebing’s work, Daniel Blain cites the following statement made in The British Medical Journal in 1893. “We have considered at length whether we should notice this book or not, but we deem the importance of the subject and the position of the author make it necessary to refer to it in consideration of the feelings with which it has been discussed by the public. We have questioned whether it should have been translated into English at all. Those concerned could have gone to the original. Better if it had been written entirely in Latin, and thus veiled in the decent obscurity of a dead language” (qtd. in Blain, xi).
Wedekind did believe in the regenerative function of sexuality and thus the prostitute, or the more appropriately-coined German term *Freudenmädchen*, holds a prominent place throughout his œuvre. Even so, Wedekind’s works, like the medical and philosophical discourses of his day, also contain warnings about the potentially rampant nature of female sexuality and the harm it could do male sexuality. By depicting the potential for sexual distortion in the children of *Frühling Erwachen* and then revealing how it could come to full fruition in the adult world of *Tod und Teufel*, Wedekind displays how easily lack of restraint could allow vital sexuality to deteriorate into a monstrous abomination of pain and punishment. In analyzing this regression, Walter Sokel submits that the descent from *Frühling Erwachen* and *Sonnenspektrum* to *Totentanz* paralleled the development of German philosophy in the nineteenth century, where “[e]rotic humanism and optimism gave way to profound pessimism. . . . [with] Feuerbach and the vogue of Saint-Simonism . . . succeeded by the popularity of Schopenhauer after the middle of the century” (203). He correctly argues that “[t]he concept of eros in *Totentanz* bears striking resemblance to Schopenhauer’s concept of the Will. It is a furious energy, an aimless and insatiable drive that precludes the possibility of happiness” (203), but then vaguely attributes this pessimism to the *Zeitgeist* without expanding this idea any further. In neglecting to note that in these works the aimless and insatiable drive that precludes happiness is embodied specifically in the female, Sokel overlooks the demonizing of the feminine and thus fails to take into account male insecurities relative to the *Frauenfrage*.

---

243 Given that Strindberg had a play with the same name, Wedekind changed the title of his drama to *Tod und Teufel* to avoid confusion between the two works.
Although Wedekind presents us with complete decadence in _Tod und Teufel_ and a hint of it in _Das Sonnenspektrum_, he portrays the “male-threatening” dangers of female sexuality best in _Frühling Erwachen_ and in the Lulu-plays. In this first work, Wedekind repeatedly illustrates this peril as he shows instance after instance of sexual encounters between men and women where the male stance is one of insecurity and instability. In the scene with Martha and her father, although there is no overt sexual act taking place, we see the father’s fear as well as his desires projected onto his daughter in the form of sadistic beatings. In the bathroom scene, woman is again the menace as Hänschen perceives threats emanating from the pictures to which he masturbates. It is in the two encounters between Melchior and Wendla, however, where Wedekind most clearly delineates the jeopardies for the male as he portrays Melchior both times unable to control his own sexual responses let alone those of Wendla. In addition to the warnings contained in each of these scenes, what we also see in them is the means for men to master sexuality—their own as well as the woman’s. The father controls his own desires by dominating and crushing those in his daughter. Hänschen fights to bring his longings under control by envisioning sexual battles that make him stronger with each female image he kills off. Even Melchior, who is portrayed both times as losing control, is already learning how to wield the whip correctly and so we know he too will learn to recognize and conquer the threat that female sexuality poses.

Whereas Wedekind shows the potential dangers of female sexuality in _Frühling Erwachen_, it is in his Lulu-plays that he now displays this threat in full force. With an emphasis on images of masculinity, Chapter Three begins by discussing the two extreme
forms of masculinity Wedekind depicts in Frühlings Erwachen. By portraying Melchior, the more aggressive male, as having the potential to overcome the devious and deviant aspects of female sexuality, we see Wedekind upholding his type of masculinity as the form to be emulated. With Moritz at the other extreme, we see Wedekind presenting a weak male not only as the type to be shunned, but also as an illustration of what could happen if Melchior’s example is not followed. Chapter Three continues then by delineating the various forms of weakness embodied in the late-nineteenth-century male and the numerous ways his susceptibility could make him fall victim to the female’s voracious sexual appetite. In Erdgeist, despite the facades of strength and social standing, each male is portrayed as having an inherent weakness or flaw that leaves him impotent in one form or another. Lulu’s first husband, Goll, is too old to consummate sex anymore, and as a consequence feels compelled to stand guard over her sexuality. Her second husband, Schwarz, is afraid of women and therefore tries as much as possible to avoid sex. It is in her third husband, Schön, however, that Wedekind hefts the sharpest criticism against modern society because it is in him that Wedekind portrays the male as actually having the instinctual desires he calls for

246 What Wedekind presents in Frühlings Erwachen by juxtaposing Melchior against Moritz is not only his ideal image of masculinity, but indeed the extreme images of manhood abounding in the discourses of his day. As discussed in Chapter One, the essential notion of an idealized masculinity carried down through the centuries was one of aggressiveness, self-determination, and intellectual and physical prowess. Even at the turn-of-the-century, such an image was still advocated not only in the Übermensch image of philosophers like Nietzsche, but as well by anthropologists such as Darwin who espoused survival of the fittest theories, by sexologists and physicians who continued to claim man was the more sexually active and the more intellectually superior, and finally by politicians like Bismarck and entrepreneurs like Krupp who through personal example showed how only men of will could forge ahead making something of themselves and their world.
in his “menschliche Moral,” but then denying them in favor of society’s rules and regulations. In the second of the Lulu-plays, Die Büchse der Pandora, Wedekind again presents us with a menagerie of male figures who for one reason or another can no longer function as strong virile men. With this play, however, Wedekind has moved outside the bourgeois realm to incorporate male characters from the aristocracy as well as the lower classes of society. In each and every case, the men are presented as dysfunctional and thus represent the pervasive feeling of decadence and disillusion seen in Europe as the nineteenth century drew to a close.

By tracing the evolution of the Lulu-plays in Chapter Four, we see first that the less caustic versions of Lulu displayed in later adaptations were the outcome of continuous battles with censors. In going back to the original manuscript, however, we are able to demonstrate that Wedekind initially presented Lulu as a femme-fatale, but one whose devious characteristics were masked with a veneer of childlike simplicity and naiveté. A close reading of the original manuscript as well as the various versions of the twin plays removed this facade of innocence, however, and revealed instead the numerous ways Lulu used deliberate artifice to bring about the death and destruction of her various male

---

247 In explaining why it was important to Wedekind that Lulu not appear to represent a femme fatale, Tilly Wedekind recounts Wedekind saying that such a blatantly wanton woman would actually scare men off. “Männer gehen solchen Frauen aus dem Weg”(47). Indeed, after having seen a performance of Erdgeist wherein Gertrud Eysoldt played Lulu as a scheming, sophisticated vamp in Max Reinhardt’s 1902 Berlin production, Wedekind took to the stage himself in order to control the way future actresses and directors would interpret this character.
partners. While Lulu does incorporate the types of animal instincts Wedekind espoused as so rejuvenating, this dissertation has shown that the debilitating effects she has on the men around her weaken contentions that see her emblematizing Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral.” Dismissing Lulu as this personification, Chapter Five investigated exactly what role Lulu did play in Wedekind’s concept of “menschliche Moral.” In analyzing the manner in which she dies as well as the function of Jack-the-Ripper, the man who murders her, it was determined that Jack-the-Ripper was not only the true representative of Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral,” since he was also the quintessential image of maleness, he was the representative of Wedekind’s own misogynist views as well. While Lulu’s death can be justified because of the death and destruction she herself has wrought, the only possible reason for Jack murdering Geschwitz is because she, like Lulu, falls outside the arena of masculine control. And control, as we have seen, is the real issue for Wedekind.  

249 That she no longer bears the innocent façade is picked up on by Leo Berg who notes, “[d]ie [Lulu] ist in der That so etwas wie eine Personifikation der Sünde, die inkarnierte Anarchie, ein weiblicher Don Juan, ein erotischer Würgengel von so ursprünglicher Zerstörungszucht, daß ein Grauen von ihr ausgeht, wie von etwas Überirdischem” (211).  

249 As Breitenberg notes, “women who dressed as men embodied both examples of disobedience to authority and analogies for other forms of status confusion” (159) thereby contributing to and likewise exposing the male’s insecurity and possible confusion relative to his own identity and/or desires.  

250 As Audrone Willeke points out, it is in his unpublished sketch called “Parthenon: Universalhandbuch der Frauenkunde” that Wedekind makes abundantly clear that he definitely perceives female sexuality to be a threat to society. Under the heading “Der Staat und das Weib” he comments: “Die Frau als Gegnerin der ‘Sittlichkeit’--Opposition, Umstürzlerin, die untermindernde Gewalt. Der Mann als Grund der ‘Sittlichkeit’ -- Conservativ auf seinen Besitz bedacht” (qtd. in Willeke 28).
In each of the works analyzed in this study, we saw not only the inherent dangers involved in sexual intercourse, but additionally, the means for avoiding or overcoming these dangers. In Chapter Five, where the characteristics of the strong man were analyzed, we saw the whip used as a symbol of mastery over the woman and her sexuality. The whip was Wedekind’s favorite form of chastisement and as such can be seen throughout his works as the tool used to this end. In Frühling Erwachen it is not only the father who whips his daughter in order to curb her emerging sexuality, but also the boy Melchior who whips Wendla in an effort to still her sexuality. While not used as a form for chastisement in Mine-Haha, the whip is nevertheless the prompt that guides and directs the girls in their sexual education. Despite the idyllic nature in which Das Sonnenspektrum is presented and the fact that one does one see a whip per se in this work, there is nevertheless a suggestion thereof as we learn that all the girls experience abuse from time-to-time at the hands of their clients. And while we also do not see a whip in Tod und Teufel, it is once again suggested when Lisiska begs to be beaten. Through over as well as cover use of this motif, we see that while Wedekind does in fact emphasize a more open expression of sexuality as a means for regaining man’s lost vitality, he simultaneously advocates controlling female sexuality in order to hinder or at least restrain its destructive potential. Therefore, despite the prevalence of the whip, it is not so much this implement which Wedekind held up for admiration as it was the strength of the man employing this tool. While Wedekind presents both Goll and Schön in this role in the Lulu-plays and thus suggests they have the potential to control the female’s nature, they do not have the necessary willpower to handle this weapon properly. Only Jack, the character associated with the whip-wielding dompteur of the Prologue, is
shown to have the self-confidence, self-control, and self-assertion to back up the power of this instrument and only Jack who is capable of conquering and destroying the deviant sexuality represented by both Lulu and Geschwitz.

Although it is reasonable to believe that Wedekind truly intended to expose the fraudulent moralities of modern society, his works inadvertently also reveal how much he himself was caught up in and defined by these very images he sought to unmask and criticize. By portraying the female as possessing the necessary instincts but nonetheless requiring and even relishing control, Wedekind reiterates contemporary discourses which maintained woman was masochistic in nature and had, as Krafft-Ebing states, “a desire for blows” (134). While Wedekind did in fact champion a more liberated sexuality, and many scholars therefore interpret him as an advocate for women, his exclusive focus on woman as a purely sexual creature problematizes such claims. The additional stress his works place on the female’s highly deviant nature then serves to undermine even further any emancipatory leanings one could attribute to Wedekind. In looking at the functions of Wedekind’s female characters, it becomes abundantly clear that the vitality he portrays in the woman was meant to reawaken the vitality lying dormant in the man. According to Hibberd, “woman was supposed to be the source of invigoration in the man’s battle with life” (348). While the voracious sexuality displayed in Wedekind’s Rassenweiber did wreak

251 That Wedekind drew a very specific connection between Lulu and Jack through her yearnings “to fall into the hands of a lustmurder,” also follows with Krafft-Ebing’s contention that women wanted a man who could master them. “Generally speaking the following masculine qualities impress women, viz., physical strength, courage, nobility of mind, chivalry, self-confidence, even self-assertion, insolence, bravado, and a conscious show of mastery over the weaker sex” (23).
havoc, this destruction occurred only with men too weak to control the carnal impulse.\textsuperscript{252} As we have seen, Wedekind portrays each woman, but especially Lulu, as not only looking for a man strong enough to control her but indeed longing for such a man.

While it is to Wedekind’s credit that he exposed the fraudulent images of masculinity and femininity late-nineteenth-century society tried to project onto its men and women and thereby allowed for critical insight into the relationships of the sexes, he was himself very much caught up in the same bourgeois ideals he sought to undermine. As his personal papers reveal, Wedekind not only believed and acted out the issues of control addressed within his \textit{œuvre}, he also expressed and suffered under the same fears and anxieties as the male characters he ridiculed in his works.\textsuperscript{253} Twelve years before writing his famous \textit{Monstretragödie} Wedekind is exchanging letters with a school friend, Oskar Schibier. In one letter he is pondering how female sexuality would evolve (or devolve) if left to its own

\textsuperscript{252}In describing the characteristics of a \textit{femme fatale}, Hilmes notes that the only reason this figure can appear so powerful is in fact because the male position is already weakened to start with, and that this figure then reflects the general crisis of masculinity being experienced at the end-of-the-century. “Die Femme fatale spiegelt das Prekäre der männlichen Situation. In Zeiten entsprechender Verunsicherung und Orientierungslosigkeit hat dieses Bild Konjunktur. . . . Die Figur der Femme fatale enthält eine implizit Kritik . . . an der prekären Situation des Mannes, seiner Ichschwäche und verdrängten Triebverfallenheit”(vix). The figure of the \textit{femme fatale}, she continues, reflects a “verstümmelter Männlichkeit” (45) in that she reflects all his fears and anxieties. “Die Mortifikations des Männlichen . . . ist das eigentliche Thema der Geschichten der Femme fatale”(64).

\textsuperscript{253}In discussing Wedekind’s various relationships, Günther Waldmann notes that while Wedekind may himself not have wanted to live the bourgeois lifestyle, he expected it of the women with whom he was involved. “So sehr Wedekind in Werk und Lebensstil das Bürgerliche ablehnte, so sehr forderte er es von seinen Geliebten ein. Hier rekurriert er deutlich auf patriarchalische Verhaltensmuster, die er in seinem Werk sonst zu brandmarktf“(103).
recourse. “Wie wäre es, wenn die Frau über ihre eigene Sexualität verfügte, sich dieser als Macht bedient und sich aus der passiven Rolle befreite, die ihr von der Gesellschaft aufgezwungen worden ist? Die Büchse der Pandora! Die Folgen sind unabhälbar!”” (qtd. in Kieser, “Vorfrühling” 320-21). In another letter to Oskar written in the same year, he is trying to convince his friend to break off contact with a prostitute he is seeing because of the detrimental side effects it will cause his mental and physical health.

Ich bitte dich, mach dich los! . . . Schön soll sie auch gerade nicht sein, die Augen abgerechnet, die Dich ebenso leicht vergiften können . . . Ich sage vergiften. Denn glaube mir, es gibt nichts Schrecklichere, Widerwärtigstes als einen jungen blasierten Greisen, der, nachdem er seine paar Unzen Gehirn bei irgend einer losen Coquette verpufft hat, als geistlose Maschine auf der Welt umherirrt . . . Noch einmal: Reiß dich los! Sei ein Mann! O, bitte, bitte, denke daran was du bist, wer du bist, bevor du die Sache weitertreibst. (qtd. in Kieser, “Vorfrühling” 328)

Ironically, a few years after he warns Schiller of the dangers the prostitute poses, Wedekind is himself seeing one and warns her of the dangers that come with declaring one’s feelings

254 Here, at the age of eighteen, Wedekind is already expressing a position on female sexuality that will be reiterated again and again throughout the works of his adult years—that the prostitute is a woman of voracious sexual appetite and that this inordinate drive, while pathological in her, can be deadly for the men with whom she comes in contact. In confirmation of this attitude, Wedekind gets a letter back from his friend a few months later, when he has broken off his relationship, that reiterates Wedekind’s feelings. “Sie wollte nichts als fleischliche Lust. Und ich, zu wenig Härte besitzend, ihr zu widerstehen, fiel. Die thierische Natur siegte über die sittliche” (qtd. in Kieser, “Vorfrühling” 331). As Kieser observes, the woman takes on the vampire-like qualities in robbing the innocent youth of the “poetry of his life”. “Was für ein Szenario! Das Weib als vampirischer Dämon, das unschuldige Jünglinge verführt und ihnen die ‘Poesie’ ihrer ‘Jugend’ raubt!” (331). Wedekind’s last response on this topic is to compel his friend to avoid future sirens and keep to platonic friendships. “Natürlich mußt Du jetzt Deinen Vorsatz, in Zukunft die Sirene links liegen zu lassen, mit aller Energie durchführen, und Dich wo möglich wieder der alten, gemütlichen, so oft von uns verspotteten, platonischen Liebe zuwenden. Wenn sie auch in Wirklichkeit gar nicht besteht, so bietet sie doch eine angenehme Unterhaltung u. ist für Leib u. Seele unschädlich” (qtd. in Kieser, “Vorfrühling” 332).
in a relationship. "She starts talking about her feelings. I reply that it’s most unwise to have feelings, you invariably come off worse" (Diaries 139). Perhaps the most insightful look into Wedekind’s psyche, where his stance on sexual relations is concerned, can be seen in an excerpt from a lost diary of 1892 where Wedekind writes of the need to control.

Chin up! Chin up! Don’t discard the mask in front of her. She’s in love. Sad, but true! ... Chin up! To gain time is to gain everything. Any old excuse, just to gain time. Chin up! I’m not looking for X. I’m in search of woman. Glad to find her in any shape whatsoever. ... X represents a whole dimension of life for me; diplomacy, not love, is the leitmotif. She’s a victim, not a deity. She fulfills her vocation, and passes on. Don’t let go of the reins. Stay in command of the situation. Govern the elements—and don’t do anything stupid. I’m in search of woman... I’ve been exiled by her for the past eight days. She tore me from my solitude, fell upon me, and I went to the devil. I thought I would enjoy the course of instruction, and would return a hero. That won’t work. My only hope will be to come back to her in a moral sense. That’s when the life or death decision will be taken. (qtd. in Hay xvii-xviii)

In clearly wanting to take the stance of a dompteur, but unable to do so, it is not only the anxiety relative to unfettered female sexuality that comes across, but Wedekind’s own personal longings to take on the characteristics of those strong men he wrote of in his works.255 Even in his married life it becomes clear from his wife’s memoirs that Wedekind was the domineering angst-filled husband he portrayed in both Goll and Schön. “Frank kannte meine Neigung zum Unbürgerlichen und betrachtete sie als eine Gefahr” (Tilly 128).

255 To what extent he in fact did objectify women is aptly expressed in a diary entry five years later where he writes down a comment made to him by a prostitute he was currently seeing. “She insists, incidentally, that love between us is out of the question. I don’t give a hang what’s in or out of the question. If her mouth existed only for the purpose of speech, I’d sew it up (Diaries 6). Two years later in relating his response to a comment made by Gerhard Hauptmann Wedekind says, “Gerhard Hauptmann thinks that perhaps I am not altogether deficient in love, he considers me capable of self-sacrifice, etc. That I readily grant him, but for me such feelings denote weakness rather than strength. They would not reinforce my moral fibre, but undermine me” (Diaries 19).
Describing while likewise living under the same impotence-producing fears that tormented the male mind at the end of the nineteenth century, Wedekind, like the majority of men, made woman the scapegoat projecting not only his miseries onto her but also all his fears and resentments.\textsuperscript{256}

Where the nineteenth century began with the Romantics lauding the sexual woman, it ended with the literati damming her. In a period which Margarete Fingerling describes as the “Ende des klassischen Frauenkults” (1), the priestess-prostitute of the Romantics had degenerated into the vampire-whore of the Dark Romantics and the Decadence writers. No longer using her sexuality to reuniting estranged man with his transcendental nature, this woman now sucked the very life out of man as she attempted to sustain her own lavish and lascivious nature. Lucinde, the \textit{Lichtbringerin} of Friedrich Schlegel’s world had become Lulu, the \textit{Lucifer} of Wedekind’s world.\textsuperscript{257} In the medical, anthropological, and sociological discourses of the day, this literary demon of death and destruction translated either into the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{256} It is precisely this resentment which Glaser sees running throughout Wedekind’s \textit{oeuvre} as he maintains it is from the perspective of the weakling rather than the strong man that his works must be read. “Eine schwache, doch wahrnehmbare Ressentimentstruktur durchzieht Wedekind’s Plaidoyer für die wahre Natur. Es bricht weniger das Raubtier Mensch aus, \ldots \ als das Ressentiment der Schwachen” (153-54).
\item \textsuperscript{257} Despite giving woman more sexual freedom in his novel, which Becker-Cantarino notes is the one emancipatory aspect of Schlegel’s Lucinde, he, like the rest of the Early Romantics, still limited woman just as much to her sensual characteristics as did the late-nineteenth-century writers, albeit in a more positive respect. In fact, as she delineates all the ways Schlegel still confines his female figure to male-images and male-phantasies, Becker-Cantarino makes the point of noting that it is not the woman who is actually emancipated in this work, but indeed only the erotic. “Das Erotische ist das eigentliche Emanzipierte in diesem Roman \ldots Lucinde ist als Individuum kaum faßbar, als Frau ganz in den traditionellen Rollen von Geliebter, Frau und Mutter dargestellt” (“Lucinde” 134-35).
\end{itemize}
sex-craved nymphomaniac who drained the very essence out of man or the suffragette who, in her striving for emancipation, had taken on masculine (i.e., lesbian) characteristics and no longer needed man. Faced increasingly with these two types of women, the individual male now felt either sexually inadequate or sexually irrelevant.

Comprehending the dire straits of late-nineteenth-century men, Frank Wedekind used his works as a forum to urge them to wage war against woman. It is in this entreaty for man to save his manhood and regain his vitality that Wedekind’s “menschliche Moral” must be understood. The only way men could recoup their loss and once again dominate and control women in the manner of their forefathers was by regaining the drives and instincts Wedekind advocated under the rubric of “menschliche Moral.” That he meant this “morality” for the male and only the male is easily recognized when one looks at a notation he made in 1908 while writing down his views on woman and marriage.

Rangordnung der menschlichen Werte
1. Beruf (Persönlichkeit)
2. Verhältnis zur Frau (Häuslichkeit, Familie)
3. Gesundheit
4. Geschäft (Vermögen) (qtd. in Höger 144)

Here, as Höger notes, Wedekind clearly distinguishes between der Mensch and die Frau. “Infolge dieser Notiz ist die Frau noch immer kein richtiger Mensch” (144). By distinguishing the woman from the human and then additionally placing die Frau below der Mensch, Wedekind clearly makes a value judgement which reflects a tradition that goes all the way back to Galen—that woman falls below man on the humanoid continuum. With woman thus excluded from his concept of “menschliche Moral,” one can now understand this ideal of Wedekind’s as a vitality to be regained through the woman but not for the
woman. For Wedekind, as for many in his day, the male was *der Mensch* and the female *das Weib*. As such, the two were irretrievably separated from one another, standing apart from each other not only as opposites but also as opponents.
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