NEUE HERRLICHKEIT? GÜNTER DE BRUYN'S NOVEL AND ITS CRITIQUE OF GDR SOCIALISM

In an 1983 monograph on Günter de Bruyn, critic Karin Hirdina wrote, "Still ist es – vergleichsweise – auch um seine Bücher. Keine heftigen öffentlichen Debatten wie um Strittmatters *Ole Bienkopp*, Christa Wolfs *Geteilten Himmel*, Wilms *Pause für Wanzka*, Kants *Aula* oder *Impressum*."[1] Little did Hirdina know that a storm of controversy was about to break over the GDR's literary world following the West German publication of de Bruyn's latest novel *Neue Herrlichkeit*, leading at first to a delay of the book's publication, later to the cancellation of de Bruyn's contract with Mitteldeutscher Verlag, and, finally, one year later, to the novel's reluctant publication.[2] All this transpired despite the fact that selections from *Neue Herrlichkeit* had been preprinted in the GDR's two most prestigious literary magazine, *Sinn und Form* and *Neue deutsche Literatur*, and that the novel had been announced in the July, 1984, edition of *Neue deutsche Literatur* as a "Neuerscheinung." [3]

Although de Bruyn is no stranger to controversy – his comments at the Berliner Begegnung and his signature under a letter protesting Wolf Biermann's expatriation caused a stir in the GDR – de Bruyn's subtle yet piercingly intelligent novels have never been viewed by GDR literary administrators as a threat to the foundations of their cultural policy. On the contrary, his books, crowned with the Heinrich Mann Prize in 1964 and the Lion Feuchtwanger Prize in 1981, have often been described as – albeit critical – minutely precise literary portraits of everyday life in the GDR. And social criticism, by virtue of the fact that it seeks to improve the conditions it castigates, has an affirmative aspect GDR officials are often quick to note. Thus de Bruyn's earlier novels, from *Buridans Esel* (1968) through *Preisverleihung* (1972) to *Märkische Forschungen* (1982), examined, among other things, petit bougeois forms of behavior as they manifest themselves in assumed roles of subordination and domination, of power and manipulation, of readiness to accept perceived shortcomings in order to protect one's own position. All this is nothing new in the GDR's literary world, and the social-critical aspects of de Bruyn's work lack the stridency found, for example, in the work of Jurek Becker, Christa Wolf, or Fritz Rudolf Fries. De Bruyn's novels, however, add an additional element to the GDR's literary discussion: nearly all his books deal with questions about the function of literature in a society that calls itself a "Literaturgesellschaft" and whose ruling elite professes to believe in the power of literature to change minds, to educate people toward a humanistic socialist ideal.

Thus Karl Erp, the hero of *Buridans Esel*, is a librarian whose failed hopes and ideals revolve around returning to the countryside to bring literary culture to the common people. Teo Overbeck in *Preisverleihung* is

Neophilologus 71 (1987) 586-595

a professor of literature who is pressured into changing his negative evaluation of a book which was about to receive an important prize and which was Teo was expected to praise. *Märkische Forschungen*, too, deals with literature and its uses. Here, a powerful literature professor and an obscure rural teacher who share an interest in a long-forgotten writer of the eighteenth century clash on the meaning and usefulness of their author for current social-political needs.

In the mid-seventies, de Bruyn published a biography of Jean Paul, long a favorite writer of his, entitled *Das Leben des Jean Paul Friedrich Richter*. Here, de Bruyn attempted to reinterpret and make fruitful for today's reader this author whose work had been condemned and deemed useless by marxist theoreticians such as Georg Lukacs, while being praised and refunctioned by Wolfgang Harich to fit prevailing marxist-leninist paradigms concerning the GDR's cultural heritage. De Bruyn rejects both approaches as dogmatic and unproductive. He stresses his view that reading broadens and enriches the reader's horizon of expectations, both in that it widens his perception and in that it offers him models of human existence with which he can compare his own experience. This approach, one that he has applied in his novels as well, clearly has a subsersive dimension in that it challenges the right of GDR literary scholars and bureaucrats to provide a politically correct and generally valid interpretation of both past literature, i.e., the much-guarded cultural heritage, and present writing.

Clearly, this is not a theme destined to produce controversy, so its rather subtle challenge of tenets of socialist cultural dogma had been accepted without much ado. De Bruyn is widely read in the GDR and in West Germany, and his novels have been aptly described as "zeitkritische Genrebilder der DDR."[4] Thus the turmoil surrounding the publication of *Neue Herrlichkeit* comes as quite a surprise to his readers and critics alike.

A superficial reading demonstrates this reaction to be all the more appropriate. The novel's slow-moving, precisely detailed and interestingly populated plot offers little of controversial nature. Indeed, early reviews in West Germany dismissed the novel as "ironisch pointierte Sofalektüre" set in the GDR's "sozialistisches Biedermeier."[5]

A more detailed reading, however, reveals critical aspects that transcend the dimension described in the above quotation. Volker Klotz, for instance, sees in the novel "die abstoßende Haltung einer neuen Herrenklasse, die den neuen, klassenlos gedachten Staat dem alten wieder anzunähern droht,"[6] and Wolfgang Nieß describes the novel's main character as "ein typischer Vertreter der neuen Klasse in der DDR, wenig leistungsfähig und angepaßt."[7] This, I believe, is more to the point: The new "Herrenklasse" both describe does indeed seem to be the topic of the novel, and this choice of theme appears to have provided GDR officialdom with the reasons to take such drastic steps against de Bruyn's novel.[8]

The story is simple enough: Viktor Kösling, a ranking employee of the foreign ministry and the son of divorced parents, both of whom hold high positions in the government (the father is a powerful minister), is sent to a retreat house in the country (the Neue Herrlichkeit of the title) to work on his Ph.D. dissertation, the completion of which appears to be the precondition for an important career step in his ministry. Yet such motivation, externally imposed by his ambitious mother and spurred on by the omnipresence of his father's long shadow, remains at best a superficial value for this young man, who realizes that his name will move otherwise impenetrable barriers to career advancement. That is the reason his mother sends him off to what she believes will be a cloistered existence in the wintery isolation of the rural Mark Brandenburg. And, indeed, as soon as Viktor arrives, a record-setting snow storm descends and cuts off the home from the surrounding world, thus forcing him to focus his weak powers of concentration on the task at hand: completing a dissertation with the working title *Die Außenpolitik der preußischen Regierung während der französischen Revolution – unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Einflusses der Handwerker- und Bauernunruhen in den Provinzen*, a title that is bound to ring a bell for readers of *Märkische Forschungen*, who will recall Pötsch's telling theme: *Die Erbuntertänigkeit der Bauern der Mittelmark* [Pötsch comes from a peasant family of the Mittelmark] *vor der Reformation im Lichte von Schwedenows historischen Schriften*. Both of these baroque-sounding titles suggest reform or revolution, both concern aristocratic governmental form being opposed and eventually overcome by peasants and workers. And both serve to ironically set the tone and announce the hidden theme in the novels they appear in.

Be that as it may, Viktor's half-hearted attempt to get to work is quickly (and easily) interrupted by the people who surround him – especially by a Mrs. Erika Schulze-Decker, a permanent resident of Neue Herrlichkeit, for whose husband, a deceased socialist hero, the house, officially called Schulze-Decker Heim, has been named. An aging but flirtatious woman, Frau Erika, as everyone in the home knows her, becomes infatuated with Viktor. Yet she also realizes that the enormous age difference between them will prevent anything but a platonic relationship from developing. So she begins an exchange of letters with Viktor, written in a florid mock Brothers-Grimm style, in which both players become fairy-tale characters – Viktor "the prince" and Frau Erika "the fairy godmother". This half-humorous banter begins to set the tone for the rest of the novel, not only in the exchanges between Viktor and Frau Erika, but also in the mind of the narrator, who increasingly describes Viktor's dealings with the people in the home in those terms. For Viktor, scion of a man whose power is nearly as unlimited as that of the Prussian royalty who once ruled from the same capital city, *is* a modern prince, a young man whose life and career are played out under the protective star of his father's far-reaching influence. When Viktor speaks, people listen, even if what he has to say is of little

merit. And Viktor grew up – where else – in Potsdam, not far from Sanssouci. So when Viktor takes an interest in a young woman who works as a chamber maid at the home, Frau Erika activates her magic wand and arranges things, sublimating her desire and finding vicarious fulfillment in the love affair she seeks to inspire. Thilde (short for the appropriately antiquated and unlikely name Klothilde) is an unpretentious young woman from simple rural surroundings – her father is unknown to her, her mother had fled to the West when Thilde was a child, and she was raised by her grandmother (the step-mother of the fairy tales), with whom she now lives at the home. And Thilde is quite simply bowled over and slightly intimidated by such exalted attention.

In an ironic scene fashioned to maintain the fairy-tale character the novel has taken, Prince Viktor, who has admired Thilde from afar, contrives to meet the object of his desire in his room – and finds her kneeling on the floor before him, heating his stove in the purest Cinderella pose. Smitten by her graceful simplicity, Viktor succeeds in charming Thilde, his "Stubenmädchen," to whom it had never once occured that that this handsome, well-connected and succesful young man could be interested in her. So Viktor tries to win over Tita, the occasionally senile grandmother, hoping she, too, will intervene for him. Soon Viktor is a regular member of Neue Herrlichkeit, a confidante of Tita's, a helper around the house, a man who is willing to listen to everybody's troubles. Not because he admires these people or their way of life, but because he feels this is necessary to win over the shy Thilde. Indeed, Viktor is a manipulator; but he is also a likeable young man who, through his rigorous upbringing and demanding education, both of which were aimed at preparing him to assume his place in the ruling hierarchy, has learned to adapt himself to become the person others expect him to be: "Seine Fähigkeit, der zu werden, der verlangt wird, ist groß. Um Erwartungen zu entsprechen, braucht er nur deren Kenntnis; wenn er die hat, ist er bald, was er soll."[9]

Thus Viktor's research project is shoved off into a corner while he immerses himself in tasks of helping run the home, of being one of these people, whom those of his class refer to as "unsere Menschen" (68) – all with one aim in mind. Viktor is not trying to deceive Thilde. He believes he truly loves her. And he realizes that there is no future for him at Neue Herrlichkeit. He fully intends to marry her and take her with him back to Berlin and later on any foreign assignments he is sent on. He also realizes that Thilde is only working at this home, which she hates, because Tita, who had once owned the home and is still its nominal director, lives there and needs her care. So Viktor pulls all the necessary strings to have Tita commited to a home for the aged – no easy task in the GDR. (The fact that the home is a huge and impersonal death factory and that Tita soon dies there of loneliness and despair only contributes to the tragedy Viktor is about to set in motion).

For a prince no obstacles are insurmountable. Except those set up by

higher-ranking royals such as his parents. Thus Viktor's next step takes him out of his rural idyll to the real world – and to his mother's. Viktor leads the unsuspecting Thilde to Potsdam and what he believes will be a confrontation with Agnola, his mother, over his choice of fiancee. They arrive in Potsdam on the mother's birthday, a day when she is surrounded by close friends. Since she has no intention of providing her son with an excuse to break with his parents and run off with his new love, Agnola avoids Viktor by occupying herself exclusively with her friends. Eventually she does, however, manoeuver Thilde into the kitchen for a heart-to-talk. Thilde, having recognized she is among people of a social standing she has never so much as glimpsed, immediately assumes a service pose: She starts washing the dishes while Agnola, standing behind her, tells her an instructive tale from her own - pre-socialist - past - a tale that is intended to invoke in the listener the recognition that the lessons Agnola learned in her youth are just as valid today. She tells of her upbringing as a child of the lower middle classes, of her ambition and her conviction that by marrying the great Kösling, Viktor's father, she could become his peer. She failed, she explains, because this kind of match is simply not possible, because these class differences are simply insurmountable. She says, coyly referring to herself in the third person: "Die Kleinbürgerlichkeit ihres damaligen Lebensstils paßte zu einem Kösling schlecht, und ihre Bildung, von der sie wegen Abitur and Studium sehr viel hielt, erwies sich als mangelhaft, weil ihr politische Fundierung fehlte" (177). She tells Thilde "von ihrem Wunsch, in Kreise einzudringen, die keine ihrer Freundinnen je betreten konnte, von ihrer Neugier und ihrem Allmachtswahn, das heißt: von ihrem lächerlichen Optimismus, der sie glauben machte, daß alles, was ihr fehlte, zu erwerben sei, jedes Hindernis zu überwinden sei" (178). Agnola's intention is clear. By drawing up this allegedly accurate model of her own past, she hopes to demonstrate to Thilde that, in today's world, too, her plans with Viktor must remain an illusion. Just in case Thilde missed the point, however, Agnola conjures up a hypothetical situation and applies it to her own past; its aim, however, is clear: to conclusively demonstrate to Thilde that her love to Viktor can never lead to marriage (and here she demonstrates for Thilde that she has access to Thilde's government files). She says: "So groß war der Glaube an die eigene Kraft, daß selbst wenn ihre [Agnola's] Eltern illegal das Land verlassen hätten, sie überzeugt gewesen wäre, daß Sicherheitsbestimmungen, die sonst als unumstößlich gelten, von ihr umgestoßen werden konnten" (178). Here hypothetical situation becomes concrete threat, for Thilde fits this description perfectly: her mother illegally left the GDR when Thilde was a child. Then Agnola, the divorced mother, caps her story of an ambitious past filled with hopeless aspirations with a slyly formulated compliment for Thilde: "Wenn ich ganz ehrlich sein soll ... muß ich gestehen, daß ... die Furcht in mir sich regte, Sie seien eine Zweitausgabe von mir selbst. Seit ich Sie kenne aber weiß ich, daß das Unsinn ist. Sie sind die Klügere von uns beiden, welch ein Glück"! (178-79).

But Agnola is really the cleverer of the two, for she knows that this message will have its desired effect, if not on Thilde, then on Viktor, who, the mother knows, has unknowingly internalized the value system of his parents. So she sends the couple on their way, having avoided any discordant discussions with her son. And, indeed, the seed she has planted begins to germinate in Viktor; he becomes unsure, begins to find fault in Thilde, to view what he had once seen as her simple charm as a set of weaknesses manifested in her ugainly bearing, her dialect-colored speech, her lack of ambition.

A short time later Viktor's father supplies the coup de grace to their relationship; he arives at Neue Herrlichkeit on a surprise visit, fully the socialist prince, in a horse-draw sleigh, accompanied by a retinue of aids and bodyguards, and quickly, by virtue of his overwhelming personality, takes control of the home and all in it – including Viktor. His manner is one of friendly authority, he speaks with "volkstümliche Derbheit" (192), he is totally and completely the benevolent monarch patronizing his idolizing subjects. And this has its effect on Viktor, who is now able to see his own situation through his father's eyes. Still, he attempts to put his plans in a good light, one that will move his father, but fails miserably. This failure is accompanied by a sense of realization: He sees the tragic flaw in this relationship and unconsciously conforms to his father's expectations.

The brief time remaining until Viktor's departure from Neue Herrlichkeit is spent in promising true and enduring love to Thilde, explaining that he will return some day, that he shares her pain. But in reality he feels little, for his ability to adapt, to becomes the person others (in this case his parents) desire him to be, has led him to internalize his parents' wishes, to embody their aspirations, and these gradually displace his love. Thus Viktor leaves the home full of hope for the future, but leaving behind an emotionally destroyed Thilde.

To help Viktor over his presumed pain, Frau Erika treats him to a consoling – and for the reader very telling – story of a better tomorow in which there will be no need for such sorrow and such betrayal. She speaks "von einem grobschlächtigen Heute, einem reineren und verfeinerten Morgen und auch von einer höheren Sphäre, wo man nicht haben will, sondern sein, wo Wille nichts will als Wollen und wo die Erkenntnis reift, daß nicht das Vollendete Glück bringt, sondern die Sehnsucht danach" (203). The fairy-tale future Frau Erika describes here has – and is intended to have – a very real correlate: the promised final stage of socialist development, namely communism. Thus she encourages Viktor to take hope, for one day in the misty future this now-unthinkable love will be possible; the social differences between the two will have been overcome in a paradisaical state of true equality.

In this view, spoken by a member of the ruling elite with the intention of legitimizing an actually existing social order and the forms of behavior

commensurate with it, Frau Erika attempts to justify the many shortcomings in the GDR by comparing them with a utopian future condition in which concrete political and social equality will be a fact, in which there will be no unbridgeable gap between Viktor's caste and the masses. Frau Erika'story serves as an ironic counterpoint to Agnola's didactic tale; where the pre-socialist past Agnola describes is, at least in terms of human relationships, essentially identical to the socialist present, Frau Erika's envisioned future state, in which personal equality has been achieved, entails the negation of an unbearable present. But doesn't this envisioned future, in that it is *totally* different from that which exists today, represent, philosophically speaking, a new quality that can only be attained by a qualitative leap, i.e., a revolution? And isn't the gulf between the social classes described here an antagonistic contradiction that is rooted in a social-political organization which produces antagonistic classes that in turn reproduce themselves and are thus fundamental to the social order?

Viktor manages to transcend this contradictory reality of his society, but only by withdrawing into an unreal world, cut off from the rest of society, in which (as in *Tristan and Isolde*) love between a member of the ruling class and a simple girl is possible, indeed in which a member of this elevated caste can act as and actually be an equal to his fellow man. But this timeless and spaceless idyll remains etherial illusion; it has no concrete existence. So it collapses as soon as it confronted with the real world of GDR socialism. Viktor's only consolation lies in the hope for a better future in which such contradictions will be rescinded, in which equality will be concretely realized. Viktor's lived utopia can only survive his departure from Neue Herrlichkeit as a mental contruct, as hope, that the suffering of today will be justified by and eliminated in a positive future, the final stage of communism.

Some two decades ago, Hans Mayer, writing about the dilemma of GDR literature, expressed remarkably similar thoughts. Created under the pressure of an oppressive cultural bureaucracy, this literature "vermag diese Wirklichkeit zwischen Ostseeküste und Vogtland nur als Negation darzustellen zum sozialistisch-kommunistischen Endzustand. Dieser selbst wird höchst utopisch als Position verstanden gegenüber dieser totalen Negation als das "Ganz Andere", woraus zu schließen wäre, daß nur ein qualitativer Sprung vom einem zum anderen Zustand führen könnte. Genauer gesagt: eine Art zweiter Revolution."[10] All this is doubtless really hinted at in de Bruyn's novel, right down to the second revolution ironically suggested in Viktor's dissertation title. Underlying de Bruyn's novel is the notion that the gulf between really existing GDR socialism and the claims of the SED represents an antagonistic contradiction.

The conflict GDR writers experience, Mayer goes on to say, arises from their refusal, "eine konfliktreiche Realität unbeschönigt darzustellen, ohne Märchen- und Legendenglanz und ohne Rembrandtlicht des Futuristischen, das von oben eine trübe Szenerie erhelt."[11] De Bruyn has

ironically and intentionally fulfilled the conditions of Mayers's description by demonstrating the *Aufhebung* of the contradictions, both in Viktor's fairy-tale existence at Neue Herrlichkeit and in Frau Erika's envisioned future, which is also described in a tone that suggests the "happily ever after" of the fairy tales. Behind all these conflicts and perhaps behind this novel and the controversy surrounding it is what Mayer calls "ein tiefes Mißtrauen gegenüber den Chancen ... aus eigener Kraft die vorhandenen Mißstände zu beseitigen."[12] Thus *Neue Herrlichkeit* ironically assumes a broken dialictical unity: in Mayer's words: "An die Stelle der marxistischen Grundposition [tritt] eine idealistische Antithese aus schlechter Wirklichkeit und guter Möglichkeit."[13]

Whether such thoughts led Party officials to attempt to prevent the publication of de Bruyn's book is unclear. But it seems unlikely. The GDR's literary administrators are customarily willing to accept the greatest contradictions in the artistic-literary realm as long as they have no concrete consequences that might interrupt the smooth functioning of GDR society. When these contradictions are held up to the bureaucrats in the mirror of West German literary criticism, however, then they are more likely to act. And West German reviews appear to have caused the cancellation of de Bruyn's contract.

Whether the cancellation and reluctant reissue of de Bruyn's publication contract signals a shift in GDR cultural policy is doubtful. Peter Jochen Winters, writing in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, reports that the SED's change of heart in the de Bruyn matter may be a sign of an incipient thaw in the relationship of Party and writers. As evidence he also cites the publication of Gabriele Eckhart's *Sturzacker*, a collection of poems once refused a publication licence. Eckhart's interviews with rural working people, published in 1985 in West Germany under the title *So sehe ick die Sache-Protokolle aus der DDR* and preprinted in *Sinn und Form*, but cancelled as a book publication in the GDR, is now again the topic of discussion between culture officials and Eckhart, who has withdrawn the application for an exit visa to the West she had filed upon the cancellation of her contract.[14]

Der Spiegel, however, reads the signals differently. In an article on Hermann Kant's resignation as president of the Writers Union, *Spiegel* reports that Kant's move is, at least in part (Kant is also ill), due to his annoyance over fighting too many losing battles with the Politburo on behalf of writer-colleagues. The same article quotes from a 1985 speech Erich Honecker read to a meeting of writers and artists. Honecker appears to be supporting a hardening of the lines when he demands: "Kunstwerke, die den Sozialismus stärken, die Größen und Schönheit des unter Schwierigkeiten Erreichten bewußt machen, Kunstwerke, in deren Mittelpunkt der aktive, geschichtsgestaltende Held, die Arbeiterklasse und ihre Repräsentanten stehen". Good socialist literature, Honecker goes on, can only be produced by those who examine their society, not from the "Position

eines Beobachters oder Kritikers", but rather from a "Position des aktiven Mitkämpfers, des leidenschaftlichen Mitstreiters."[15] Tone and content of Honecker's ponouncements sound reminiscent of the Stalinism of the early fifties. It should be noted that it was Honecker who in 1971 and again in 1979 announced that there could be "no more taboos" in GDR art and literature as long as artists and writers assumed a solid prosocialist stance.[16]

Writing in 1981, Wolfgang Emmerich, author of the respected *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*[17], noted that the trend toward repressive measures aimed at critical writers, initiated in the later seventies, is part of a greater process taking hold in the GDR (and, in a different form, in the West, as well): "nämlich die vorerst wohl endgültige Durchsetzung einer Zweckrationalität spezifisch realsozialistisch-preußischer Prägung, in der eine auf der Mobilisierung der Phantasie insistierende, ästhetisch souveräne ... Literatur keinen Platz mehr hat."[18] This, I believe, sums it up admirably. Where in earlier years GDR culture administrators saw in literature a propagandistic force that, if brought under their control, could shape the consciousness of the people, politicians and literature bureaucrats today see writing as a superfluous and incorrigible source of dissident views that make life uncomfortable for the SED leadership. Moreover, Konrad Franke argues that there is no longer a consistent, coherent cultural policy in the GDR: "Es gibt keine einheitliche Kulturpolitik mehr. Gültig ist das Prinzip von Belohnung und Strafe, wobei die Maßstäbe für 'gut' und 'schlecht' ungenau geworden sind ... Es gibt keine kulturpolitische Linie mehr, es sei denn, man erblickt in der Rücksichtnahme auf internationales Renommee und in der Vermeidung von Publizität für wenig oder kaum bekannte Autoren ein kulturpolitisches Konzept."[19]

Behind these changes, behind Honecker's recent pronouncements lie the harsh truth that the GDR's ruling elite has declared itself ideologically bankrupt, holding on to power's sake and for the privileges power brings. Herein also lies the foundation for the critique *Neue Herrlichkeit* provides. De Bruyn's novel calls these facts by their name; it shows, perhaps for the first time, the moral and ideological bankrupcy of the GDR's elite.

Rutgers University JAMES KNOWLTON

Notes

1. Karin Hirdina, *Günter de Bruyn* (East Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1983), p 103.
2. Marcel Reich-Ranicki describes this entire process in an article entitled "Machtwort," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 24 July, 1984, p. 21. In early 1985, Peter Jochen Winters announced that Mitteldeutscher Verlag had offered de Bruyn a new contract. Winters, who appears to have had access to to original documents, reports that repeated intervention by the Schriftstellerverband had moved the Ministry for Culture to give its approval "*Neue Herrlichkeit*. Günter de Bruyns Roman jetzt doch in der DDR", *FAZ*, 9 March, 1985, p. 25.
3. Preprinted in *Neue deutsche Literatur*, 31, no. 3 (1983), pp. 29-41; and in *Sinn und Form*,

34, no. 6 (1982), pp. 1222-1239. *Neue deutsche Literatur* (32, no. 7 [1984], p. 175) lists *Neue Herrlichkeit* as a "Neuerscheinung".

4. Emmanuel La Roche, "Ein neues Biedermeier in der DDR. Günter de Bruyns neuer Roman *Neue Herrlichkeit*," *Tagesanzeiger* (Zurich), 23 June, 1984, p. 10.

5. Hans-Peter Klausnitzer, "Erziehung der Gefühle. Günter de Bruyns Roman *Neue Herrlichkeit*," *Deutschland-Archiv*, 17, no. 12 (1984), p. 1337.

6. Volker Klotz, "Aus dem Leben einer Delle. Ein tragi-komischer Roman von Günter de Bruyn," *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 14 July, 1984, p. 12-13.

7. Wolfgang Nieß, "Neue Herrlichkeit," broadcast by Süddeutscher Rundfunk in the series Bücherbar-unterhaltsames für Hörer und Leser, 5 August, 1984.

8. In an informal and unpublished interview with an American Germanist, de Bruyn said that his novel took aim at "der übliche Feudalismus in der DDR." A writer-colleague of de Bruyn's offered in explanation of why the novel was banned his belief that de Bruyn has strayed onto tabooed turf, namely "sozialistische High Society." Both sources have requested anonymity.

9. *Neue Herrlichkeit* (Frankfurt/M:Fischer, 1984), p. 164. Parenthetical page references are to this edition.

10. Hans Mayer, "Die Literatur der DDR und ihre Widersprüche," in H.M., *Zur deutschen Literatur der Zeit* (Reinbeck:Rowohlt, 1967), p. 382.

11. Hans Mayer, p. 385.

12. Hans Mayer, p. 383.

13. Hans Mayer, p. 382.

14. Peter Jochen Winters, "*Neue Herrlichkeit*," p. 25.

15. "Zweck der Selbstreinigung", *Der Spiegel*, 39, no. 7, February 11, 1985, p. 32.

16. Honecker's 1971 speech is printed in *DDR-Literatur · Texte und Materialien*, ed. Hedwig Walwei-Wiegelmann (Padeborn: Schöningh, 1982), p. 43. Honecker reiterated this position in a 1979 speech printed in *Neues Deutschland*. 23/24 June, 1979, p. 2.

17 (Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1981).

18. Wolfgang Emmerich, "Der verlorene Faden: Probleme des Erzählens in den siebziger Jahren," *Die Literatur der DDR in den siebziger Jahren*, ed. Peter Uwe Hohendahl and Patricia Herminghouse (Frankfurt/M:Suhrkamp, 1983), p. 175.

19. Konrad Franke, "Nachwort," *Gespräche hinterm Haus · Neue Prosa aus der DDR*, ed. Konrad Franke (Frankfurt/M:Ulstein, 1981), p. 275.