

Shalom, Not Bigotry: Orthopraxis as Response to Karl Gutzkow's *Wally, die Zweiflerin* (1835)

Andrew Wisely
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

Abstract

Karl Gutzkow's Wally, die Zweiflerin (1835) features Cäsar, a brilliant and cold cynic who simultaneously courts and "emancipates" Wally, souring the restless young aristocrat toward her Christian faith and driving her to despair. Gutzkow's roughshod novel provoked from critic Wolfgang Menzel a polemic as alarming as the novel itself, but that did it little justice. Mark Walhout's concept of "orthopraxis," a practice for determining how a novel encourages or discourages shalom, is a starting point for going beyond critical vendettas, and for challenging the purely empirical descriptions of epochal irresponsibility emphasized thus far in the criticism of the novel.

Count Clemens Metternich (1773–1859), synonymous with the absolutism of the German Confederation in the Restoration years between 1815 and 1848, did everything in his power to suppress the impulses of reform in the 1830s in a group of writers known as "Young Germany." When it appeared five years after the July Revolution of 1830, Karl Gutzkow's (1811–1878) novel *Wally, die Zweiflerin* (1835) unleashed one of the major scandals of Young Germany's ongoing provocations against Metternichean absolutism. A polemic against established religion, the novel quickly attracted a blistering response from the venerable critic Wolfgang Menzel (1798–1873), whose preference for vendetta above thoughtful engagement will be taken in this paper as emblematic of much literary criticism based on ostensibly "Christian" principles. Menzel is examined here as representative of all critics unable to suspend animosity long enough to show charity

toward disagreeable texts. The values under siege appear too sacrosanct for frank debate, with the result that a critical response resembles a monologue that closes down discussion. Refusing charitable engagement stems from an anxiety in which the adjective “Christian” offers a convenient kind of sacred Fifth Amendment for keeping taboos under wraps.

The shortcomings of such an approach, exemplified by Menzel’s response to *Wally, die Zweiflerin* provides a starting point that in turn begs a corrective. Christian criticism stands to benefit from an interpretive model known as “orthopraxis,” which can rescue texts such as *Wally* for reflection within the context of shalom. Because the interests of orthopraxis open up a surprising number of avenues for investigation, the present argument is forced to limit its application of “orthopractic” insights to the figure of Cäsar in the novel, and only then as a starting point, to suggest that the virtue of hope lacking in his character is precisely what should define the vision of the Christian reader.

Gutzkow’s novel entered the political and literary landscape of the Young Germany movement, a loosely-knit group of writers for whom movement in a general sense was essential for escaping the suppressive alliance of politics and religion. Heinrich Heine (1797–1856), who included himself among these “Männer der Bewegung” (men of movement),¹ published four *Reisebilder* (Images of Travel) volumes (1826–1831) that are perhaps the most enduring travel accounts of the nineteenth century. Another variation of the metaphor is found in Ludolf Wienbarg’s (1802–1872) Kiel lectures of 1834 compiled as *Ästhetische Feldzüge* (Aesthetic Campaigns). Whether city snapshot or more systematic call to theoretical arms, the constant movement of supple prose poked fun at laboriousness and *Epigonentum* while eluding Metternich’s state censor. Movement was also supported epistemologically: believing truth to be present in resistance to the status quo, restless Young Germans admired the Reformation and Enlightenment as guideposts for shattering fossilized systems. Ignoring approved plot developments in favor of a quick turn of phrase—this was when journalism took root—Gutzkow, Heine, Wienbarg, Heinrich Laube (1806–1884) and Theodor Mundt (1808–1861) were in the 1830s considered for a short time unwelcome guests in the temple of German literature.²

Gutzkow especially behaved inappropriately in that space, but he was not chastised by Menzel on the level of poetics. Formalistic guidelines might have provided both author and critic a grid for judging the success of a finished text. Instead, as the case of *Wally* makes clear, Menzel initiated a

journalistic duel with scarcely a nod to the text. It was more the very idea of a plea for emancipation from religion that infuriated Menzel and led to a federal prohibition on Gutzkow's writings. Only twenty-four when *Wally* was published in August of 1835, Gutzkow was ordered to spend a month in a Mannheim prison in January of 1836 due to "verächtlicher Darstellung des Glaubens der christlichen Religionsgemeinschaften" (spiteful depiction of the belief of Christian religious communities).³ His prison sentence lasted a week longer than the time he took to write the novel. Upon release, Gutzkow was ordered to leave Baden altogether.

Under more tolerant post-Revolution circumstances, Gutzkow published a second edition in 1852. In the preface, he admits that the scandal of the novel derives from his polemic against established theological and clerical principles.⁴ A summary of the novel's plot crystallizes this impression. As the title suggests, the novel discusses the increasing despair of the central figure, Wally. At nineteen, she is carefree, mood-driven, and bored by her many aristocratic suitors. Her curiosity is piqued instead by Cäsar, a Mephistophelean outsider five years her senior (i.e., Gutzkow's own age at the time), who considers her the potential antidote to his boredom. Cäsar does not end up wooing Wally so much as slowly dismantling her identity, however. By degrees, he drains any meaning her faith still holds and redirects her allegiance to him instead. He unsettles her in part by reciting haunting tales about double-crossed lovers who commit suicide. The gratuitous scandal of the novel is Wally's agreement to show herself nude to Cäsar on the evening before her wedding to a Sardinian ambassador named Luigi. After Wally and Luigi move to Paris, Luigi's brother Jeronimo makes desperate advances toward Wally, who is too bored to seriously discourage him. She thus plays unwittingly into Luigi's plan to force Jeronimo to entrust him with the dwindling inheritance that Jeronimo is too lovesick to manage. Increasingly perplexed, Jeronimo kills himself outside Wally's window while she watches. Wally is ripped out of complacency now, and flees Paris immediately with Cäsar. The final part of the novel, told through her diary, reports that Cäsar has become enraptured by a Jewish woman named Delphine, enough to marry and live with her in territory subject to more lenient French laws. With Cäsar's loss, Wally also loses any religious comfort his skepticism has left untouched. The effect on Wally of reading Cäsar's treatise on belief (which Gutzkow culls from the fragmented writings of Hermann Reimarus [1694–1768]), is a final six months of despair that concludes with her suicide by knife.

Sketching a plot in this manner, however briefly, is already to do criticism. Before continuing that tack, however, it is necessary to examine why Menzel's stinging indictments led to the novel's prohibition. As mentioned, there is little of the plot he addresses except the central scandalous moment: "Der Verfasser glaubt nicht pikant genug sein zu können und entblößt seine Geliebte gleichsam auf offner Straße . . ." (The author thinks it necessary to spice up his account by undressing his beloved character, so to speak, out in the open).⁵ In the first of his dispatches, Menzel accuses Gutzkow, his former protégée at the newspaper *Zeitung für gebildete Stände*, of responding to his tutelage by mocking him with this novel he finds so filthy. Impervious to what he sees as Gutzkow's smear tactics, Menzel presents himself as writing instead to protect the honor of German literature: "So lange ich lebe, werden Schändlichkeiten dieser Art nicht ungestraft die deutsche Literatur entweihen" (As long as I live, such abasements will not desacralize German literature without being punished).⁶ Sacrosanct and German, literature requires safeguarding from men like Gutzkow—the "plague-bearing pioneer" of Young Germany—whose paltry French immorality shrinks, according to Menzel, next to the manly spirit of the German fraternity: "Die Unsitte kam immer von Frankreich herüber, und der deutsche Volksgeist war immer gesund und edel genug, sie wieder von sich abzuschütteln" (Immorality has always come from France, and the spirit of the German people has always proven strong and noble enough to shake it off).⁷ Gutzkow's hatred and scorn of Christ has turned the temple of literature into a house of sin, claims Menzel—yet the sole passage quoted to support this verdict is Cäsar/Reimarus's belief that Christ's claim to be the Messiah resulted from a "bedenkliche Verwirrung" (worrisome confusion) of his ideas.⁸

Menzel's *ad hominem* argument becomes even more personal when he links the novel's filthiness not only to Gutzkow the author, but also to Gutzkow the *critic*, with whom he is now competing for readers and who lacks the virtue demanded by life under the public eye. Gutzkow, proposing a new Bible of weakness and sin, brings upon himself in Menzel's account a judgment from the old Bible of strength and holiness: "Darum wird über dich ein Unglück kommen, daß du nicht wissest, wenn es daherbricht, und wird ein Unfall auf dich fallen, den du nicht sühnen kannst" (Therefore a misfortune will come upon you at a time that you do not expect, and a calamity befall you for which you cannot atone).⁹ Clearly, this verdict addresses Menzel's readership with an apocalyptic fury that, far removed

from patient dialogue with the text, serves to conflate bigotry with things “Christian.” Surprisingly, safeguarding orthodoxy does not even figure in Menzel’s rhetoric, busy as he is haranguing about Gutzkow’s immoral French assault on the purity of German youth.

The incongruity of Menzel’s response is recognized by no less a contemporary than Heinrich Heine: “Sonderbar! Und immer ist es die Religion und immer die Moral und immer der Patriotismus, womit alle schlechten Subjekte ihre Angriffe beschönigen!” (Remarkable! It’s always religion, morality, and patriotism that vile persons use to dress up their attacks!) To defend Christianity by plunging the dagger into Gutzkow’s back is, he conjectures, “freilich ein bißchen unchristlich” (admittedly a bit un-Christian).¹⁰ Gutzkow, too, is disturbed—less with Menzel’s behavior than with his surprising lack of textual analysis, and thus resulting disrespect for the author: “Wann hat Menzel ein Werk in seine einzelne Theile zerlegt; wann ist er auf dessen innres Wesen eingegangen; wann ließ er den Autor zu Worte kommen?” (When has Menzel examined the intricate parts of a work; when did he ever approach its inner workings; when did he allow the author to speak?)¹¹ Had Menzel admonished him instead to avoid mixing too much pedantry into his poetry, Gutzkow would have been at least reminded of Aristotle instead of the state and “bewaffnete Autorität” (armed authority).¹²

Heine and Gutzkow, critics themselves, thus insist that criticism at least involve consistent textual analysis. Menzel’s insistent defense of the politico-religious status quo under the guise of moral indignation offers little that is either “Christian” or critical. He dismisses empirical data to argue for a zero sum game in which men live and die by the convictions by which they judge a text that is unlikely to challenge those convictions. He perceives a need to supervise a fledgling yet wholesome German literature, interchangeable with and as precious a commodity as German youth, against assaults from the irreligious French outside. In so doing, Menzel endears himself to the official censors and clerical-political authorities, but not on rational terms. He must resort to apocalyptic rhetoric to conjure up biblical authority. The effect is to shut off the dialogue with the text and with the public sphere that is necessary for criticism, because to allow an interruption of his own prophetic monologue is to invite failure. The intensity of Menzel’s response is proof, writes Herbert Kaiser, that *Wally* struck a nerve in the collective *Feindbilder* (images of the enemy) of contemporary literary-cultural circles.¹³ The German-Nationalist propaganda of identifiable

scapegoats construed Francophiles and the Jews of Young Germany (Heine, Gutzkow) as non-German and non-Christian.¹⁴ For the first time in literary history, Kaiser claims, the reactions to a novel showed how and which prejudices could be mobilized in a hurry to deflect criticism of the ideological center. The mixture of moral outrage, dogmatic watchfulness, and nationalistic imagery finds its literary parallel under National Socialism a century later.¹⁵

For a century and a half, the knee-jerk reactions of Menzel and his contemporaries held sway in the criticism of this “cold” novel. Theodor Mundt, for example, emphasized the novel’s “raffinierte Kälte” (sophisticated coldness), while Ferdinand Gustav Kühne commented on its “kalthertige Zerstörungsluft” (coldhearted air of destruction)¹⁶—here the morbidity of the text itself may play a role. In any event, the stigma that accompanied Gutzkow’s writings was still apparent in a research review of 1976 that appraised his works as “unzulänglich” (inadequate).¹⁷ Nevertheless, not quite a century after Feodor Wehl’s admiration in 1886—“Niemand hat die Bedürfnisse, Wünsche, Zielpunkte seiner Periode so klar erkannt, so tief ergriffen wie er” (No one else has realized so clearly and grasped so deeply the needs, wishes, and goals of his period)¹⁸—*Wally* became accessible in a Reclam study-edition in 1979 and is scheduled to appear as a hybrid text/CD critical edition in 2007, as Volume 4 of the *Erzählerische Werke* published by Oktober Verlag.¹⁹ The fact that the novel will appear with texts documenting its reception underlines its value for most critics in sociohistorical rather than aesthetic currency. Recognized as perhaps more calculated than inspired, *Wally* is appreciated for revealing the struggle of practices and norms in a public sphere that gave rise to all manner of journals around 1830.²⁰

Whatever the reasons for rescuing the novel from obscurity, a scholarly re-assessment should also alert us to the possibility of an alternative reading from a perspective more in tune with Christian practices. Might it be possible for a critic shaped by life in the Christian community to propose an alternative not only to harmful “Christian” readings, but also to what have become theoretically top-heavy readings—and, as will be shown, to sociohistorical readings that see characters only as representative and explainable? How, in other words, might one assess the proposal Mark Walhout has made “to evaluate a literary practice in faith, hope, and charity”?²¹ For his model of Christian literary scholarship, Walhout suggests traveling the same route taken by Christian institutions of higher learning,

as described in Nicholas Wolterstorff's history of their scholarship.²² Rather than adopting a posture of rhetorical confrontation, Walhout proposes "reflection on practice in the light of belief, in which certain Christian virtues play a role in interpretation."²³ Rooted in the virtue of hope, for example, the Christian critic can participate in the transformation of society "in order to bring about *shalom*."²⁴ The suggested material for the critical examination is "the literature of the oppressed," and the suggested critical activity is the defense of those "whose flourishing is enabled or hindered by literary texts." Walhout suggests the term *orthopraxis* to describe the method of examining "the nature of the literary *practice* that has produced [them]—a practice which, because it is a form of action that makes other actions possible, has social consequences that advance or inhibit shalom."²⁵

The understanding of shalom—Hebrew for "peace" or "well-being"—that Walhout takes for granted can be enriched by heeding the suggestions given by Roger Lundin and Susan V. Gallagher for how reading literature helps bring about shalom: "1) we are to cultivate the potentials of God's world; 2) we are to enjoy a world of delight; 3) we are to work for a world of physical sustenance and justice."²⁶ In some ways, shalom is already orthopraxis—a Judeo-Christian ethics where orthodoxy yields right praxis, which in turn shapes orthodoxy. It is the convergence of spirit and politics that springs from the mandates of citizenship in God's Kingdom. By spreading the Gospel of peace (Eph. 6:15), Christians are in the vanguard of the age to come, people "on the way" committed to the unity of all things in Christ.

Orthopractic critics would query texts and contexts (the milieus of author, text, and reception) for the presence and absence of those qualities, asking what practices are being advocated, and to what extent the text can contribute to the flourishing not only of its readers, but also of all groups affected by whatever forces are set in motion by the text. Rather than isolating doctrine from the practices it helps guide, one would be so informed by it as to defend the persons affected adversely in and by the text and its surrounding practices—one would focus attention on the tangible consequences of the text's reception. Indeed, one could advocate orthopraxis as a textual practice apprenticed to Jesus' style of revelatory confrontation, as recorded in John's Gospel, toward individuals such as Nicodemus, Zacchaeus, and the woman at the well. Noel Moules remarks: "We shine a

light in the darkness to reveal it for what it is, rather than shouting into the darkness about darkness.²⁷

By and large, Menzel's criticism meets few of these criteria. As shown, he is motivated by personal animosity toward his protégé to attack the text as an extension of its author; he confuses Christianity with German nationalism at the expense of everything French; he confuses virtue with German male youth; he projects his literary vendetta onto an apocalyptic screen of victor and vanquished, in which, as he writes, his boot crushes the head of the serpent warming itself in the manure of concupiscence (283).²⁸

Shining a light on the text to reveal lightness or darkness must overlap with those critical views calling for engagement with the text. What are the ramifications of orthopraxis for the text itself and the context in which *Wally* was written and received? What emerges from a patient reading of the text informed by the concerns of shalom? Several themes invite reflection: the aristocracy, particularly the Parisian version described by Gutzkow as superficial and money-obsessed, which has formed Cäsar and Wally but leaves them unsettled; the figure of Luigi as negative exemplar driving his brother Jeronimo to ruin, a poor soul whom, despite depicting him sympathetically and with humor, Gutzkow consigns to death by obsession; the problematic aspects of "life" and spontaneity championed by Young Germany and manifested in the novel; the issue of emancipation for women as embodied by Wally, by Delphine as the idealized personification of sensuality, and by Wally's literary predecessors such as Friedrich Schlegel's *Lucinde* (1799) and George Sand's *Lélia* (1833);²⁹ the relation of that emancipation to Wally's doubt and despair; the underlying motivation and strategy of Gutzkow's attack on Christianity; and finally a study of the reception of novel via the ideological battles it unleashed,³⁰ involving the attempt to read Gutzkow on his own terms.³¹ Many of these aspects, addressed already in the research, could be revisited productively by orthopraxis.³²

The present focus singles out the character of Cäsar for analysis. In him, as the following remarks show, shalom is glaringly absent. It is worth considering how readers recognize and interpret this absence. Either we identify Cäsar's frozen virtue because Gutzkow has successfully depicted him as a negative role model, or we notice Gutzkow's failure to present Cäsar as a believable, perhaps even admirable counter-hero. Few readers would wish to identify with Wally's growing despair, let alone call it a longed-for

condition of shalom; Cäsar's cynicism produces a similar effect. After all, the accusations of irreligion, frivolity, and immorality of which Menzel accuses Gutzkow derive largely from the reader's reception of Cäsar. While readers are neither encouraged directly to flourish nor to take Cäsar as a warning how not to bring about shalom, the more astute among them could nevertheless view him as a negative role model, in spite of Gutzkow's intentions. Ultimately the text could serve, in the right hands, as a negative treatise on virtue.

Gutzkow, who admits to transplanting something of his own "Seelenstimmung" (soul condition) into Cäsar's mannerisms,³³ describes Cäsar as cynical, unchangeable, no longer curious, prematurely old, and defined by an unceasing movement to keep boredom at bay, with "zerstreut" (distracted) describing the permanent condition for which he strives. Wally's impressions of him are that he is unnatural (12), his theories depend on his goals (12), and he has no interest in anything except as a catalyst for momentary pleasure (15). "Das Schöne, Wally, ist immer das Überraschende" (What is beautiful, Wally, is always that which surprises us) (20): with this sentence he implicates his own impressionism and lack of commitment. For Cäsar, nothing is left to discover or look forward to except the surprises he attempts to fashion out of his tired cynicism. "Cäsar's training was finished," reads one of the earliest descriptions:

Was er noch in sich aufnahm, konnte nur dazu dienen, das schon Vorhandene zu befestigen, nicht zu verändern. . . . Er hatte einen ganzen Friedhof toter Gedanken, herrlicher Ideen, an die er einst glaubte, hinter sich. . . . Er war reif, nur noch formell, nur noch Skeptiker: er rechnete mit Begriffsschatten, mit gewesenem Enthusiasmus.³⁴

(What he still took in could only serve to solidify what was already there, not to change it. . . . He had behind him an entire graveyard of dead thoughts and fabulous ideas in which he had once believed. . . . He was mature, formal, nothing but a skeptic: he dealt with the realm of conceptual shadows and a one-time enthusiasm.)

A situation preventing Cäsar from self-observation would be fatal, remarks the narrator (33). The result is the condition of "Desenganno":³⁵ a resignation pronounced by ironic distance and frivolous manipulation of people

and beliefs. This is the territory of the “Spätling,” as Günter Heintz calls him, who is typified by his lack of spontaneity and naturalness.³⁶

Contrasted with Luigi, however, who uses Wally as the bait to drive his brother mad and make Jeronimo’s money his own, Cäsar appears briefly commendable. His defense of Jeronimo and rescue of Wally from Luigi’s machinations is nothing short of chivalrous. “Cäsar war unermüdtlich,” reports the narrator, “den Ruf seiner Freundin wiederherzustellen und die öffentliche Meinung über sie zu berichtigen” (Cäsar was tireless in reestablishing the reputation of his friend and correcting public opinion about her) (81). Cäsar’s good deeds are nonetheless only briefly commendable, only temporarily redemptive, because they originate in self-interested moods. A more accurate measure of his character is the narrator’s remark that even though Wally has entered Cäsar’s affections, he is driven by vanity to conquer this “phenomenon.” If he is on his knees before her, it is to enjoin her affections, not her commitment. Gutzkow makes Cäsar a mouthpiece for the viability of the “human” as a means for mutual recognition between Cäsar and Wally. On this plane, high above conventional attractions reliant upon appearances and flirting, Gutzkow/Cäsar has little patience for conventional manners harboring shame. In other words, because he wants to harvest the bounty of beauty available to him now, he calls for the barriers between the sexes to tumble. This entreaty, he insists, has nothing to do with differences of gender (33–34).

Admittedly, character examination of this sort runs the risk of shading over from criticism into sophistry. This would be the objection against removing characters from their contexts in order to judge them as though they were not authorial constructs, but real people. An opposite, sociohistorical danger, however, is to freeze characters into playing only representative roles. Such is the view of Günter Heintz, mentioned above, who regards Cäsar as an epochal cynic born into an era that has exhausted intellectual and spiritual experiences and can only dole out resignation.³⁷ To overcome his ennui, Cäsar has converted the rule “Liebe deinen Nächsten!” (Love your neighbor!) into “Lebe deinen Nächsten!” (Live your neighbor!)³⁸ The problem with this view is that there is no such thing as an epochal experience that would apply in an undifferentiated way to individuals across the board and excuse them from pursuing shalom. Is Metternich’s suppression the sole source of the belief that egoism is appropriate so long as one does not harm one’s neighbor? The potential friction between orthopraxis and a sociohistorical approach arises if characters “representa-

tive of their time” are forgiven their (albeit fictional) responsibility. If avoidance of the good is explained away as epochal resignation, then fiction (where it matters least, because characters aren’t “real”), biography (where it matters more), and reader response (where it matters most) are insulated from claims of accountability. Any criticism, orthopraxis included, should acknowledge empirical categories but reject the notion that epochal trends are merely descriptive. Scholars can be so intent on rescuing an author from neglect that they withhold comment on the true scoundrels into whom he or she has breathed life.

There can be no doubt that sociohistorical explanations of Cäsar’s behavior are helpful, but an understanding of orthopraxis makes clear that individuals require more than social, political, and economic emancipation. Claiming the necessity of spiritual emancipation does not mean dismissing Christianity in the belief that it has failed. In Cäsar’s case, emancipation may mean the recovery of hope: that virtue preyed upon by boredom. Hope is what underlies the Christian’s interpretation: it is the bright light that illuminates the text to enable the discovery, if need be, of hope’s own historical absence. Hope, too, can help gauge shalom without mistaking characters for real people. Given that texts are ethical exercises—vicarious dry runs for a reader’s own actions—it is instructive to consider how one should live with hope either through emulating or avoiding how characters come to make their decisions and act upon them. The contention here is that examining characters in terms of virtue opens up readings hitherto considered abjectly subjective. In addition, bringing a virtue analysis to bear upon the context of the text can shed light on what factors were causing dysfunction or success. What factors are responsible for the relative presence and absence of courage, for example? In what ways might there be, even under absolutism, courageous alternatives to a form of provocation that aims at offending and injuring? How might one write about emancipation with hope instead of despair? Or can despair, when read by those driven by shalom, signal the presence of hope through its very absence?

These conjectures make more sense when applied concretely to Cäsar: one no longer teachable, precisely when he stands to benefit from *Bildung*. The metaphor of movement enlisted as a characteristic of Young Germany no longer describes the skill involved in escaping the censor, but instead the anxious need to escape the boredom of self. Interestingly enough, it is another movement, the *status viatoris*, that the theologian Joseph Pieper uses a century after *Wally*’s appearance to describe the “not yet”

that identifies the pilgrim on the way.³⁹ Seen thus, the nihilistic orientation at the heart of Cäsar (he disdains even the melodic movement of music) parts ways with what Pieper insists is “the proper movement of natural being, which is always directed toward a good.”⁴⁰ It may be necessary to discourage the impatient movement of *praesumptio*, which Pieper calls the “already” that is “the perverse anticipation of the fulfillment of hope.”⁴¹ The vocabulary of hope thus offers an alternative to a purely empirical description of Cäsar’s presumption—and Wally’s despair, for that matter—which insists on the non-fulfillment of hope.

It is easy to agree with Herbert Kaiser’s comment that Cäsar tells Wally his horrible tales of despairing lovers because he is bored. In Kaiser’s view, boredom that gives rise to play, especially in the sense of gambling, frequently avoids the question of responsibility, but is anchored principally in society.⁴² Cäsar and Wally are studied players in every respect: in conversation, with each other, with their gender-specific roles. By attributing Cäsar’s boredom to Metternich’s prevention of action in the public sphere, however, Kaiser turns Cäsar from villain into victim. Wally receives a similar pardon from responsibility by being shut out of the realm of male political action. Even though Young Germany has claimed a public space for liberated movement, the “play” must remain private and employed against boredom.

The ennui experienced by Young Germany, preserved in Gutzkow’s Cäsar, can be explained, but not excused sociologically. The point is not to trump other readings of the text, but to introduce it to orthopractic sensibilities. One can note with Gutzkow, for example, that restoration practices such as censorship and police control perpetuated the unity of church and state in the public name of morality and God, shrinking individual and collective freedoms for the sake of the privileged. Without a doubt, Menzel’s moral pretense makes the ironic vigilance, iconoclasm, and constant movement of Young Germany appealing by contrast. It is never a good idea to stifle criticism of the ideological center, as Menzel tried to do, in order to avoid the prospect of universal emancipation. Even so, shalom offers a standard of hoped-for emancipation by which to appraise the kind of anarchy espoused by Cäsar. Seen through the eyes of faith, the boundary between order and suppression is no longer merely in the eye of the beholder. Christians are charged to work to end suffering, restore balance, and foster the unity of all creation, and this charge should infuse their reading of literature.

Wally, die Zweiflerin is difficult to digest both for those who believe God has abandoned the world to despair, and for those who believe God has not. The concern here has been to propose a Christian reading that refuses to conflate Christianity and bigotry at the expense of author, text, and audience. Much more, concerns of shalom can be seen to apply even to works banned during their time, and to suggest the beginnings of virtue vocabulary with respect to Cäsar. Using the vision of orthopraxis proposed by Walhout, one can conclude that to the extent that Young Germany works toward universal emancipation, it is closer to shalom than is Restoration politics. Its attempts to articulate some manner of liberation come, however, at the cost of the hope that must accompany the Christian's position between the already and the not yet. Orthopraxis insists that neither Gutzkow nor his creations can claim emancipation by ignoring other aspects of human wellbeing essential to the movement toward ultimate redemption in Christ. In its better moments, ecclesial movement shares the desire of the Young German movement to overthrow oppression, identifying the last that should become the first in this lifetime—not, as Heine writes disparagingly, “erst am Jüngsten Tage, im Himmel” (for the first time at the Last Judgment, in heaven).⁴³ The church sets its sights on an emancipation that outlasts every earthly regime.

NOTES

¹ Qtd. in Jost Hermand, “Nachwort,” *Das Junge Deutschland. Texte und Dokumente* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1966), 369–391, here 375.

² Hermand, 369.

³ Herbert Kaiser, “Karl Gutzkow: *Wally, die Zweiflerin* (1835),” in *Romane und Erzählungen zwischen Romantik und Realismus. Neue Interpretationen*, ed. Paul Michael Lützel (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1983), 183–201, here 184.

⁴ Karl Gutzkow, “Vorrede,” *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, rev. ed. (Frankfurt a. M.: n. p., 1852), reprinted in Gutzkow, *Wally, die Zweiflerin*, ed. Günter Heintz (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1979), 133–148, here 142.

⁵ Wolfgang Menzel, “*Wally die Zweiflerin*. Roman von Karl Gutzkow,” reprinted in Karl Gutzkow, *Wally die Zweiflerin* (1979), 274–291, here 277. I provide dates and reprint information here; original dates and sources for writings surrounding the publication of *Wally* can be found in the “Verzeichnis der Folgepublikationen zu *Wally*” (Index of Publications Pertaining to *Wally*) on pp. 436–441 of Heintz’s 1979 Reclam edition.

⁶ Wolfgang Menzel, “Drei Abfertigungen des Dr. Gutzkow” (1835), reprinted in Hartmut Steinecke, *Literaturkritik des Jungen Deutschland: Entwicklungen, Tendenzen, Texte* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1982), 41–64, here 43.

⁷ Menzel, “Drei Abfertigungen,” 44.

⁸ Menzel, “Drei Abfertigungen,” 46.

⁹ Menzel, “Drei Abfertigungen,” 49–50, 52.

¹⁰ Heinrich Heine, “Über den Denunzianten,” *Sammelte Werke VIII* (Leipzig: 1910f), 11–15, 22–25, qtd. in *Das Junge Deutschland. Texte und Dokumente*, ed. Jost Hermand (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1966), 66–72, here 67.

¹¹ Karl Gutzkow, “Vertheidigung gegen Menzel—Berichtigung einiger Urtheile im Publikum” (1835), reprinted in Steinecke (1982), 70–85, here 77.

¹² Gutzkow, “Appellation an den gesunden Menschenverstand. Letztes Wort in einer literarischen Streitfrage“ (1835), reprinted in Heintz (1979), 148–162, here 150.

¹³ Kaiser, 184.

¹⁴ Kaiser, 185.

¹⁵ Kaiser, 186.

¹⁶ Theodor Mundt, “Wally, die Zweiflerin. Roman von Karl Gutzkow. Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835” (reprinted in Heintz [1979] 300–303, here 301), and Ferdinand Gustav Kühne, “Gutzkows neueste Dichtung” (reprinted in Heintz [1979] 326–329, here 327).

¹⁷ Volkmar Hansen, “‘Freiheit! Freiheit! Freiheit!’ Das Bild Karl Gutzkows in der Forschung; mit Ausblicken auf Ludolf Wienbarg,” in *Literatur in der sozialen Bewegung. Aufsätze und Forschungsberichte zum 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Alberto Martino (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1977), 488–542, here 489.

¹⁸ Feodor Wehl, *Das Junge Deutschland. Ein kleiner Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte unserer Zeit* (Hamburg: Richter, 1886), 103, qtd. in Heinz, “Nachwort,” 461.

¹⁹ The 1997 plan for a commentated digitalized complete works is producing results; for available works, see <http://www.gutzkow.de/>. For the publishing trajectory of the complete works by Oktober Verlag, see http://www.oktoberverlag.de/gutzkow_editionsplan.

²⁰ See Peter Uwe Hohendahl, “Literary Criticism in the Epoch of Liberalism,” *A History of German Literary Criticism, 1730–1980*, ed. Hohendahl (Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988), 179–276, here 193.

²¹ Mark Walhout, “Critical Theory,” *Contemporary Literary Theory: A Christian Appraisal*, ed. Clarence Walhout and Leland Ryken (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 271–291, here 290.

²² Nicholas Wolterstorff, "The Mission of the Christian College at the End of the 20th Century," *The Reformed Journal* (June 1983), 14–18.

²³ Walhout, 290.

²⁴ Walhout, 289.

²⁵ Walhout, 289.

²⁶ Susan Gallagher and Roger Lundin, *Literature through the Eyes of Faith* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989), 44.

²⁷ "The Gospel of Peace: An interview with Noel Moules," originally published in *Anabaptism Today*, Issue 2, February 1993. <http://www.anabaptistnetwork.com/book/view/183>. Accessed 6 September 2005.

²⁸ Surely we would misconstrue this strident-style criticism if we made it a characteristic of Menzel's milieu, however. Wilhelm Wagner is one contemporary of Menzel who berates him for overstepping the bounds of criticism and putting personal hostilities above a judgment of this "etwas leichtfertig hingeworfenen, aber doch geistreich geschriebenen Roman, dem man in ästhetischer Hinsicht manchen Vorwurf machen könnte" (somewhat thrown-together superficial novel, albeit clever, which one could accuse of this or that aesthetic shortcoming). See Wilhelm Wagner, "Literatur" (1835), reprinted in Heintz (1979), 298.

²⁹ Three investigations are: M. Kay Flavell, "Women and Individualism. A Re-examination of Schlegel's *Lucinde* and Gutzkow's *Wally die Zweiflerin*," *Modern Language Review* 70 (1975): 550–566; Martina Lauster, "Lucinde's Unfinished Business: Women and Religion in Gutzkow's Works," in *Das schwierige Jahrhundert. Germanistische Tagung zum 65. Geburtstag von Eda Sagarra im August 1998*, ed. Juergen Barkhoff et al., 427–442 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000); and Inge Rippmann, "'... statt eines Weibes Mensch zu sein'. Frauenemanzipatorische Ansätze bei jungdeutschen Schriftstellern," *Das Junge Deutschland. Kolloquium zum 150. Jahrestag des Verbots vom 10. Dezember 1835, Düsseldorf, 17.–19. Februar 1986*, ed. Joseph A. Kruse and Bernd Kortländer, 108–133 (Hamburg: Hoffmann and Campe, 1987).

³⁰ Ruth-Ellen Boetcher-Joeres, "The Gutzkow-Menzel Tracts: A Critical Response to a Novel and an Era," *Modern Language Notes* 99 (1973), 988–1010; Peter Stein, "Probleme der literarischen Proklamation des Politischen: Karl Gutzkow im Jahre 1835," in Hermand (1987), 134–154; Joseph A. Kruse, "Gutzkows Wally und der Verbotsbeschuß," in Hermand (1987), 39–50; Ingrid and Günter Oesterle, "Der literarische Bürgerkrieg: Gutzkow, Heine, Börne wider Menzel. Polemik nach der Kunstperiode und in der Restauration," in *Demokratisch-revolutionäre Literatur in Deutschland: Vormärz*, ed. Gert Mattenklott and Klaus R. Scherpe, 151–185 (Kronberg/Taunus: Scriptor, 1974); and Erwin Wabnegger, *Literaturskandal: Studien zur Reaktion des öffentlichen Systems auf Karl Gutzkows Roman "Wally, die Zweiflerin" (1835–1848)* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1987).

³¹ Hansen, 539. This has been done by, among others, Kaiser and Olaf Briese, “‘Kannibalische Menschheit’: Gutzkows Roman *Wally, die Zweiflerin* im Lichte seiner philosophischen und literarischen Quellen,” *Wirkendes Wort* 42:3 (1992): 430–439.

³² To touch upon only one in passing: one of the most convincing arguments for wholeness is Inge Rippmann’s discovery that in Young German discourse images of young and attractive women overpower themes of maternity, aging, neglect, economic misery, or political isolation. Whatever one calls it, Rippmann is summoning arguments for orthopraxis by showing the absence of justice extended toward one social group. See Rippmann, 114–115.

³³ Gutzkow, “Appellation an den gesunden Menschenverstand,” reprinted in Heintz (1979), 148–162, here 152.

³⁴ Gutzkow, *Wally*, 6.

³⁵ Ernst von Feuchtersleben, *Diätetik der Seele* (Vienna, 1842), VIII, qtd. in Heintz, “Nachwort” (1979), 459.

³⁶ Heintz, 459.

³⁷ Heintz, 459.

³⁸ Gutzkow, *Wally*, 14.

³⁹ Joseph Pieper, “On Hope” (trans. Mary Frances McCarthy), in *Faith, Hope, Love* (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1997), 98.

⁴⁰ Pieper, 97.

⁴¹ Pieper, 113.

⁴² Kaiser, 192.

⁴³ Qtd. in Hermand, “Nachwort” (1987), 381.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boetcher-Joeres, Ruth-Ellen. “The Gutzkow-Menzel Tracts: A Critical Response to a Novel and an Era.” *Modern Language Notes* 99 (1973): 988–1010.

Briese, Olaf. “‘Kannibalische Menschheit’: Gutzkows Roman *Wally, die Zweiflerin* im Lichte seiner philosophischen und literarischen Quellen.” *Wirkendes Wort* 42:3 (1992): 430–439.

“Editionsprojekt Karl Gutzkow.” 30 December 2005, <http://www.gutzkow.de/>.

Feuchtersleben, Ernst von. *Diätetik der Seele*. Vienna, 1842.

- Flavell, M. Kay. "Women and Individualism. A Re-examination of Schlegel's *Lucinde* and Gutzkow's *Wally die Zweiflerin*." *Modern Language Review* 70 (1975): 550–566.
- Gallagher, Susan, and Roger Lundin. *Literature through the Eyes of Faith*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.
- Gutzkow, Karl. "Appellation an den gesunden Menschenverstand. Letztes Wort in einer literarischen Streitfrage" (1835). Reprinted in Heintz (1979). 148–162.
- . "Vertheidigung gegen Menzel—Berichtigung einiger Urtheile im Publikum" (1835). Reprinted in Steinecke (1982), 70–85.
- . "Vorrede." *Wally, die Zweiflerin*. Rev. ed. Frankfurt a. M.: n. p., 1852. Reprinted in Gutzkow, *Wally, die Zweiflerin*. Ed. Günter Heintz. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1979. 133–148.
- . *Wally, die Zweiflerin. Roman*. Mannheim: Löwenthals Verlagshandlung, 1835. Reprinted Stuttgart: Reclam, 1979.
- Hansen, Volkmar. "'Freiheit! Freiheit! Freiheit!' Das Bild Karl Gutzkows in der Forschung; mit Ausblicken auf Ludolf Wienbarg." *Literatur in der sozialen Bewegung. Aufsätze und Forschungsberichte zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Alberto Martino, 488–542. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1977.
- Heine, Heinrich. "Über den Denunzianten." *Sammelte Werke VIII*. Leipzig: 1910f, 11–15, 22–25. Qtd. in Hermand, Jost, ed. *Das Junge Deutschland. Texte und Dokumente*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1966. 66–72.
- Heintz, Günther, ed. *Wally, die Zweiflerin. Roman. Studienausgabe mit Dokumenten zum zeitgenössischen Literaturstreit*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1979.
- Hermand, Jost. "Nachwort." In *Das Junge Deutschland. Texte und Dokumente*. Ed. Hermand, 369–391. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1966.
- Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. "Literary Criticism in the Epoch of Liberalism." *A History of German Literary Criticism, 1730–1980*. Ed. P. Hohendahl, 179–276. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.
- Kaiser, Herbert. "Karl Gutzkow: *Wally, die Zweiflerin* (1835)." *Romane und Erzählungen zwischen Romantik und Realismus. Neue Interpretationen*. Ed. Paul Michael Lützeler, 183–201. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1983.

- Kruse, Joseph A. "Gutzkows Wally und der Verbotsbeschluß." In Hermand (1987): 39–50.
- Kühne, Ferdinand Gustav. "Gutzkows neueste Dichtung." Reprinted in Heintz (1979): 326–329.
- Lauster, Martina. "Lucinde's Unfinished Business: Women and Religion in Gutzkow's Works." *Das schwierige Jahrhundert. Germanistische Tagung zum 65. Geburtstag von Eda Sagarra im August 1998*. Ed. Juergen Barkhoff et al., 427–442. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2000.
- Menzel, Wolfgang. "Drei Abfertigungen des Dr. Gutzkow" (1835). Reprinted in Steinecke (1982). 41–64.
- . "*Wally die Zweiflerin*. Roman von Karl Gutzkow." Reprinted in Heintz (1979). 274–291.
- Moules, Noel. "The Gospel of Peace: An interview with Noel Moules." 30 December 2005, <http://www.anabaptistnetwork.com/book/view/183>. Originally published in *Anabaptism Today*: Issue 2, February 1993.
- Mundt, Theodor. "Wally, die Zweiflerin. Roman von Karl Gutzkow. Mannheim: C. Löwenthal, 1835." Reprinted in *Wally, die Zweiflerin. Studienausgabe mit Dokumenten zum zeitgenössischen Literaturstreit*. 300–303.
- Oesterle, Ingrid, and Günter Oesterle. "Der literarische Bürgerkrieg: Gutzkow, Heine, Börne wider Menzel. Polemik nach der Kunstperiode und in der Restauration." In *Demokratisch-revolutionäre Literatur in Deutschland: Vormärz*. Ed. Gert Mattenklott and Klaus R. Scherpe, 151–185. Kronberg/Taunus: Scriptor, 1974.
- Pieper, Joseph. "On Hope." Trans. Mary Frances McCarthy. In Pieper, *Faith, Hope, Love*. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1997.
- Rippmann, Inge. "'... statt eines Weibes Mensch zu sein'. Frauenemanzipatorische Ansätze bei jungdeutschen Schriftstellern." *Das Junge Deutschland. Kolloquium zum 150. Jahrestag des Verbots vom 10. Dezember 1835, Düsseldorf, 17.–19. Februar 1986*. Ed. Joseph A. Kruse and Bernd Kortländer, 108–133. Hamburg: Hoffmann and Campe, 1987.
- Stein, Peter. "Probleme der literarischen Proklamation des Politischen: Karl Gutzkow im Jahre 1835." In Hermand (1987), 134–154.

- Steinecke, Hartmut, ed. *Literaturkritik des Jungen Deutschland: Entwicklungen, Tendenzen, Texte*. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1982.
- “Verzeichnis der Folgepublikationen zu Wally.” In Heintz (1979), 436-441.
- Wabnegger, Erwin. *Literaturskandal: Studien zur Reaktion des öffentlichen Systems auf Karl Gutzkows Roman Wally, die Zweiflerin (1835–1848)*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1987.
- Wagner, Wilhelm. “Literatur” (1835). Reprinted in Heintz (1979), 298.
- Walhout, Mark. “Critical Theory.” *Contemporary Literary Theory: A Christian Appraisal*. Ed. Clarence Walhout and Leland Ryken, 271–291. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Wehl, Feodor. *Das Junge Deutschland. Ein kleiner Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte unserer Zeit*. Hamburg: Richter, 1886.
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas. “The Mission of the Christian College at the End of the 20th Century.” *The Reformed Journal*. June 1983: 14–18.