

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)

1. INTRODUCTION: THEORY AND INTERPRETATION

The German Novelle, always a popular field of study in German Literature, has been the subject of increasing attention in the last decade. During the 1960s another history of the Novelle appeared (by Himmel),¹ Bennett's older history was reissued, revised and brought up to date by Waidson, and Kunz began to publish a multi-volume history of the Novelle based on his earlier, shorter history.² A second volume of interpretations was produced by Benno von Wiese,³ and four volumes concerned with the theory of the Novelle also appeared: one in the series 'Sammlung Metzler', by von Wiese,⁴ a general discussion of Novelle theory by Malmede,⁵ an important collection of essays from Wieland and Goethe to the present day in the 'Wege der Forschung' series,⁶

¹ Hellmuth Himmel, *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle* (Berne and Munich, 1963).

² E. K. Bennett, *A History of the German Novelle*, 2nd ed., revised and continued by H. M. Waidson (Cambridge, 1961). The first edition of this standard work appeared in 1934. Josef Kunz's original history was his contribution to *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss*, II (Berlin, 1954), 'Geschichte der deutschen Novelle vom 18. Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart'. A much revised and extended version of this is appearing as three volumes in the *Grundlagen der Germanistik* series published by the Erich Schmidt Verlag; the first two volumes have appeared: *Die deutsche Novelle zwischen Klassik und Romantik* (1966), and *Die deutsche Novelle im 19. Jahrhundert* (1970). Other standard histories of the German Novelle are those by Johannes Klein, *Geschichte der deutschen Novelle*, 4th ed. (Wiesbaden, 1960), and Fritz Lockemann, *Gestalt und Wandlungen der deutschen Novelle* (Munich, 1957).

³ Benno von Wiese, *Die deutsche Novelle von Goethe bis Kafka: Interpretationen*, II (Düsseldorf, 1962). The first volume appeared in 1956.

⁴ Benno von Wiese, *Novelle*, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1967). First edition in 1963.

⁵ Hans Hermann Malmede, *Wege zur Novelle. Theorie und Interpretation der Gattung Novelle in der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft* (Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz, 1966). Malmede's book is adversely reviewed by Karl Konrad Polheim in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, LXXXV (1966), 615–28. Polheim regards Malmede's work as one which attacks previous Novelle theorists in a clumsy and unnecessarily personal way, while making no substantial positive contribution of its own to the field; and this view appears to me a reasonable one.

⁶ *Novelle*, ed. Josef Kunz (Darmstadt, 1968). This volume is an invaluable collection of classic essays by Schlegel, Tieck, Spielhagen, Heyse, et al., together with a number of standard modern discussions by, e.g., Walzel, Pongs, Grolmann, Pabst, Schunicht, and many others. A comparable collection, including the same kind of material, has just appeared: *Theorie und Kritik der deutschen Novelle von Wieland bis Musil*, ed. Karl

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)*NARRATION IN THE GERMAN NOVELLE*

and a 'Forschungsbericht' on the years 1945–64 by Polheim,¹ which is very largely a protracted discussion of theoretical issues. It is clear from this brief survey not only that there has been more writing on the Novelle in the last decade than in that which preceded it, but that the theory of the Novelle is now taking a larger place in such writing; in the 1950s histories of the Novelle and collections of interpretations appeared,² but no volume devoted primarily to the theory of the genre.

Throughout the nineteenth century, and right up to the present day, the most discussed question in the theory of the Novelle has been the simple one: what is a Novelle? And it is still, in the most recent work on the subject, thought to be as problematic as ever: this question, says Polheim, still in 1970 'bereitet der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft seit einiger Zeit erhebliches Kopfzerbrechen'.³ In the discussion which follows I shall first set out the dimensions of the problem, and then suggest that it can be solved by means of modern conceptual analysis. Recent discussion takes place largely against the background of certain very well-known statements⁴ made mainly in the nineteenth century, though there have been many different adaptations of these ideas. Despite a good deal of minor variation, however, there is a large area of common ground which is accepted by nearly all critics and scholars who have discussed the issue, and certainly by all the recent writers of histories of the Novelle.⁵ It has been agreed that

Konrad Polheim (Tübingen, 1970). But the two collections do not cover the same ground; Kunz's collection is mainly concerned with the twentieth century, while Polheim's is exclusively concerned with the earlier periods.

¹ Karl Konrad Polheim, *Novellentheorie und Novellenforschung. Ein Forschungsbericht 1945–1964* (Stuttgart, 1965). This is, from a theoretical point of view, the most sensible contribution to Novelle literature in the last few decades.

² E.g., the works by Klein, Lockemann, and von Wiese mentioned above, and also Walter Silz's *Realism and Reality. Studies in the German Novelle of Poetic Realism* (Chapel Hill, 1954).

³ Polheim, *Theorie und Kritik der deutschen Novelle*, p. xiii.

⁴ These are reviewed by, for example, Bennett and Silz. Texts of these classic statements can be found in *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, or *Theorie und Kritik der deutschen Novelle*, ed. Polheim.

⁵ E.g., Bennett, Klein, Himmel, Kunz, Lockemann; cf. also von Wiese, with his three volumes on the Novelle; and the excellent recent collection of texts *Deutsche Novellen von Tieck bis Hauptmann*, ed. A. P. Foulkes and E. Lohner (Boston, 1969). Two signi-

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION: THEORY AND INTERPRETATION

the Novelle deals with a *single* event, and one which is of a striking character (i.e., 'headlines' material). Thus, it is a realistic genre. The striking event makes for a narrative with a rather clear outline, and one which is sharply focused; this means that it is in its composition artistically concentrated. Because the event is so central, character is less important in the Novelle, and there is little or no development of character.¹

This much is almost universally accepted. In addition, certain views about the narration of the Novelle, and also its temper, are commonly expressed. In that a striking event is related as if it had actually happened, it is asserted that the narration which is appropriate to the Novelle is objective and distanced;² the narrator

significant exceptions are Polheim and von Arx, whose contributions I shall discuss below; but even the iconoclast Malméde accepts at least part of this common ground in his concentration on a certain kind of event as being the material of a Novelle.

¹ It will be useful to set out a sample of these points as formulated by some of the most representative, up-to-date, and widely read scholars. Von Wiese, *Die Deutsche Novelle*, 1, 15–16: '... die Heraushebung eines Ereignisses, der Vorrang des Ereignisses vor den Personen, die pointierende Darstellung . . .', and p. 14: 'Das Charakteristische der Novelle liegt vor allem in der Beschränkung auf eine Begebenheit.' His *Novelle*, p. 12, stresses that what a Novelle needs above all else is 'das novellistische Ereignis'; p. 26 of *Die deutsche Novelle*, 1, speaks of '... das Profilierende, Pointierende und Herausgehobene des erzählten isolierten Falles . . .', and of the Novelle as a genre which demands 'Beschränkung, Konzentration und Überraschung'. Bennett, p. 1: 'A minimum of definition, to be elaborated in the course of this survey, is the following: a Novelle is a narrative in prose, usually shorter than a novel, dealing with one particular situation, conflict, event, or aspect of a personality; it narrates something "new" in the sense of something unusual or striking.' Cf. also his pp. 18–19. Silz, p. 6: '... it must be concentrated and intensified, limited to one central event of crucial importance'. Kunz, *Novelle*, p. 22: '... trotz der Verschiedenheit, ja Gegensätzlichkeit der Novellentheorien bleibt durchgängig eine Gemeinsamkeit bestehen, die im allgemeinen nicht in Frage gestellt wird: daß sich diese Gattungsform auf ein Geschehen "ereignishafter" Art zentriert.' Cf. also Foulkes and Lohner, p. 1: 'Even today, a strict definition of the literary genre *Novelle* would tend to emphasize the structural and narrative qualities which would of necessity accompany the portrayal of a single "novel" occurrence. Most *Novellen* are distinguished by the fact that they depict a particular situation, portraying persons, things, and actions only insofar as they are directly affected by this central situation.' Klein's history elaborates this basic definition considerably, but without abandoning any of it.

² E.g., von Wiese, *Die deutsche Novelle*, 11, 12–13. Koskimies in his recent 'Theorie der Novelle', (pp. 405–32 of *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, originally *Orbis Litterarum*, xiv, 1959, 65–88) argues that 'frame' narration is especially central to the Novelle form ('Die Ursituation der Novellenform ist also in einer vielköpfigen Gesellschaft zu Hause . . .', p. 408), and then deals with the obvious objection that most Novellen are not so narrated by saying that it can simply be supplied: 'Meiner Ansicht nach hätte jeder beliebige neuzeitliche Novellist recht leicht seiner Sammlung einer Rahmenerzählung geben

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)

NARRATION IN THE GERMAN NOVELLE

will often appear as a 'frame' narrator addressing an actual audience, and his stance will always be one of presenting the event directly to his readers as something from his experience. Meanwhile the world view which emerges from this kind of narrative, it is often said, will be one that stresses chance, and the unpredictability of fate.¹

Two formal criteria have been suggested which make concrete the idea that the Novelle must have a clear outline and be artistically concentrated. These are the suggestions (originally made by Tieck and Heyse) that there be first, a distinct turning point in the story (a 'Wendepunkt') at which the striking event takes place, and, second, that the story should have a silhouette and distinctive symbol.² The second of these two has provoked widespread dissent, but the first still has a number of adherents, who do, however, often caution against too rigid an application of the idea.³ Typically, whenever the theory of the Novelle comes under any attack from a sceptic, these two ideas are the first to be abandoned, though the basic idea from which both spring (that the Novelle is a sharp and concentrated form) is not.⁴

können . . . eine Rahmenerzählung vom theoretischen Standpunkt [ist] durchaus nicht notwendig, denn der ideale Rahmen läßt sich auch ohne sie klar genug feststellen und erkennen' (p. 411). But an argument which rules out all possible counter-examples by definition, is one which asserts nothing.

¹ Bennett (p. 5) says the Novelle presents chance as fate, and presupposes an irrational view of life. Cf. von Wiese, *Novelle*, p. 9; Klein, p. 5; and Foulkes and Lohner, p. 1: '... the Novelle can be regarded as the genre which deals with chance, with the arbitrariness and capriciousness of fate'. Lockemann and Kunz present more developed versions of the characteristic metaphysical content of the Novelle.

² The original texts have recently been reprinted, both in Kunz, *Novelle*, and Polheim, *Theorie und Kritik der deutschen Novelle*.

³ Heyse's 'Falkentheorie' has been widely criticised, e.g., by Silz, pp. 4–5; Bennett, p. 14 ('neither very profound nor illuminating'), von Wiese, *Die deutsche Novelle*, 1, 26, and many others; Theodor Storm's criticism of Heyse appears often to serve as a model for later critics. The 'Wendepunkt' is less challenged, however; Bennett accepts it (p. 18), Silz queries its *exclusive* occurrence in the Novelle, but still says that in this genre 'it stands out more starkly' (p. 9). Cf. the very recent Foulkes and Lohner, p. 1; and H. H. Remak's continued use of it as a criterion for the analysis of some stories by Keller ('Theorie und Praxis der Novelle: Gottfried Keller' in *Stoffe, Formen, Strukturen, Studien zur deutschen Literatur. Hans Heinrich Borchardt zum 75 Geburtstag*, ed. Fuchs and Motekat, Munich, 1962).

⁴ E.g., von Wiese (*Novelle*, pp. 11–12, or *Die deutsche Novelle*, 1, p. 26) makes clear that while the formal requirement for 'Wendepunkt' or 'Falke' can be abandoned, the ideas underlying them cannot. Thus, when he asserts that there can be good Novellen

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)*INTRODUCTION: THEORY AND INTERPRETATION*

My own belief is that both the basic theory and its extensions are deficient in every particular, and I shall attempt briefly to demonstrate this. It will soon become apparent that all these statements which attempt to show characteristic features of the Novelle are subject to one or more of three general objections: first, some or even most Novellen do not show the feature in question; second, what is asserted is so general in scope that it concerns a feature of literature in general, not the Novelle in particular; third, the assertion is so vague that presence or absence of the feature concerned cannot be determined at all.

To take an easy example of the first kind of objection, most Novellen do not have 'frame' narrators, nor do they display as a group a characteristically Novellistic narrative stance – whether objective and distanced, or any other kind. The same range of narrative stances is found in Novellen as in any other kind of fiction; to this point I shall return in the later part of this chapter. The requirement of a striking event turns out to be too broad, on the other hand: works of literature are generally concerned with such things. Let us take Shakespeare's big four plays for some familiar examples: the murder of a king (*Macbeth*), the brutal rejection of a father by his daughters (*Lear*), jealousy drives a husband to kill his wife (*Othello*), a son avenges his father's murder by his uncle (*Hamlet*) – all of these offer striking events, which can be reduced to the striking headline formulae classically demanded of Novellen, though there seems to be no point in doing so. It might well be objected that these statements grossly reduce Shakespeare's plays, but in like manner, the required striking formulae have always reduced Novellen too; the formula 'two lovers perish because of the enmity between their families' is as injurious to Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* as it is to Keller's *Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe*. Evidently, literature deals for the most part with material that is rather more concentrated and striking than everyday life, and this is a fact of artistic concentration in general, not Novellistic construction in particular. Equally,

without these characteristics, he is not in essence abandoning the common definition of the Novelle.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)*NARRATION IN THE GERMAN NOVELLE*

it is a general characteristic of literature that this artistic concentration often involves symbolism; this is neither less, nor more, the case in the Novelle that it is in literature generally. To demand that a Novelle have a 'Wendepunkt', on the other hand, seems both pointlessly trivial, and too vague a test. Presence or absence depends on an arbitrary analysis of plot structure rather than its real characteristics. Droste-Hülshoff's *Die Judenbuche*, usually taken as a classic example of the genre, illustrates this arbitrariness well. Is the turning-point the death of Brandes? Friedrich's adoption by his uncle? The death of Aaron? Friedrich's fate abroad? In *Das Erdbeben in Chili*, is the turning-point the decision to go back into the city? The priest's sermon? The earthquake itself? These questions are evidently pointless, and the decisions they require are arbitrary. For the sake of a theory about the genre 'Novelle' they ask us to give one aspect of the text an emphasis which it does not have, and so to distort it.

Similar considerations apply to any attempt to diagnose whether the text is about a single event rather than more than one; this depends on a definition of what a 'single' event is, not on any real characteristics of the plot of a particular story, and so this criterion also is too vague to be tested. Kleist's *Erdbeben*, or Keller's *Romeo und Julia*, can be *spoken* of as if they concerned one event, or a sequence of events; and so could most novels, or plays. As to character: Storm's *Der Schimmelreiter* shows great concern with the figure of Hauke Haien, Keller's *Kleider machen Leute* with the characters of Wenzel and Nettchen and their development, Grillparzer's *Der arme Spielmann* with Jakob, and so on; more examples are superfluous. Yet the error here is more logical than factual; for at bottom this alleged characteristic of the Novelle depends on a misconceived opposition of 'Character' and 'Situation'. All human situations are created by the characters involved in them, and all character is shown in the response of people to situations. When we talk of 'Character' instead of 'Situation' we are thus opposing one kind of analysis to another, not two different kinds of things. For this reason, the difference between the two terms cannot be used as a means of differentiating

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)*INTRODUCTION: THEORY AND INTERPRETATION*

works of literature.¹ Naturally, some books can be more concerned with one central character than others (both novels and Novellen), and long novels offer more space for more detail, over a longer period, than does a Novelle. But they do so by providing more situations, and so this is still nothing to do with an opposition of situation and character or a different kind of relation between the two.

Even the demand that a Novelle be realistic in its material turns out to be not very helpful; if taken seriously it would mean that we should have to exclude Kafka when we talk about the Novelle, and Klein conscientiously does so. Other histories of the Novelle, though accepting the standard theory, seem instinctively to feel how foolish it would be to exclude Kafka from the series of works in German literature which include, for example, Kleist, Hoffmann, Hauptmann, and Hofmannsthal.² And even Klein seems to feel that Hofmannsthal's grotesque fantasy *Reitergeschichte* cannot be ignored. Again, who will feel that it makes sense to include Keller's collection of stories *Die Leute von Seldwyla*, but omit from it *Spiegel das Kätzchen*?³ Much of Hoffmann would need to be rejected, and the absurdity of this would be emphasised by the fact that it would split his very closely knit *oeuvre* down the middle; presumably *Der Sandmann*, and *Der goldene Topf* would be excluded and *Das Fräulein von Scuderi* included, with *Rat Krespel* a query. Worst of all, that most popular Novelle, Storm's

¹ This distinction is most recently reasserted by von Wiese (*Novelle*, p. 5), who maintains that 'Kleist's *Michael Kohlhaas* nicht eine Charakternovelle ist, wie sehr oft behauptet wurde, sondern nur vom Ereignisgeflecht und von der symbolischen Verdichtung her angemessen verstanden werden kann . . .' The logic of what is being asserted is worth attention. Von Wiese cannot be arguing against the view that Kleist's Novelle is concerned with the character of Michael Kohlhaas – that would be simply to deny part of its 'Stoff' which we can all see. Logically, he can only be saying that it is not (or is not important for) the 'Gehalt', the meaning of the book. But on this interpretation, he must also be mistaken: the 'Gehalt' of any book is a product of all its characters, events, and symbolism.

² Lockemann (pp. 357–63), Bennett/Waidson (pp. 265–71), Himmel (pp. 425–26) and von Wiese, (*Die deutsche Novelle*, I, 325–42, and II, 319–45), discuss such blatantly unrealistic stories as *Das Urteil*, *Ein Hungerkünstler*, and *Die Verwandlung*, and so let their instincts judge their theory to be inadequate.

³ Lockemann (p. 185), includes it, but Klein, in his ten pages (pp. 303–12) on the *Leute von Seldwyla*, does not even mention it by name.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)

NARRATION IN THE GERMAN NOVELLE

Der Schimmelreiter, with its ghosts, might have to go if we took this requirement seriously. But there is no need to: when this kind of practical dilemma occurs with regularity, we may be sure that the tradition of Novelle writing has no strict and essential requirement of realistic material.¹ To be sure, a very special convention of unrealistic prose is identifiable (the Märchen) which is separable from the Novelle; but it is not *opposed* to the Novelle as unrealistic to realistic writing, i.e., the meaning of the two categories does not depend on each being the opposite of the other (as in the case, for example, in the opposition dark/light). Novelle and Märchen are not in binary opposition as categories, though this is frequently assumed.

Some of these weaknesses in the standard theory of the Novelle are so obvious that they have been commented on before, but until very recently these comments were only made in piecemeal fashion, never adding up to any serious challenge to the whole theory; and on occasion, the reconciliation of the theory with its evident flaws has been achieved with much ingenuity. Von Wiese accepts the common theory of the Novelle, and is even fairly sympathetic to the extensions of it which I have noted; and he deals with the fact that there are Novellen without ‘Wendepunkt’, ‘Rahmen’, etc., by warning against any dogmatic attitude to Novelle requirements.² Here, a negative value (dogmatism) is assigned to any consistent attitude to the definition of a Novelle, and thus also to any very close scrutiny of the accepted definition.

¹ I develop the much more serious theoretical argument against this criterion below, pp. 20–25.

² Von Wiese, *Novelle*, pp. 11–12: ‘Jedem Dogmatismus in der Novellentheorie muß entgegengehalten werden, daß das spannungsreiche Verhältnis zwischen einer als objektiv wahr, neu und wirklich erzählten Begebenheit und einer indirekten, subjektiven Darstellungsform sehr verschiedene Abwandlungen erfahren kann. Verbindliche Regeln gibt es hier glücklicherweise nicht. Wir besitzen wertvolle Novellen mit und ohne “Falken”, mit und ohne “Wendepunkt”, mit und ohne “Rahmen”, mit und ohne “Idee”, ja sogar mit und ohne “Leitmotiv”.’ Yet von Wiese goes on to make it clear that the basic theory is not challenged here, and is for him as much a dogma as ever: ‘Was jedoch die Novelle in erster Linie braucht, wird immer das novellistische Ereignis und seine jeweilige Formung sein’ (p. 12). Much the same kind of attitude is found in Joachim Müller’s ‘Novelle und Erzählung’, in *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, pp. 463–76 (originally *Etudes Germaniques*, xvi, 1961, 97–107); cf. for example, p. 465: ‘Der Gattungstypus ist keine Norm, die eine absolute Erfüllung fordert . . .’

INTRODUCTION: THEORY AND INTERPRETATION

The much-quoted judgment of Pabst: ‘Denn es gibt weder die “romanische Urform” der Novelle noch “die Novelle” überhaupt. Es gibt nur Novellen’,¹ is largely sceptical about the possibility of a definition, yet even so has been turned to good use as a means of preserving the standard theory; the unworkability of the standard definition is related only to the demand for ‘die Novelle’, while shifting from generic singular to a much more unspecified plural (‘Novellen’) seems to allow for a variety and so for less rigid conformity to the definition, which thus once more survives without radical change.² A similar grammatical shift is used by von Wiese when he seeks a way out of difficulties by speaking not of ‘Novelle’ but of ‘novellistisches Erzählen’.³ But this shifting of the grammatical status of the term makes no difference to the substantive issue of the theory of the genre; whether the term ‘Novelle’ is retained as noun or made into an adjective, whether it is singular or plural, the question still remains: What does it categorise, and where are the boundaries of the category? Grammatical shifts are an avoidance of the issue, and do not deal with the problems inherent in the standard theory, giving only the illusion of having dealt with those problems. Kunz,⁴ too, tries to solve the problem by juggling with the notion

¹ Walter Pabst, *Novellentheorie und Novellendichtung. Zur Geschichte ihrer Antinomie in den romanischen Literaturen* (Hamburg, 1953). I cite from p. 324 of the ‘Schlußbetrachtung’ of this work as reprinted in *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, pp. 313–28.

² Manfred Schunicht (‘Der “Falke” am “Wendpunkt”’. Zu den Novellentheorien Tiecks und Heyses’, in *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, pp. 433–62, originally *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* xli, 1960, 44–65) cites Pabst’s statement with approval (p. 462), but still maintains many of the old distinctions between *Novelle* and *novel*, and allows the existence of a ‘deutscher Novellentyp des 19. Jahrhunderts’ (p. 460).

³ Von Wiese, *Novelle*, p. 13. Martini agrees that von Wiese’s phrase is a ‘Verlegenheitslösung’ (p. 351 of ‘Die deutsche Novelle im “bürgerlichen Realismus”’, in *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, pp. 346–84, originally *Wirrendes Wort*, x, 1960, 257–78), though his concept of the ‘dominierende Intention’ of the *Novelle* has become for other scholars (cf. Kunz, *Novelle*, p. 4 and p. 23, and Müller, ‘Novelle und Erzählung’, p. 465) just as useful a means of filling the gap between the standard theory and the facts.

⁴ Kunz, *Novelle*, p. 22: ‘Eine umfassende “Definition” der *Novelle* – etwa als Summe der hier einbezogenen Theorien – zu geben, ist unmöglich. Aber eines kann man den meisten von ihnen entnehmen: Von dem her, was man noch einmal mit Fritz Martini die “dominierende Intention” der *Novelle* nennen könnte, ist es sehr wohl möglich, die *Novelle* als Gattungsform zu erfassen und von anderen epischen Formen – etwa der *Erzählung* – zu unterscheiden.’

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-29592-5 - Narration in the German Novelle: Theory and Interpretation

John M. Ellis

Excerpt

[More information](#)*NARRATION IN THE GERMAN NOVELLE*

of definition; his view is that there can be no comprehensive definition of the Novelle, yet that we can nonetheless understand it and distinguish it from other genres. But what is an attempt to distinguish between one thing and another, if not a definition?

The point at issue is precisely: how can we distinguish the Novelle from other genres. One can perhaps generalise from these and other instances¹ that there is a fairly widespread attitude to the difficulties inherent in the accepted definition of the Novelle; it is that in spite of evident weaknesses, the definition works, some of the time at least, more or less adequately, if only one is not too strict about it. Thus one must be cautious rather than too normative or dogmatic; instead of a comprehensive definition one must be content with approximations; difficulties only arise if one seeks the abstract 'die Novelle' instead of talking about concrete examples, a kind of story-telling, or the dominant intent of the category. And yet: when all these qualifications have been made, the basic content of the definition remains unchanged. Involved are still the same features and characteristics of the accepted definition.

One of the reasons for this lack of real forward movement in Novelle theory has been that radical sceptics have never seemed to offer anything satisfying in place of the accepted definition; if one thing is to be abandoned, something else must take its place. Frequently, the destruction of some parts of the accepted definition leads only to a greater reliance on other (equally questionable) parts, instead of a really new departure. Thus Schunicht² analyses the contributions of Tieck and Heyse with great exactitude, and questions their theoretical validity; he then stresses the narrator's

¹ E.g., Silz (p. 10) concludes that 'these features [the usual Novelle criteria], though not individually indispensable, yet all have a certain validity as partial and approximate descriptions of a highly concentrated, highly artistic form of narrative literature'. Foulkes and Lohner adopt the standard definition of the Novelle in their 'Introduction', but, in their 'Preface', 'urge the student to approach these definitions with caution, even with skepticism . . .'

² 'Der "Falke" am "Wendepunkt"', in *Novelle*, ed. Kunz, pp. 433–62. For example, p. 454: 'Ein entschiedenes Kriterium novellistischen Erzählens liegt in dem deutlichen Bestreben des Erzählers, sich mit Hilfe zahlreicher Fiktionen von der dargestellten Begebenheit zu distanzieren.'