

BERTOLT BRECHT'S

SCHWEYK IM ZWEITEN WELTKRIEG

Nehm jeder sich heraus, was er grad braucht!

Ich selber hab mir was herausgenommen . . .

BRECHT 1930

BERTOLT BRECHT'S
SCHWEYK IM ZWEITEN WELTKRIEG

By
LINDSAY THOMAS MASSY HEWSON, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1974

MASTER OF ARTS (1974)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

(German)

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Bertolt Brecht's Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg

AUTHOR: Lindsay Thomas Massy Hewson, B.A. (Ulster)

SUPERVISOR: Professor F. T. Widmaier

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 80

SCOPE AND CONTENT: This study offers a detailed analysis of the main character of Bertolt Brecht's play Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg. The play has, to a large extent, been neglected, criticised and generally regarded as a second-rate work. One of the objects of this study is to destroy that view. Schweyk is seen as conforming to a typically Brechtian pattern, in that he is basically a character made up of two conflicting, socially conditioned sides. This study attempts to bring these two sides into perspective, thus showing Schweyk in his true light. Schweyk is basically seen to be following a campaign of "opponierendes Mitläufertum" and as such is closely linked with Brecht's most significant political publication "Fünf Schwierigkeiten beim Schreiben der Wahrheit". At the end of the character analysis a definition of Schweyk is formulated based on the qualities of the aforementioned political treatise, so that some observations can be made on the terms "Schweyk figure" and "Schweykian philosophy", both terms which seem to have been abused by the critics. From these observations and the character analysis of Schweyk, it then becomes quite obvious that Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg is of fundamental importance, since in the character of Schweyk Brecht seems to express his philosophy of life in the clearest, most unequivocal manner.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study developed out of an Undergraduate Seminar at the New University Of Ulster given by Dr. Walter Baumann and Mr. Dennis Tate during the academic year 1971-72. It is to these two that I owe my careful baptism into the world of Bertolt Brecht, a baptism designed with the intent of not allowing any of Brecht's lesser known works to be dismissed as second class. It was through them that I got to know and love Schwegk and thus to a great extent this study is deeply indebted to them. I should like to thank my supervisor Professor F. T. Widmaier for his always constructive criticism, his willingness to provide a different point of view when perhaps I had taken an idea too far, and his valuable assistance, readily given whenever it was asked for. I should also like to thank my readers Mr. H. H. Schulte and Mr. G. Teuscher for their helpful suggestions. Finally I should like to thank my wife, Grace, without whose aid, comfort, and endless patience, especially in the troubled periods of this study, it would never have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	Page 1
SCHWEYK IM ZWEITEN WELTKRIEG: AN ANALYSIS	
OF THE MAIN CHARACTER. Part I	6
Part II	37
CONCLUSION	67
FOOTNOTES	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	76

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study on Bertolt Brecht's Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg is, in effect, to attempt to fill a hole which has surprisingly been left in the secondary literature on Brecht. Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg has to a point been dismissed as a rather second-rate work compared with the established and so-called great works such as Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder or Der gute Mensch von Sezuan, to name just two. It is the intention of this study firstly, on a general level, to attempt to destroy what I believe is a totally unwarranted neglect of this very fine play, and secondly, on a more specific level, to investigate the character of Schweyk in the hope of gaining insight into the terms "Schweyk figure" and "Schweykian philosophy", terms which have been bandied about in various manners and with such alarming frequency, with the result that to a large extent they have, like the term "Verfremdung", become clichés, even misnomers.

My contention is that the play Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg is one of the most important plays that Brecht ever wrote. I believe that had it not been for the fact that Brecht died before he was able to produce the play (it was Brecht's way to leave the establishing of a definitive version of any play until it was actually put on stage¹), this would have been clearly established. However, one fact that

cannot be denied is that the figure of Schweyk held in Brecht's heart a place that was second to none. For example, in his Arbeitsjournal under the entry 18. 8. 38 Brecht calls Hasek's novel "die einzige groBe volkstümliche erzählung der zeit".² John Willett, in quoting an unpublished note of Brecht's, illustrates this fact even further: "An unpublished note of Brecht's says: 'If anyone asked me to pick three literary works of this century which in my opinion will become part of world literature then I would say that one of them was Hasek's Adventures of the Good Soldier Schwejk'."³

Ever since Brecht had helped Piscator produce a dramatisation of Hasek's novel, a production which incidentally was, according to some critics, that year's greatest stage success including even Brecht's own Dreigroschenoper, Brecht always seemed to be haunted by the character. In his book Der Dichter und die Ratio Fritz Sternberg recalls what happened shortly after the first night of Piscator's production:

Brecht kam also zu mir und begann gleich: "Ich habe eine Idee zum Soldaten Schweyk. Ich möchte in einem Gebäude den Ludendorff darstellen, wie er vor riesenhaften Landkarten steht. Das Zimmer muß außerordentlich hoch sein, so hoch wie sonst zwei Stockwerke. Und auf diesen Landkarten dirigiert Ludendorff die deutschen Divisionen. Er dirigiert sie von der Ostfront--damals war Revolution in Rußland--an die Westfront; er dirigiert sie nach Rumänien; er dirigiert sie nach Italien. Er hat die innere Frontlinie; er hat ein glanzend funktionierendes Eisenbahnsystem; aber die Divisionen kommen nicht rechtzeitig an. Sie kommen auch nicht in der von ihm bestimmten Zahl. Es funktioniert nicht--und warum funktioniert es nicht?

Unter dem riesigen Zimmer, in dem Ludendorff an seinen Karten regiert und die deutschen Di-

visionen hin- und herschiebt, befindet sich ein großer kellerartiger Raum, der mit Soldaten gefüllt ist; und wenn man näher hinsieht, ähneln sie alle in irgendeiner Form dem Schweyk. Und die Schweyks werden in Bewegung gesetzt. Sie wehren sich nicht direkt, aber sie kommen nicht oder nicht rechtzeitig an. Es gibt Zwischenfälle. Immer mehr und immer vielseitigere Zwischenfälle, die sie hindern; sie brauchen mehr Zeit, sie verschwinden. Es gibt nirgendwo einen aktiven Widerstand; es gibt nicht einmal im Gespräch eine Opposition, die direkt gegen den Krieg gerichtet wäre; sie folgen allen Befehlen, sie respektieren ihre Vorgesetzten, sie setzen sich, wenn sie die Marschorder bekommen, in Bewegung. Aber niemals erreichen sie in der Zeit, die Ludendorff oben an der Karte bestimmt, ihren Bestimmungsort, und niemals erreichen sie ihn vollzählig."⁴

Nothing ever came of what eventually might have been called "Schweyk im ersten Weltkrieg", yet it is obvious that the subject never really left Brecht, for according to Petr in 1936 Brecht was again working on the possibility of a Schweyk-play of his own.⁵ In July of 1942 Brecht was again thinking of a Schweyk drama, this time incorporating scenes from Kraus' Die letzten Tage der Menschheit:

und w i e d e r möchte ich SCHWEYK machen, mit
szenen aus DIE LETZTEN TAGE DER MENSCHHEIT
dazwischengeschnitten, so daß man oben die
herrschenden mächte sehen kann und unten den
soldaten, der ihre großen pläne überlebt.⁶
(AJ.1,p.493)

It was not until May of 1943 that anything concrete ever came of Brecht's plans,⁷ but it is quite obvious from the f o u r occasions on which Brecht was keenly interested in Schweyk that the importance of the play in his development should in no way be underestimated. The final judgement on Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg must, of course, be left to the reader, although I hope that in this study I will be able to demonstrate in the character analysis of Schweyk the true

significance of the play.

As far as the discussion of Schweyk is concerned I felt that the secondary literature which mentions Schweyk and the "Schweykian philosophy" was so imprecise and left room for such a considerable margin of error, that what was needed was an in-depth evaluation and characterisation of Schweyk, followed by a workable definition of the "Schweykian philosophy" as portrayed in Schweyk himself. At the start of my research there was nothing published which aided to any great extent an analysis of the hero of Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg and nothing at all which would help in formulating any kind of definition. Thus I planned my own. In the meantime an article was published by Herbert Knust⁸ which provided what I considered to be the first comprehensive evaluation of Schweyk. Although I did not agree with all that Knust stated, especially in the latter part of the study, I found some of his ideas to be of fundamental importance to an understanding of Schweyk and thus incorporated them in my plan for this study. But Knust's analysis in no way pre-empted my own, for he neglected, though probably through lack of space, to discuss what I felt were fundamental areas of the play, such as language, which were essential to my argument. In no way did he help me in my search for a workable definition of the Schweykian character.

Thus, this study provides a detailed analysis of the figure of Schweyk, followed by my own working definition of a "Schweyk figure". With these I hope that a clearer picture of the complex being of Schweyk will be established, and that the whole concept of the "Schweyk

figure" and the "Schweykian philosophy" will be brought into perspective, so that the play Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg will be regarded as the important piece of literature which it so obviously is.

SCHWEYK IM ZWEITEN WELTKRIEG: AN ANALYSIS OF THE MAIN CHARACTER

Part I

A great deal has been said in the secondary literature on Brecht about the Schweykian philosophy or attitude, which can be seen mirrored in the leading characters of his other plays, and which, according to the critics, is a fundamental characteristic of the author himself.¹ Martin Esslin, for example, in his book Brecht: A Choice of Evils says this:

Brecht not only entered into the ways of thought of Hasek's immortal character so completely that twenty years later he could reproduce the authentic accents of the little soldier in his own play on Schweik in the Second World War; he also made the Schweikian attitude his own. Many of the characters in his later plays show features of this ironic servility: the hired man Matti in Puntila, the rascally judge Azdak in The Caucasian Chalk Circle, the great Galilei himself. And these characters are all, in some way, self portraits of Brecht. So also is Brecht's most completely Schweikian character an unmistakable likeness of his author: Herr Keuner.²

Apart from the almost dubious fact of calling anybody but Schweyk himself the "most completely Schweikian character",³ there seems to me to be one grave mistake which Esslin, amongst others, makes. This is not to say that he is not correct in his assumption and characterisation of the Schweykian philosophy. But he and other notable critics make the mistake of seeing in Schweyk a certain attitude which is also evident in other works by Brecht and then without further ado form a whole concept behind Brecht's writings. Now

it must be obvious to anybody who is at all conversant with Brecht that his works, and indeed Brecht himself are among the most ambivalent, ambiguous products of the twentieth century, and that with Brecht nothing can be taken for granted unless it has been thoroughly investigated. Herein lies the error that Esslin has made. He does not seem to have investigated the character of Schweyk to the extent that he can say with certainty that the Schweyian attitude is part and parcel of Brecht's later works and of Brecht himself. Indeed, he makes such fundamental errors with regard to this play, that one wonders whether anything that he says can be taken as the truth without first verifying it. The two which stand out are, firstly, the spelling of Schweyk, which Esslin spells throughout as "Schweik" (the way in which Hašek spelt it) even to the extent that he misspells the title of the play, and secondly, the assumption that Hašek's Schweik and Brecht's Schweyk are almost synonymous, something which, as Hoffmann and Fuegi have shown, is patently not true.⁴ This is not to say that the conclusions Esslin draws are not, in part at least, correct, but I feel that there is a very definite necessity to investigate this matter further, an opinion in which I am not alone, if we look at the publications that have appeared since 1970, giving the first real characterisations of Schweyk.⁵

The tone of the early studies on Schweyk was set by Walter Benjamin when he coined the phrase "geprügelte Helden" for characters in Brecht's work who resembled Schweyk. Since that time, up until recently, this had always been the dominating force when discussing Schweyk. Let us now take a look at the conclusions drawn by such

critics as Esslin, Ewen and Petr, and in conjunction with the text draw together a kind of "Vorverständnis" of the character of Schweyk.

Esslin describes the Schweykian attitude in the following terms: " . . . a philosophy of self interest based on the conviction that survival . . . is more important than the striking of heroic attitudes. . . . Many of his [Brecht's] later actions . . . become intelligible if seen in the light of . . . the Schweikian philosophy, based as it is on the idea that it is often wisest to purchase one's peace and quiet by a show of compliance and even cheerful servility towards even the most absurd authorities."⁶ Among other things, Esslin names as a quality of this Schweykian attitude servility, an eagerness to please and to carry out the letter of any order or request. Ewen follows the same sort of course: "The German critic Walter Benjamin coined a term for such 'heroes'. He called them 'caned heroes'--'geprügelte Helden'. Candidates for survival, they are beaten one day, only to live on to another. Like Mother Courage, Schweyk reiterates the theme that merely being alive and keeping body and soul together constitute heroism enough. If he must achieve that through a temporary servility, well he will be servile."⁷ I would now like to investigate these remarks with the use of the text, an action which will, I am sure, bear out that they are correct at least to some extent.

The first thing which I would like to point out is that there is a radical difference in Schweyk's behaviour and language between his dealings with his own friends and the "Stammgäste" at his local "Zum Kelch", and his dealings with the authorities. Indeed, I intend

to show here that within Schweyk's dealings with the authorities there are various "Haltungen" depending on the situation in which Schweyk finds himself. When speaking to his friends or to people of his own standing Schweyk has his own peculiar way of speaking:

Das is, wie ein verliebter Mensch sein soll. In Pilsen hat sich ein junger Mensch für eine Witwe, wo sogar schon nicht mehr ganz jung war, am Scheunenbalken aufgehängt, weil sie im Gespräch hat fallen lassen, er tut nichts für sie, und im "Bären" hat einer sich am Abort die Pulsader aufgeschnitten, weil die Kellnerin einem andern Gast besser eingeschenkt hat, ein Familienvater. Paar Tag später haben sich von der Karlsbrücken zwei in die Moldau gestürzt wegen einer Person, aber da wars wegn ihren Geld; siewar, her ich, vermögend.⁸

We see from this that Schweyk talks in stories. He is, as Ewen quite rightly points out, "the embodiment of folk wisdom".⁹ For although Schweyk has a clear grasp of historical facts, a point to which I shall return later, he is much more a person who knows people, and knows them well. He listens to stories, tales and gossip; this is how his experience of life is gleaned, and then he uses these anecdotes to explain his point of view whenever he sees some peculiar association between the subject under discussion and his particular story. Indeed, as we see throughout the play, among people of his own standing the "associated anecdote" is Schweyk's main conversational device.¹⁰

Schweyk's anecdotes gain there humour from the fact that they are only partially relevant, if that, to the matter at hand. This is exactly what is illustrated in Schweyk's first speech. The only thing that has to be pointed out here is that there is a member of authority

present at the time, but the fact that he is "ein betrunkenen SS-Mann" (St.10,p.9) and thus not really able to do much about Schweyk's almost inane utterances, means that Schweyk does not really regard himself as being in danger. The conversation has been brought around to the attempted "Attentat auf den Adolf". Schweyk replies: "Was für ein Adolf is es denn? Ich kenn zwei Adolfe". (St.10,p.9). Thus the mention of the name Adolf allows Schweyk to proceed to tell us all about the Adolfs he knows--with the exception of the one in question--followed by everything he knows about each of the Adolfs. Here, speaking to a man who represents authority at its most cruel, we can detect an almost insolent irony. We see from later on in the scene that Schweyk does know of Adolf Hitler, and yet he deliberately avoids mentioning the Adolf about whom they are talking. This is, of course, one fundamental element of the Schweykian character when confronted by authority. When he believes that he can get away with it, Schweyk, by talking ad absurdum about subjects which have only partial or even no relevance to the topic at hand, disrupts and makes positive nonsense of the actual by exploring it in terms of his own purely personal range of experience.

Yet there is more to it than just that; the very fact that in comparing the two Adolfs he personally knows, he also associates Adolf Hitler with "der was den Hundedreck sammelt", a remark which would certainly get Schweyk into deep trouble were there anybody from the authorities present who was in a state of mind to recognise the association, displays one basic part of his make-up; namely that he is the possessor of an insatiable appetite for talking.¹¹ This idea

is backed up by Brecht's stage direction for Schweyk's first speech:

"freundlich vom Nebentisch". We can see from this that the conversation is not directed at Schweyk at all, and yet as soon as our hero hears something, to which he feels he has something relevant to say: "er mischt sich ein"¹²--something which he does frequently during the course of the play.

Schweyk's appetite for talking is, in fact, as likely to get him into trouble as Baloun's "FreBsucht" is to get Baloun into the Nazi army. Indeed, we could take Schweyk's own description of Baloun: "Essen is bei ihm ein Laster", (St.10,p.13), and substitute "Quatschen" and it could just as easily apply to Schweyk. His incessant babble is always likely to get him into trouble. For example, even at this point Schweyk cannot be certain that the SS-Mann is so drunk that he will not arrest him at the very least for remarks liable to undermine the morale of the Nazi Reich, because at this stage the SS-Mann is still talking relatively coherently. So Schweyk may be, as Frau Kopecka recognises when she gives the SS-Mann the drink that she had previously refused him, in considerable danger. Yet Schweyk, either oblivious to this fact or possessing great insight into human behaviour, plods on with his highly questionable remarks as far as treason is concerned:

Wenns der Hitler war, auf den sie ein Attentat
gemacht haben, das war gelungen.
(St.10,p.10f.)

This type of remark is utterly typical of Schweyk because it is highly ambiguous as well as being totally useless. First of all

Schweyk knows, even though he pretends not to know, that it was Hitler whom they tried to assassinate, and secondly, he knows that, although it was Hitler whom they tried to kill, he escaped with his life, for as the SS-Mann says: "Er ist beinah draufgegangen, um ein Haar".

(St.10,p.9). Yet as Thomas Brandt points out in his book Die Vieldeutigkeit Bertolt Brechts the sentence exudes more than just one meaning: "Wenn Schweyk sagt: 'Wenns der Hitler war, auf den sie ein Attentat gemacht haben, das wär gelungen' (St X, 10f.), so heit das prima facie 'das wre sonderbar'. 'Gelungen' hat aber eine positive Bedeutung, also wre es 'erfreulich sonderbar'. Weiters kommt es einen Ausruf nah: 'Nein, so etwas!' oder 'Allerhand!'"¹³

Thus even apart from the meaning of "gelungen" as the past participle of the verb "gelingen", there are various ways in which this sentence can be understood. Herein lies one of Schweyk's most characteristic qualities. He uses ambiguity to his own benefit. While saying something which could be interpreted as insulting to Hitler, he always leaves an exit open for himself, ever mindful of the fact that any form of authority could cause him difficulties, even if it is only a drunken SS-Mann. For Schweyk there is always security in ambivalence.

Schweyk continues in exactly the same manner, mixing his eternal thirst for talking with his dexterity at ambiguity, saying highly treasonable things in a manner as innocent as one could imagine: "Wenns geschehn is . . ." (St.10,p.11). Here Schweyk starts out with another example of what seems to be an unnecessary sentence, since he knows very well that it did happen, and that it was unsuccessful. But what seems useless is not, for by the use of it Schweyk

is able to graduate to the policies of the Nazi regime: "Wo viel is, herrscht keine Ordnung". (St.10,p.11). What in effect Schweyk is saying here is that the more "Ordnung" there is, the less supplies, such as food, are available for the people, and as Schweyk himself says: " . . . und ich hab sagen hern, der Hitler hat eine größere Ordnung gebracht, als man für menschenmöglich gehalten hat". (St.10,p.11) In other words Schweyk is saying that Hitler has control over all supplies, including food, so that he can compel the "Volk", whose existence depends on these supplies, and who otherwise might be against him, to follow him, even force them to join the Nazi army, as Baloun is prepared to do, in order that they might benefit from Hitler's "Ordnung", which has merely directed the supplies away from the people to the authorities.

Schweyk's remarks on the transport situation in Italy express the same feeling:

In Italien, wie der Mussolini gekommen is, ham sich die Zug nicht mehr verspätet. (St.10,p.11).

Schweyk is, of course, again being utterly ambiguous. Although the way in which the remark is made implies that Schweyk thinks that this is a turn for the better, what indeed he is saying is that the trains are no longer running late because there are none, or at least very few. Moreover, the "Ordnung" involved in disposing of the trains is, according to Schweyk, the reason why "sieben bis acht Attentate auf ihn verübt worden [sind]". (St.10,p.11). In between these two highly dangerous excursions on the state of the fascist regimes Schweyk very carefully inserts a little story about himself and his business of

selling dogs. This little story, although it implies exactly the same criticism of the fascists as the ones on either side of it, does, because of its personal relevance to Schweyk, to some extent at least minimise the effect of his remarks on "Ordnung" within fascist societies.

Such is the basis of Schweyk's attitude to the SS-Mann, whom he sees as presenting very little danger to the status quo in the "Kelch". His attitude is almost that of carrying on in exactly the same way as he would had the SS-Mann not been there. Thus, even though most of Schweyk's remarks are directed at the SS-Mann, Schweyk in effect talks through him, and we can detect a large amount of scorn, derision, and sarcasm, and even defiance in his speech and actions. For example, just after Schweyk has compared Hitler with the two Adolfs, the following exchange takes place:

SS-Mann erhebt sich und salutiert: Heil Hitler!

Schweyk erhebt sich ebenfalls und salutiert:
Heil Hitler! (St.10,p.10)

Here we can see that Schweyk's action is pure and utter mockery. Indeed, this is so obvious that even the drunken SS-Mann is aware that something is amiss, and his demeanour changes drastically:

SS-Mann drohend: PaBts Ihnen etwa nicht?

Schweyk: Zu Befehl, Herr SS, es paBt mir gut.
(St.10,p.10)

Schweyk, finding himself on the defensive, immediately loses the impudent irony of his first speech and the mocking scorn of his "Heil Hitler", and he becomes utterly passive, servile and submissive, and instead of giving one of his patented comic responses, he answers

the SS-Mann directly and deliberately, using the exact words the latter used in his question. To be sure, it is at this point that Frau Kopecka brings the SS-Mann the beer she had refused him previously, thus helping Schweyk out of his perilous situation.

This servile attitude is assumed by Schweyk again and again during the play, especially with the representatives of higher authority, when he finds himself on the defensive. This fact becomes very obvious as Schweyk stumbles through a progression of brushes with authority within the first two scenes. Having encountered the SS-Mann, the lowest of the low as it were, Schweyk is faced with the Gestapoagent Brettschneider followed finally by the highest of the three, Bullinger, the "Scharführer der SS". During the course of this progression we will notice that Schweyk's attitude will change, and the impudent, mocking, sarcastic Schweyk that we saw in the conversation with the drunken SS-Mann will gradually disappear, and the servile attitude he assumed when threatened will become all the more evident. It is exactly this servility to which certain critics refer when they characterise him in the following ways: "Er spricht sich für das In-den-Arsch-Kriechen aus";¹⁴ and "The Unheroic Hero".¹⁵

By the time Schweyk and his cronies have finished with the SS-Mann he is dead to the world, utterly drunk. Moreover with the singing of "Und was bekam des Soldaten Weib" the regulars at the Kelch gain a symbolic victory over the SS-Mann, since it is immediately before the singing of the last verse of the song that he becomes dead to the world. Schweyk, as if trying to prove that his symbolic victory is indeed a real victory, bellows into the SS-Mann's ear:

"Hoch Benesch!" (St.10,p.22), the cry of the Czechoslovakian anti-fascist movement, named after the Czech political leader, who was the symbol of Czech resistance against the Nazis from his government in exile in London. When the SS-Mann does not move Schweyk is about to revel in the atmosphere of freedom that has been established with the unconsciousness of the SS-Mann when the Gestapoagent Brettschneider arrives and catches the end of Schweyk's remark about fear, and immediately Schweyk finds himself on the defensive. Yet his attitude does not seem to be affected much and his answer to Brettschneider's question about who is afraid is very definite. As usual Schweyk, when faced with a difficult question that is liable to get him into trouble says nothing but the truth. Yet this truth is often phrased in such a way that it sounds absurd. Schweyk's contention that the "SS-Männer" are afraid, that the force of which all men must be aware, should themselves be scared, is almost ludicrous. Yet the way in which Schweyk says it--"bestimmt" (St.10,p.22)--lends it an element of truth.

Schweyk's attitude towards Brettschneider is, at the beginning, not dissimilar to his attitude towards the drunken SS-Mann:

Brettschneider seine Zeitung entfaltend: Das ist eine Extraausgabe. Auf den Führer ist ein Bombenattentat verübt worden in einem Münchener Bräukeller. Was sagen Sie dazu?

Schweyk: Hat er lang leidn missn? (St.10,p.23)

In Schweyk's tone we can denote a derisory irony. Schweyk is playing with the Gestapoagent. He knows that Hitler escaped injury from his discussion with the SS-Mann, and yet he replies to Brettschneider's question, which is designed to try and force Schweyk into making a

treasonable remark, in a way which will certainly prolong the conversation. Indeed, it seems that Schweyk wants to keep the conversation alive at all costs, for to Brettschneider's next remark about the attempted assassination, Schweyk, in keeping with his character, plunges off into one of his associated anecdotes. Instead of talking about the effect of the attack on Hitler, he talks about the bomb, and in such a way that he is bound to evoke an answer of some sort:

Schweyk: Wahrscheinlich eine billige. Heut stellens alles in der Massenproduktion her, und dann wundern sie sich, wenn es keine Qualität ist. . . . Aber daB sie für eine solche Gelegenheit keine bessere Bomb wählen, is eine Nachlässigkeit von ihrer Seit.
(St.10,p.23)

What Schweyk says here is, of course, highly dangerous, since it could very easily be interpreted in such a way that it seemed Schweyk wanted Hitler dead. This speech reminds us of Schweyk's first speech of the play, when he talks about the two Adolfs without mentioning the one who was the topic of the conversation. However the reaction of Brettschneider to the remark is somewhat different. Instead of letting Schweyk drift on into one of his farcical anecdotes, which in any case would probably have little or no relevance to either bombs or Hitler, Brettschneider, who has returned to the Kelch for the sole purpose of attempting to make an arrest, sees that he has his fish almost hooked, and he interrupts him. It appears at first that Schweyk has misjudged his adversary and that he is now going to pay the penalty for his never-ending babble. Brettschneider, however, in his haste to hook the fish, spoils his whole plan by providing Schweyk with an exit:

Brettschneider unterbricht ihn: „Das nennen Sie eine Nachlässigkeit, wenn der Führer beinahe seinen Tod findet? (St.10,p.23)

Schweyk, slippery as an eel, completely outmanœuvres him. By his careful picking on the word "beinah" Schweyk, even though he is speaking irrelevant inanities, somehow seems to convince Brettschneider that, at this moment anyway, he has no possibility of an arrest:

Schweyk: So ein Wort wie "beinah" is oft eine Täuschung, Herr Brettschneider. . . . Auf "beinah" kannens nicht rechn. (St.10,p.23f.)

This, of course, is absurd, since the reason that Schweyk is liable to get arrested is that he called the failure to kill Hitler negligent. But Brettschneider does not seem to notice this, nor the fact that Schweyk is almost daring him to try again. Now we see the reason why Schweyk does not don his servile attitude. He feels that, at this point at least, he has little need to fear, for Brettschneider quite obviously does not possess one ounce of intelligence, and Schweyk believes that he is able to outsmart him at every turn. Frau Kopecka is, on the other hand, not of the same opinion. She, in keeping with her name,¹⁶ is worried about the continuing operation of her business, and knowing Brettschneider from previous visits, during which he has managed to arrest a patron of the Kelch, she tries in vain to prevent Schweyk from his seemingly insane course. But Schweyk is not to be subdued. His appetite is not yet sated, and he feels the need to qualify one of Brettschneider's accusations:

Brettschneider: Ich hab das Gefühl, Sie hätten es nicht für einen großen Verlust für das Protektorat gehalten, wenn der Führer jetzt tot wäre.

Schweyk: Ein Verlust wär es, das läßt sich nicht leugnen. Ein fürchterlicher auBerdem. Der Hitler läßt sich nicht durch jeden beliebigen Trottel ersetzen. (St.10,p.24)

Brettschneider's accusation is, of course, highly leading, yet Schweyk plunges straight in. However this time his answer seems to be a little guarded, and he agrees that it would be a loss. If, however, we look at the second half of the remark, we will see that, what at first seems to be a compliment, turns out to contain the ambivalence so typical of Schweyk. "Der Hitler läßt sich nicht durch jeden beliebigen T r o t t e l ersetzen" implies that Hitler cannot be replaced by just anybody, since he is such a great leader, and leaders as great as he is are few and far between. But if we let the emphasis fall on the "jeden", we see that the sentence implies that Hitler cannot be replaced by a n y o l d "Trottel", but only by a superior "Trottel", a "Trottel" who measures up to Hitler himself. Brettschneider is, however, slow to react. His demeanour is now hopeful, but it seems that this attitude has been awakened not by Schweyk's remarks about Hitler being a "Trottel", but by Schweyk not being surprised "daß er [Hitler] angegriffen wird". (St.10,p.24). So at the point when the game could have been won, Brettschneider fails to make the correct move. Thus the Gestapoagent asks Schweyk to explain himself, and Schweyk, as always when it is possible, spells out the truth. His remarks here are extremely important, since they portray the attitude and philosophy of the "kleinen Mann":

Die großen Männer sind immer schlecht angeschrieben beim gewöhnlichen Volk . . . Warum, es versteht sie nicht und hält alles für

überflüssig, sogar das Heldentum. Der kleine Mann scheißt sich was auf eine große Zeit. Er will ein bisschen ins Wirtshaus gehn und Gulasch auf die Nacht. (St.10,p.25)

The philosophy of the "kleinen Mann" is simple. He does not want to fight, or to be a hero; all he wants to do is to live, to survive these cruel times, so that he will be able to sit in the pub at night, have plenty to eat, and enjoy himself. As a "kleiner Mann" this too is Schweyk's ambition, and he will do it any way he can. However, what Schweyk fails to mention is that at present these means to happiness are not available. For Hitler has produced "eine Ordnung", in which there is no food to be had, and thus the means to survival for the "kleinen Mann" have been severed. Therefore the "kleine Mann" is forced to adopt other attitudes to obtain what he wants.¹⁷

Gradually, Brettschneider finds his feet, and he begins to manoeuvre Schweyk to where he wants him. He interprets Schweyk's remarks as calling Hitler's war not a defensive one but an "Eroberungskrieg", and from this point on Schweyk is on the defensive. This time however the Gestapoagent does not provide Schweyk with a way out:

Und Sie behaupten also, daß der Führer die Welt erobern will? Und er muß nicht nur Deutschland gegen seine jüdischen Feinde und die Plutokratie verteidigen? (St.10,p.27)

Schweyk realises that he is in a hole and in his almost mocking tone he tries to wriggle out by making what he said seem something quite ordinary:

Sie müssen nicht so nehmen, er denkt sich nichts Schlechtes dabei. Die Welt erobern, das ist für ihn ganz was gewöhnliches wie für Sie Biertrinken . . . (St.10,p.27)

But even his pro-Hitler "Wehe den perfiden Briten, mehr sag ich euch nicht" (St.10,p.27) fails to extricate him from this position. Even his change of attitude from the defiance of "auf 'beinah' könnens nicht rechn" to this more subdued, friendly position has failed. Schweyk has indeed appeared to have underestimated his adversary.

There have been some critics¹⁸ who have implied that Schweyk deliberately sets out to get himself arrested, and certainly Brecht wants Schweyk to get arrested so that the play may continue; but I believe that these critics are slightly off the track here, and that Schweyk's change of attitude and the "mehr sag ich euch nicht", which implies that Schweyk feels that any more could get him into really deep trouble, refute this point of view to some extent at least.

From this time on Schweyk's attitude toward the higher echelons of authority changes radically. He assumes when he has to a cloak of complete servility both in his actions and in his language. From this point Schweyk's main purpose is survival, to try and find his way out of the "Petschekbank" other than in a wooden box, so that later he will be able to enjoy his life in the Kelch with his friends. And indeed, as Baloun points out, survival of the atrocities perpetrated within the "Petschekbank" is by no means a certainty:

Baloun: Den erschießens jetzt vielleicht.
(St.10,p.28)

Thus Schweyk's behaviour towards even the idiotic Brettschneider changes:

Ich bitt um Entschuldigung, daB ich voraus
durch die Tür tret, damit Sie mich im Aug haben
und gut bewachen können. (St.10,p.27f.)

Even though we may note a friendly smile on Schweyk's face and a touch of irony as he says this, the important thing is that, to all intents and purposes, he is polite and subservient, at least as far as Brettschneider can see he is. Here I feel that I must stress once again that Schweyk is only servile when he has to be, above all before authorities who represent a danger to his survival. However, even then his servility is assumed only to the extent that Schweyk thinks it is necessary to survive. The fact that Schweyk succeeds in surviving as long as he does, and there is nothing to suppose that he will not be able to keep his date with Vojta "im 'Kelch', um sechse, nachm Krieg" (St.10,p.105), shows that Schweyk's knowledge of human nature is great indeed, and that his evaluation of the situation in which he finds himself is mostly perfect.

Scharführer Bullinger represents the Nazis at their most cruel, and as such he represents to Schweyk the greatest danger of death. At first Schweyk does not know just what to expect, but knows, as Baloun pointed out in the previous scene, that he is now fighting for his life. He knows that Bullinger, on the pretext of a whim, can dispose of him at a moment's notice, and so Schweyk follows his own philosophy, which he later explains to the "dicken Frau" after he has managed to survive the situation:

Die dicke Frau: Sind Sie der, den Sie gestern weggeführt haben von hier?

Schweyk stolz: Derselbe. In solchen Zeiten muß man sich unterwerfen. Es ist Übungssache. Ich hab ihm die Hand geleckt. Früher hat man mit Gefangenen das gemacht, daß man ihnen Salz aufs Gesicht gestreut hat. Sie sind gebunden gewesen,

und man hat große Wolfshund auf sie gelassen,
 die ihnen die ganzen Gesichter weggeleckt haben,
 her ich. Heut is man nicht mehr so grausam,
 auBer wenn man wütend wird. (St.10,p.43)

The kernel of Schweyk's philosophy of survival is contained in this last sentence, and explains all Schweyk's actions with relation to the SS-Mann, Brettschneider and now Bullinger. He maintains that it is possible to do or say almost anything to the authorities, however defiant or ironic it may be, providing that it does not make them angry.

However, Bullinger constitutes a greater problem than either of the first two, and as Schweyk points out, the only way to survive in the face of such an irrational person is to be servile, to bend as low as possible. Later in the play Schweyk is reprimanded by the "Kurzsichtigen":

Man muB ihnen nicht noch in den Arsch kriechen.
 (St.10,p.98)

What the "Kurzsichtige" does not realise is that it is exactly this "In-den-Arsch-Kriechen" which has enabled Schweyk, and will enable him in the future, to survive under the irrationalities of an oppressive fascist regime. Schweyk, true to his philosophy, acts and speaks in exactly this manner to Bullinger, until the time that he has evaluated his opponent and knows just how far he can go without succumbing.

Bullinger asks:

ScheiBt du dick oder scheiBt du dünn?
 (St.10,p.29)

to which Schweyk, being as submissive as he possibly can, replies:

Melde gehorsamst, Herr Scharführer, ich scheiB,

wie Sies wünschen. (St.10,p.29)

This "Tonfall", as Brecht liked to call it, is typical not only of Schweyk, but, as Brecht himself notes in his Arbeitsjournal¹⁹ is also to be found in significant proportions in some of his other plays, and used, among others, by Mutter Courage and Matti. Hans Mayer in his book Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition characterised this type of servile language as "Sklavensprache"²⁰ and since that time this "Tonfall" has been called just that. I shall be returning to the characteristics and use of "Sklavensprache" later, since I believe that within it there is contained one of the most fundamental elements of the whole Schweykian attitude. Let it suffice at this present time to point out that Schweyk's "Sklavensprache" is his way of trying to guarantee his survival in the face of Bullinger and what he represents.

The "Melde gehorsamst" is, of course, the basis of the submissive servility, which is transmitted by the "Sklavensprache" and Schweyk's outward appearance. With this the addressee is at once placed on a pedestal and Schweyk's inferiority and subordination are displayed beyond doubt:

Bullinger: Schiffst du gelb oder schiffst du
grun?

Schweyk freundlich: Melde gehorsamst, ich schiffe
gelblich-grun, Herr Scharfuhrer. (St.10,p.87)

Both this situation and the one almost the same as it (St.10,p.29) carry the utmost danger for Schweyk, and so on both of these occasions Schweyk feels that he has got no recourse except to his "In-den-Arsch-Kriechen". He becomes so servile that Bullinger is flattered by his own authority, and on both occasions Schweyk manages to escape unscathed.

On a few occasions, however, usually after Schweyk has measured his opponent, his "Melde gehorsamst" is used for other purposes, namely merely to create the impression of utter servility, while speaking in a manner that would not otherwise be tolerated:

Schweyk da Baloun keine Antwort weiB: Melde gehorsamst, Herr Scharführer, daB der dumme Mensch unschuldig sein muB, weil er nicht hineingeschaut hätt, wenns ihm gehern wird, dann mecht er wissen, was drin is. (St.10,p.84)

Here Schweyk is again speaking to Bullinger and yet his tone is frivolous, if not downright impudent. And yet the "Melde gehorsamst" has created such an impression on the Scharführer that he does not realise this fact. Bullinger has come to take Schweyk's "Sklavensprache" so much for granted, that he fails to notice when it is just a façade.

However, in general Schweyk's behaviour towards Bullinger conforms with his philosophy of "sich unterwerfen", and it seems to be successful, for Schweyk elicits from Bullinger an "Antwort korrekt" (St.10,p.29) for his answer to Bullinger's first question, and Schweyk, having negotiated the first, and what is for him the most critical test, (a wrong answer would have meant a severe beating at the very least), is now on the right track. For once he knows what kind of attitude to adopt with a person, his knowledge of human personality will give him a good chance of survival. Nevertheless, Schweyk is not safe yet. Even though he has passed the first test, he still has to face the charges that Brettschneider has brought against him:

Bullinger: . . . Was hast du dazu zu sagen?

Schweyk: Es is viel. Allzuviel is ungesund.
(St.10,p.29)

Schweyk continues with his "Sklavensprache" and his servile attitude. He has learnt from experience that when in conflict with the authorities, that it is always best to tell the truth. Schweyk, however, often takes the truth so far that it becomes absurd:

Bullinger: So. Und du gestehst alles zu, was hier über deine Äußerungen steht? Auf Brettschneiders Rapport zeigend.

Schweyk: Wenn Sie wünschen, Euer Hochwohlgeboren, daß ich gesteh, so gesteh ich, mir kanns nicht schaden. Wenn Sie aber sagen: "Schweyk, gestehen Sie nichts ein", wer ich mich herausdrehn, bis man mich in Stücke reißt. (St.10,p.30f.)

Despite the fact that Schweyk again takes his "I will do whatever you want me to" stance, which has previously succeeded, Bullinger is obviously more observant than Brettschneider had been, and he realises immediately that this time Schweyk is being rather "frech" with his seemingly servile, but in effect utterly ironic "Euer Hochwohlgeboren". Thus he calls for Schweyk to be taken away and his attitude implies that it will not be for the good of Schweyk's health:

Bullinger brüllt: Halt das Maul! Abführen!
(St.10,p.31)

Schweyk immediately recognises the fact that he is in serious trouble and sees the need for playing his trump-card:

Schweyk als Brettschneider ihn bis zur Tür geführt hat, die rechte Hand ausstreckend, laut:
Lang lebe unser Führer Adolf Hitler. Diesen Krieg gewinnen wir! (St.10,p.31)

I contend that Schweyk has realised all along that if he can get the topic of conversation around to his "insanity", then this is his best chance of successful survival. So at this opportune juncture Schweyk uses his trump-card. In this respect also his understanding of human

nature and his mental awareness of things happening around him have stood him in good stead. At the very beginning of the scene Bullinger characterised the Kelch as a "nettes Nest subversiver Gestalten" (St.10,p.28), a remark which Brettschneider is at pains to contradict most emphatically:

Brettschneider eilig: Keineswegs, Herr Scharführer. Die Wirtin Kopecka ist eine sehr ordentliche Frau, die sich nicht mit Politik abgibt . . . (St.10,p.28)

Schweyk, of course, knows the fact that Brettschneider is infatuated with Frau Kopecka---"Frau Kopecka, Sie schaun heut wieder aus wie ein Maiglöckerl" (St.10,p.22)---but I am convinced that he realises that the Gestapoagent's defence of Frau Kopecka and her public house is more than really the protection of somebody he loves. Schweyk can feel something, he, in some way or another, thinks that he can detect a small rift, a tiny chasm that divides the two Nazis, and by means of his "insanity" he hopes to exploit it. At any rate his plans start off on the right track:

Bullinger konsterniert: Bist du blöd?
(St.10,p.31)

Bullinger is shocked because he cannot conceive of a man, arrested for allegedly talking treasonably about the Third Reich, saluting its leader. When Schweyk answers his question in the affirmative and explains that he was "amtlich von einer ärztlichen Kommission für einen Idioten erklärt" (St.10,p.31), Bullinger's reaction is, just as Schweyk had predicted in his mind, to castigate Brettschneider, thus changing the field of battle and making Schweyk merely an interested bystander, instead of a highly out-gunned adversary:

Bullinger: Brettschneider! Haben Sie nicht gemerkt, daß der Mann blöd ist? (St.10,p.31)

Brettschneider, realising his mistake, can do nothing except look "gekränkt". The "Zwietracht" of which Schweyk had previously recognised just a hint, is now shown to be a gaping schism, based on jealousy and even hatred, and Schweyk's plan is indeed paying off:

Bullinger: Brettschneider, nach meiner Ansicht sind Sie ein Scheißer.

Brettschneider: Herr Scharführer, das muß ich mir von Ihnen nicht sagen lassen. (St.10,p.32)

The quarrel continues with Schweyk merely standing back listening, until he is called upon by Bullinger to act as a sort of judge. But Schweyk realises the danger of taking one side or the other. If he takes Bullinger's side now then Brettschneider will get him later, and if he rules in favour of Brettschneider, then the likelihood is, that he will never get out of the place alive. So of course he is very careful:

Schweyk: Melde gehorsamst, daß ich mich nicht einmischen mecht zwischen die beiden Herrn, daß ich aber versteh, was Sie meinen, Herr Scharführer. Es is aber schmerzlich für den Herrn Brettschneider, indem er ein so guter Spürhund is und es sich sozusagen nicht verdient hat. (St.10,p.33)

Schweyk's first move is to create the atmosphere of servility with his "Melde gehorsamst" and to declare his impartiality, stating that he does not want to enter into the argument. By doing so he clears a path free of any retribution when in fact he does just that. "Schweyk will sich nicht einmischen, und mischt sich doch ein; er gibt keinem und beiden Recht; er erhöht die Spannung zwischen beiden . . ." ²¹ Schweyk

quite obviously benefits from the quarrel and he is well aware of this fact. As he says later:

Schweyk: . . . Sie hätten mich erschießen können, aber die Gestapo hat mich als Zeugn gegen die SS gebraucht. Ich hab von der Zwietracht der Großen profitiert. (St.10,p.95)

Even though Bullinger is not too happy that Schweyk did not back him up, Schweyk is still almost home at this point, since Bullinger is still enraged at the fact that Brettschneider has brought him an idiot, and has thus wasted his time:

Bullinger: . . . Werfen Sie den Idioten da hinaus und bringen Sie mir e i n m a l was Besseres. (St.10,p.33)

Schweyk now feels that it is time to try his second trump-card. During the time that he has been stealing dogs and falsifying their pedigrees, Schweyk has experienced that most people of high standing cannot resist the opportunity of possessing a pedigree dog, at least he has made his living this way, and so Schweyk plans to try it with Bullinger:

Schweyk schreitet auf ihn zu und küßt ihm die Hand: Vergelts Gott tausendmal, wenn Sie mal ein Hunterl brauchen sollten, wenden Sie sich gefälligst an mich. Ich hab ein Geschäft mit Hunden. (St.10,p.33)

Schweyk obviously realises that Bullinger could interpret this action as a bribe, and so he prepares the way for his action by being as submissive as possible. Not only does he use his most polite "Sklavensprache", but he also kisses his hand as one would a king's, thus making Bullinger more important than he really is. Schweyk's action is, of course, a little dangerous, but he feels that he must try and gain his freedom, since to do nothing would mean his rotting away in the

"Kazett". Even if it did not, then Schweyk, in all probability, would still not be able to resist the chance of making Bullinger indebted to him, dependent on him in some way. Anyway, at this point Schweyk feels that he has the measure of the man.

At first Bullinger does not react to the offer, but then, as if realising the opportunity that lies before him, his reaction is just as Schweyk had hoped for:

Bullinger: Kazett. Als Brettschneider Schweyk wieder abfahren will: Halt! Lassen Sie mich mit dem Mann allein. (St.10,p.33)

Schweyk now feels more or less at home, even during the time when Bullinger is meting out punishment to the Bankier Kruscha, a fate which could just as easily befall Schweyk himself. Faced with a man "der ihn freundlich anlächelt" (St.10,p.34), Bullinger half threatens him, yet it is as if Schweyk were back in the Kelch, for he dares interrupt the Scharführer and then proceeds to detail facts about the dog, on which Bullinger has got his eye, facts which are quite blatantly a parody of Hitler's racial policies:

Die nichtreinrassigen sind klüger, aber die reinrassigen sind feiner und werden lieber gestohlen. Sie sind meistens so dumm, daß sie zwei bis drei Dienstboten brauchen, die ihnen sagen, wenn sie scheißen müssen, und daß sie das Maul aufmachen müssen zum fressen. Es ist wie bei die feinen Leute. (St.10,p.34f.)

Not only do we notice that Schweyk dares to say such blatantly treasonable remarks in front of a man of authority, but also that he is now speaking in a completely different manner. His "Sklavensprache" has, to all intents and purposes, now disappeared, and we again observe his old anecdotal patter. Moreover, Schweyk even dares to

tell him outright that it is not possible for him to have the dog:

Schweyk: Sie kennen ihn nicht haben, der
Vojta verkauft ihn nicht. (St.10,p.35)

However, he then feels that to contradict Bullinger so openly could be a mistake and so he tries to rectify the matter by offering another dog as a pacificatory gift. When Bullinger appears to be mad and re-affirms his intention, Schweyk's reaction is to find excuses why this is impossible, and it seems that the only hope of obtaining the dog lies in the fact that Vojta, a collaborator and Quisling, and otherwise a perfect Jew-hating Arian, has a beard which is a "bissel zerfranzt". (St.10,p.35). Even so Schweyk sees little hope of getting the dog. Bullinger immediately threatens Schweyk by pulling a revolver out of a drawer and beginning to clean it, thus intimating that unless Schweyk procures the Spitz for him, he is of very little use. Schweyk at once senses the dangerous predicament in which he finds himself:

Bullinger einen Revolver aus der Schublade ziehend
und ihn anzuglich reinigend: Ich seh, du willst
mir den Spitz nicht verschaffen, du Saboteur.

Schweyk: Melde gehorsamst, daB ich Ihnen den Hund
verschaffen will. (St.10,p.36)

Schweyk's language and behaviour change at once. We again observe his pure and utter servility. Indeed the manner in which he answers the Scharführer's contention that he does not want to get the dog, only emphasises this fact even more. For Schweyk uses almost exactly the same words in his reply as Bullinger had used in his contention. Yet even at this point he cannot be certain that this submissive action will extricate him from this tight spot, despite the fact that Bullinger is more aware of his desire for the dog than of his own duty. Thus

to demonstrate to Bullinger that he knows his job and will be able to obtain the Spitz, he strays off into one of his anecdotes about methods of catching dogs, which continues ad absurdum. Of course, the fact that this story does continue so long suggests another function. Schweyk uses the story to take Bullinger's mind off the threat that he has just delivered, and once again to effect the change in Bullinger, whereby his official duty suffers because of his burning desire for a status symbol. At any rate the scheme is successful since we hear no more about the revolver, and we see that beyond all doubt Bullinger wants the Spitz more than anything else:

Bullinger: Und ich glaub, daß du dir einen Jux gemacht hast mit dem Zertifikat als Idiot; ich will aber ein Aug zudrücken, erstens weil der Brettschneider ein ScheiBer ist, und zweitens, wenn du den Hund für meine Frau bringst, du Verbrecher. (St.10,p.37)

Even though he is aware that it is more than likely that Schweyk has been feigning his lunacy and lying about the fact that the army authorities certified him an idiot, Bullinger is prepared to forgo the procedure that his office demands in order to get the dog. Schweyk, now realising that he is out of all danger and a person for whom truth is of paramount importance, and who will therefore tell the truth if at all possible, then admits that, despite the certificate being "echt", he was indeed putting on a bit of an act. Nevertheless, Bullinger declares Schweyk "Bis auf weiteres frei" (St.10,p.38) and yet Schweyk feels that it is necessary to poke his nose in once again on behalf of a gentleman, who, despite the fact that he was there "nur wegen versuchten Raubmord an einem Bauer aus Holitz" (St.10,p.38), was forced to

sit among the political prisoners and who thought that as a result he might suffer. Schweyk is, of course, being highly ironic and critical of the whole Nazi regime, in which it is better to have committed a crime against humanity, than to have done nothing like the Greislerin Moudra, and yet be an "echte Tschechin". Bullinger's booming retort evokes from Schweyk an immediate defensive move:

Schweyk stramm: Zu Befehl. Das Spitzerl bring
ich, sobald ichs hab. Winsche einen guten Morgen.
(St.10,p.38)

This is the real Schweyk, at least the Schweyk that most of the critics emphasise. It is important for Schweyk to remain alive, since for him life is essential. It is the source of his vitality, which in turn motivates the Czech people who frequent the Kelch. Therefore, in order to survive, Schweyk will resort to almost anything. Thus we see how successful he has been to extricate himself safely from a situation about which Baloun remarks: "Den erschießens jetzt vielleicht". (St.10,p.28). It does not matter to Schweyk how he manages to get out of such a mess, the only thing that matters is the fact that he has succeeded in doing so. Thus when the "dicke Frau" reprimands the Czech people in general for failing to do more to help the like of Baloun, Schweyk refutes her:

Schweyk: Verlangens nicht zu viel von sich. Es
is schon viel, wenn man überhaupt noch da is
heutzutag. Da is man leicht so beschäftigt mit
Ieberlebn, daß man zu nix andern kommt.
(St.10,p.54)

Moreover, he gives exactly the same sort of advice to the dog Ajax, whom he finds buried in the snow on the way to Stalingrad:

Schweyk: . . . Wir gehn nach Stalingrad. Da

triffst du noch andre Hund, da is Betrieb. Wenn
 du im Krieg ieberleben willst, halt dich eng an
 die andern und das Iebliche, keine Extratouren,
 sondern kuschn, solang, bis du beißen kannst.
 (St.10,p.124f.)

It is exactly this "kuschn", which Schweyk gives as advice to the dog, that he himself undertakes when confronted with dangerous situations at the hands of the authorities. It is not, as we can see from his normal behaviour and language, an attitude of which he is particularly fond, but it is a necessary attitude, and one which sees him at the end of the play still very much alive and ready to keep his appointment with Vojta in the local after the war. Indeed the fact that he not only manages to survive the first visit to the "Petschekbank", but also emerges a free man, is all the more startling if we compare it to the fate of the Bankier Kruscha. Unlike Schweyk he refuses to "kuschn" and suffers as a result:

Bullinger: . . . Dann zehn übers GesäB.
 (St.10,p.29)

and then later:

Bullinger: Weitere zehn aufs GesäB, ich brauch
 die Äußerungen. (St.10,p.32)

and then finally:

Bullinger: Fünf weitere, bis es ihn freut und
 bis der Führer ein blutiger Hanswurst ist.
 (St.10,p.34)

He refuses to admit to something which he has not done. Schweyk, on the other hand, is prepared to subjugate himself, to confess to anything Bullinger wants. He lies down like a dog, acts in a servile manner, and finally benefits.

Later in the play, Schweyk again survives what is this time

an even more dangerous situation. He is confronted with Bullinger, who wants to know what has happened to the dog, which Schweyk was meant to obtain for him. On this occasion, unlike the last, Bullinger is not dependent on Schweyk; indeed, Schweyk is at the mercy of the Scharführer, liable to be dispatched at any whim Bullinger might have.

Schweyk again resorts to his saviour, a servile attitude with speech to match, although even here we notice, masked by the "Sklavensprache", an ironic dig at conditions under Hitler's regime:

Schweyk: Jawohl, Herr Scharführer. Ordnung muß sein. Der Schleichhandel is ein Übel und hört nicht auf, bis nix mehr da is. Dann wird gleich Ordnung sein, hab ich recht? (St.10,p.88)

Yet as we have noticed before, Bullinger rarely, if ever, recognises the fact that Schweyk is being ironic or mildly impudent. The quality that impresses him most about Schweyk is his eagerness to please, this submissive "Haltung", an attitude which holds Bullinger, the one member of authority who is empowered to have Schweyk dispatched, spellbound and stupefied, as he himself remarks:

Bullinger ihn anstarrend: Ich weiß überhaupt nicht, warum ich dir zuhöre, und schon einmal vorher. Wahrscheinlich, weil ich einen solchen Verbrecher noch nicht gesehen hab und wie hypnotisiert auf ihn hinstarre.

.
Ich hör dir immer noch zu. Ich kann mich nicht wegreißen. (St.10,p.86f.)

Herein lies the success of Schweyk's manner, a manner which has been described by Pavel Petr as "kriecherische Unterwürfigkeit".²² Schweyk's "kriecherische Unterwürfigkeit" is the only way in which Schweyk knows he can survive, and its success is demonstrated yet again when Schweyk survives this second arrest, an occasion about which Baloun remarks

with certainty:

Meinen besten Freund hab ich so hineingeris'n,
daß er mir womöglich heit nacht erschossen wird,
wenn nicht, kann er von Glick sagn, und es pas-
siert ihm morgen frih. (St.10,p.90)

In the light of this, his second escape from the jaws of death, Schweyk's remarks to the "dicken Frau" (St.10,p.43) take on an even greater significance. If he had not assumed this "Haltung" he would have "disappeared" like the "Tapezierer aus der Quergasse":

Baloun: . . . Der Herr Brettschneider ist sonst
so tüchtig. Vorige Wochen, wo du nicht hier warst,
is er mit dem Tapezierer aus der Quergasse fort-
gegangen, und der is nicht mehr zurückgekommen.

Schweyk: Wahrscheinlich ein ungeschickter Mensch,
der sich ihnen nicht unterworfen hat. (St.10,p.42f.)

Schweyk's action in the company of the authorities is, by his own definition, "geschickt". No matter what else he may do or say, the assuming of his servile attitude and submissive mask will enable him to survive, in order to be able to enjoy the good times foretold in "Das Lied von der Moldau".

This then is the Schweyk called by Benjamin a "geprügelte Held" and described by Brecht himself in his Arbeitsjournal as an "unerschöpfliches objekt des mißbrauchs". (AJ.2,p.569). This is the side of Schweyk which is most obvious to the reader, the side which has been emphasised by the critics, drawing such accolades as "the unheroic hero".²³ Perhaps the last word here should be given to Pavel Petr who sums up the play in the following manner: "Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg gehört zu Brechts Experimenten mit unpositiven Helden."²⁴

Part II

The position of the critics to me falls far short of a complete understanding of the complex character of Schweyk. In this matter I am fully in agreement with recent critics of the play, notably Herbert Knust,²⁵ and Hoffmann and Fuegi²⁶ who see far more. In their article entitled "Brecht, Schweyk and Commune-ism" the latter express this view as follows: "The first contention of this paper is that Esslin's picture of Schweyk is only half right and that, as a result, the conclusions he draws are misleading. Brecht and some of his characters do indeed share a way of looking at things and a mode of action with Schweyk. But Esslin's definition of the 'Schweikian philosophy' is an oversimplification derived from only one of two conflicting sides of Schweyk's being."²⁷ While I do not completely share some of the views expounded by Hoffmann and Fuegi, I must concur with this statement, and it is this second, and perhaps more important side of Schweyk which I would like to investigate at this point.

One of the most significant sentences in the play is to be found when Schweyk remarks to the SS-Mann Müller 2 on the way to the Kelch: "Alles hat zwei Seitn". (St.10,p.40). Within its context the sentence seems to be harmless enough, yet true to Brecht's theory of putting fundamental theses in unexpected places, we find here what turns out to be one of the guiding lights for a correct interpretation of Schweyk and the play itself. Schweyk is implying that even the most

uneventful and suppliant person or object could and will work against you. This thesis must, I feel, be used in turn as a measuring stick of Schweyk's own behaviour towards the "Großen". Herbert Knust says: "Alles hat zwei Seiten--das heißt: nichts ist absolut. Was sich als absolut gebärdet, ist im Irrtum, muß sich gegen sich selbst kehren".²⁸

The first part of this study has illustrated the servile, suppliant nature of Schweyk. Now I contend that true to Brecht's theory of Marxist dialectics (everything has two sides to it) and to Schweyk's own remark, at the same time as he is kneeling down kissing the hands of the authorities, Schweyk is pursuing a far from accidental, but rather outright and deliberate attack on those same authorities, who stand for a political creed abhorred by all Czechs and by Brecht himself. Now it could be argued that Schweyk's "acts of sabotage" do very little to help the cause of the "antifaschistischen Einheitsfront"²⁹ and that Schweyk could do more by direct methods of attack. But as Brecht points out in "Das Lied von der Moldau" individual forays against the power of the Nazi armies are useless:

Es wechseln die Zeiten, da hilft kein Gewalt.
(St.10,p.130)

"Brecht läßt keinen Zweifel daran, daß vereinzelte revolutionäre Aktionen zu nichts führen, daß sowohl das in der erste Szene diskutierte Attentat auf Hitler als auch die sieben oder acht Attentate auf Mussolini erfolglos waren und die Lebenschancen des kleinen Mannes eher gefährden als verbessern."³⁰ What we must remember is that no matter what the circumstances, the main hope of the "kleinen Mann" and his strivings are aimed at self-preservation. He wants to live on and

be able to enjoy the time when there will be no oppression. Yet at the same time, without endangering his existence, the "kleine Mann" must try to do something about the situation, for without his action it is very possible that the Third Reich will last the thousand years predicted by Hitler. So Schweyk in his own little way goes out and hinders the Nazi cause by any method that is left open to him.

Yet one of Schweyk's actions has caused East German critics to look at Schweyk in a negative way, to see him as a traitor to the Czech national cause, and hence in the D.D.R. the play has become rather maligned. This action is Schweyk's joining of the Nazi army and his "mitmachen" in the oppression of the people of Europe. I, however, feel that Schweyk's actions are fully in keeping with his goals both in and out of the war. He joins the army because he is forced to, in order to save the life of Baloun. Brecht notes in his Arbeitsjournal:

erzähle steff einiges von dem SCHWEYK-plan. er sagt sogleich, der originalschweyk würde sich um balouns schwierigkeiten kaum kümmern, ihm eher zum eintritt in die deutsche armee zuraten und schwerlich in einem so gefährlichen lokal wie dem jetzigen wirtshaus ZUM KELLCH verkehren. tatsächlich liegen da die verschärfungen gegenüber 1914. jedoch beschließe ich auf der stelle, diese unpolitische haltung s[schweyks] widersprüchlich in die kleine fabel (rettung des fressers baloun) einzubauen. (AJ.2,p.569)

This, of course, completely disproves Esslin's thesis that Schweyk's attitude is purely a "philosophy of enlightened self-interest"³¹ for both here in the saving of Baloun from the perils of the Nazi army, and in various other places within the play, Schweyk displays a willingness to put himself out on a limb, if it means the safety of one of his

fellow "kleinen Männern".³² As Frau Kopecka sings in her song "Und was bekam des Soldaten Weib?" (St.10,p.15f.) membership of the Nazi army would mean for Baloun certain death and a betrayal of the Czech cause, and Schweyk re-emphasises this fact:

Schweyk: Ein sehr schönes Lied. Zu Baloun: Es beweist dir, daß du es dir zweimal überlegen sollst, bist du etwas Unüberlegtestust. Laß es dir nicht einfallen, nach Rußland zu ziehn mitn Hitler wegen große Rationen und dann erfrierst du, du Ochs.

.
Wenn man dir einen Teller mit Schweinernem hinstellen konnt, da, iß, verkommener Mensch, aber schwor, daß du ein guter Tschech bleiben wirst.
(St.10,p.16f.)

Schweyk, however, is able to overcome this problem, firstly because there is no doubt, as Brecht himself points out, that he will survive:

weill da, um eine revue zu besetzen. er hat ein gutes dramaturgisches urteil. zb fehlt ihm das element des überlebens des SCHWEYK, das ich in der kleinen plangeschichte hatte. - ich entwerfe das den-hund-treffen für diesen zweck.

(AJ.2,p.579)

and secondly because he is able to continue his work against the Nazi Reich from within the Nazi army, and yet still not lose his identity as an "echter Tscheche". Petr calls Schweyk's entry into the fascist army a "Kapitulation"³³ and criticises him for not being against the war, which is attempting to spread a fascist ideology over the continent of Europe. Hans Mayer in his book Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition is of a similar opinion: "Schweyks Einverständnis mit der Gewalt demonstriert gleichzeitig die Unwirksamkeit seiner Kampfmethod. Die Gestalt des Pragers erfüllt zwar die Aufgabe der List gegenüber der Gewalt, versagt aber bei den anderen Aufgaben, die der Schreibende

takes advantage of a situation, where people cannot possibly believe that an "echter Tscheche" and anti-Nazi is to be found wearing a Nazi uniform. Schweyk, on his way to Stalingrad, is more than correct when he assures Bullinger's brother, the Feldkurat, that he is not "gegen Krieg" (St.10,p.114), for although he is struggling there on behalf of Hitler, the war which he is waging is undoubtedly a war a g a i n s t Hitler.

I contend that throughout the play Schweyk remains constant to this rather ambivalent method of fighting Hitler, a method which I would like to call "opponierendes Mitläufertum" after Herbert Knust who coined the phrase.³⁵ I would like now to look at Schweyk's actions during the play, to prove that he is worthy of carrying this epithet.

The great secret of Schweyk's success lies in the fact that he constantly maintains his flexibility, so that if his action should backfire, he has always some means of extricating himself. In this respect we have seen that one fundamental part of his make-up is that he is never ashamed or afraid to become entirely servile in the face of adversity. Another attribute which helps him in his opposition is his knowledge and understanding of human nature, and his insight into the workings of a fascist state. As Knust says: " . . . so hat er doch ein scharfes Auge für die wunden Punkten im totalitären System".³⁶ All this, as we shall see, bears him in good stead.

Schweyk's first encounter with authority is, as we have seen, with the drunken SS-Mann, and although the man is so drunk that we could hardly call Schweyk's actions, together with those of his friends, "Widerstand", what we do find here is a deliberate attempt to under-

mine the morale of this man. This fact is best illustrated, of course, in Frau Kopecka's rendition of "Und was bekam des Soldaten Weib", where Brecht's stage directions read as follows:

Der SS-Mann nickt triumphierend am Ende jeder Strophe, aber vor der letzten sinkt ihm der Kopf an den Tisch, da er jetzt völlig betrunken ist. (St.10,p.16)

It is, of course, significant that during the final stanza, the crux of the song, the SS-Mann is "dead" to the world. Although Schweyk's opposition here could hardly be called great, it does give him a platform on which to build, and indeed he gets an immediate chance with the arrival of Brettschneider.

Brettschneider, described ironically by Schweyk as "ein so guter Spürhund", (St.10,p.33) is, as Schweyk himself recognises, in the Kelch solely for the purpose of attempting to make an arrest, and Schweyk deliberately goes out of his way to raise Brettschneider's hopes of obtaining this goal by immediately talking about the one thing Brettschneider wants him to talk about, namely the attempted assassination of Hitler. Schweyk's aim is to raise the Gestapoagent's hopes to fever pitch and then suddenly smash them. There are even some who have maintained that Schweyk deliberately contrives a situation whereby he can be arrested, so that he can show Brettschneider up in front of the Scharführer, Bullinger. This is, naturally, very difficult to ascertain, since it could only be correct if Schweyk already knew Bullinger and the fact that he and Brettschneider were not on the best of terms. Whatever the outcome of this line of thought, Schweyk is arrested, always knowing, however, that he has the trump card, in that

he has been certified insane and thrown out of the army. This is what Knust means when he talks about Schweyk's "scharfes Auge für die wunden Punkte". Schweyk makes use of the conflict between Bullinger and Brettschneider not only for his own benefit, but also in order to disgrace the latter in front of a superior officer, with the effect of total demoralisation.

Anywhere Schweyk feels that he can usurp some power from the authorities or gain some influence for himself, there Schweyk attacks. In this regard he also hacks away at Bullinger's Achilles' heel, his greed for material wealth and status symbols, here represented by a dog. But Schweyk's reasons for doing this are not purely personal. Of course he wants above all to escape Bullinger's clutches, yet he is always on the look out for an opportunity to increase tension within the Nazi camp, and this is just what he does here. Knowing that Brettschneider will jump at the chance to get back at the Scharführer for calling him "ein ScheiBer", Schweyk steals the dog in such a way that suspicion is bound to fall on Bullinger:

Schweyk: Ich will nix gesagt habn, aber die Deutschen haben eine Vorliebe für Hunde, daB es erstaunlich is, speziell die SS, so ein Hund is weg, vor Sie umschaun, sie schickens heim, ich hab selbst neulich einen Scharführer mit Namen Bullinger getroffn, wo einen Spitz hat haben wolln für seine Gemahlin in Köln. (St.10,p.59f.)

The proof of Schweyk's success in this attempt to create even more conflict in the ranks of the Nazis is to be seen in the scene with the raid on the Kelch, where Brettschneider accuses Bullinger of having stolen the dog:

Brettschneider der in der Tür erschienen ist:
 Herr Scharführer Bullinger, kann ich ein Wort
 mit Ihnen unter vier Augen sprechen?

Bullinger: Ich wüßte nicht, was ich mit Ihnen
 zu besprechen hätte. Sie wissen, für was ich Sie
 halte.

Brettschneider: Es handelt sich um neue Inform-
 ationen über den Verbleib des verschwundenen
 Hundes des Vojta, die wir in der Gestapo erhalten
 haben und die Sie interessieren dürften, Herr
 Scharführer Bullinger.

Die beiden Herren gehen in eine Ecke und fangen
an, wild zu gestikulieren. Brettschneider scheint
zu entwickeln, Bullinger habe den Hund, dieser
scheint zu sagen "Ich?" und in Empörung zu
geraten usw. (St.10,p.82f.)

Schweyk has aided and abetted in the deterioration of their relation-
 ship, and has thereby effectively cut down on their productivity. As a
 result of Schweyk's action, Brettschneider will have as little to do
 with Bullinger as possible and thus will be less likely to harass poor
 Czechs in the hope of gaining their arrest. Also, he will be looking
 for every opportunity to pay back Bullinger, since on this occasion
 he was unable to do so, and thus his full attention will not be on
 his job.

The dog-stealing episode also undermines the Nazi cause even
 further. However, although opposition to fascism is the basic cause
 of this, the undermining is largely unintended. Nevertheless, what
 must be pointed out as far as this is concerned is that Schweyk's
 actions are carried out in such a way, that the best things possible
 will happen, whether they were preconceived or not. This further de-
 terioration in the Nazi hold over Czechoslovakia is illustrated in the
 figure of Vojta. While discussing with Bullinger the matter of the

Spitz, Schweyk describes Vojta in the following terms:

Aber er is Kollaborationist und wird schon
Quisling geschimpft . . . (St.10,p.35)

Vojta is, therefore, aiding Hitler and his fascist regime in their drive for the total domination of the European continent. The next time we meet him, however, introduced as a "kleiner Dicker" (St.10,p.99) he is sitting in jail with Schweyk and the others awaiting transportation to the Russian front:

Schweyk: Ich wett, Sie heißen Vojta. Ich freu mich, daß ich Sie noch treff. Streckt ihm die Hand hin, was der Dicke übersieht. Ich bin der Schweyk, das sagt Ihnen vielleicht nix, aber Sie können meine Hand annehm'n, ich wett, Sie sind kein Deutschfreund mehr, jetzt wo Sie hier sitzen.

.
Sie wern in den Kaukasus marschiern und aufn
Hitler scheißen . . . (St.10,p.100)

As a result of Schweyk's action in stealing the dog, not only does he widen the already existing conflict between Bullinger and Brettschneider significantly, but also, and this is as important as it is unintended, he turns a one-time informer and collaborator into an anti-fascist nationalist. This is a loss to Hitler, of course, since for him it is imperative to have friends and allies among the Czech nation, on whom he can rely for help, and to whom he can turn in trying to persuade Czechs to follow his cause, for as Hitler is constantly reminding himself in the "Zwischenspiele" the "kleine Mann" in Czechoslovakia is of vital significance to the success or failure of his campaign.

Immediately after his release from the "Petschekbank" Schweyk again finds the opportunity to demoralise a member of the German army. He is accompanied to the Kelch by the SS-Mann Müller 2, and he wastes

no time at all in preparing him for his "destruction":

Schweyk: Wenn ichs der Frau Kopecka sag, mecht
sies Ihnen mächen. (St.10,p.39)

Schweyk has been telling Müller 2 of Frau Kopecka's ability to read the future from people's hands, and he has managed to do it in such a way as to raise the expectation of Müller 2 to a high level. He quite obviously feels there is a lot of promise in this situation, and so it proves to be. Between them, Schweyk and Frau Kopecka manage to raise the tension in the soldier, so that he just cannot resist having his own hand read:

Schweyk: . . . Aber ich hab ganz vergessen: der
Herr--auf den SS-Mann--möcht wissen, was ihm die
Zukunft Schönes bringt, Frau Kopecka, und zwei
Bier. Ich hab ihm gesagt, daB Sie das zweite
Gesicht ham und daB ichs unheimlich find und ihm
abrat. (St.10,p.43)

Schweyk has very obviously reported Frau Kopecka's gift in glowing terms, and the very fact that he advises Müller 2 to have nothing to do with it, will, of course, only make him even more determined to see what is in store. Then, when Schweyk says nothing about it immediately upon their arrival, the tension is heightened even more. Schweyk continues to raise the SS-Mann's hopes even though Frau Kopecka seems, on the surface at least, a little loathe to perform this "good turn". She is persuaded by the entrance of "der junge Prochazka", who, she surmises, is carrying black-market meat for Baloun. So she hastily takes the SS-Mann's hand and begins. It is quite obvious to everybody except Müller 2 himself that Frau Kopecka has not the slightest trace of "das zweite Gesicht", yet from the facts that she already knows about Müller 2, and what she is able to squeeze out of him, she formulates a cred-

ible future. Whether or not she had realised before this time Schweyk's plan to demoralise the man, and I would suspect that she had, from this point on Frau Kopecka knows what course she is going to take, and Müller 2 is only a plaything. Having told him about a certain "Heldentat" which he will perform on some foreign battlefield, Frau Kopecka lets the rest of the story hang in the air:

SS-Mann: Aber jetzt dürfen Sie nicht aufhören.
Ich will mehr über das Geheimnis wissen, Frau Kopecka.

Schweyk: Ich find auch, Sie sollten den Herrn nicht hangen und bängen lassen. Frau Kopecka zwinkert ihm so zu, daß es der SS-Mann sehen kann. Aber vielleicht is es auch genug, warum, manches weiß man besser nicht. (St.10,p.49)

Schweyk and Frau Kopecka are merely making the poor SS-Mann more excited, and then the wink brings the expectation to its peak. The thought of a heroic deed in the midst of a battle has worked him into such a frenzy, that, expecting something even better, he has to know what is to come. But the two Czechs are going to make him "hangen und bängen" as long as possible, thus exploiting the situation to the fullest, and ensuring that the demoralisation is complete. Frau Kopecka then tells him the rest of his future: "Heldentod" (St.10,p.52). Müller 2 is "zerschmettert", despite the fact that he tries to show otherwise, and utterly demoralised, he storms out, with Frau Kopecka ironically shouting after him: "Kommens wieder!" (St.10,p.52).

This action is all the more effective since the demoralisation will not only effect Müller 2 but also his relationship with the twenty men with whom he is "auf Tod und Leben verbunden" (St.10,p.48) is demolished. Müller 2 will, of course, try to escape the "Heldentod"

which has been prophesied, and as a result, the compactness and closeness of his platoon will very probably be destroyed, since his mind will necessarily be on his coming death and how to avoid it, and not on his duties and the team-work, which constitute an effective platoon.

As we have seen, Schweyk's "opponierendes Mitläufertum" takes the form of a pretence of help, which in turn leads to a demoralisation or hindrance of the Nazi cause. This is, perhaps, most clearly displayed in the episode in which Schweyk and Baloun find themselves "im Dienst Hitlers" (St.10,p.67), at work in the rail-yard. The soldier guarding them is told to remember the number of a wagon that is to be transported to Niederbayern. Schweyk, seeing that he is having trouble remembering the number without repeating it time and time again, offers the soldier some help:

Schweyk: . . . Sie ham recht, daB Sie sichs gut merken, es kommt viel vor. . . . Was is es denn fier eine Nummer, 4268, nicht? Also brauchen Sie nicht eine halbe Stunde mitn Lippen zähl'n. Ich wer Ihnen sagn, was Sie machen missn . . . Ich erzähls Ihnen an Ihrer Nummer, daB Sie sehn, wie leicht es is. 4268. Die erste Ziffer is ein Vierer, die zweite ein Zweier. Merken Sie sich also schon 42, das is zweimal 2, das is der Reihe nach von vorn 4, dividiert durch 2 und wieder ham Sie nebeneinander 4 und 2. (St.10,p.71f.)

Schweyk's absurd method of remembering numbers gets even more absurd as it develops and the soldier can only sit dumbfounded: "Der Soldat hat ihm mit weitgeöffneten Augen zugehört. Seine Lippen haben aufgehört sich zu bewegen." (St.10,p.72). Schweyk, in explaining how easy it is, proffers more advice "mit Hilfe von Multipliziern und Dividiern" (St.10,p.73), and the result is, of course, that the soldier cannot remember the number when asked. Schweyk contentedly remarks to

Baloun when the guards take pot-luck:

Ich kann mir denken, jetzt geht vielleicht nach Bayern ein Waggon mit Maschinengewehre. Philosophisch: Aber jetzt vielleicht mechten sie bis dahin in Stalingrad nix nötiger brauchen als Erntemaschinen und in Bayern wiederum schon Maschinengewehre. Wer kanns wissen? (St.10,p.74)

Schweyk's action here is not just a trick, but a conscious act of sabotage. He has already reported to Frau Kopecka: "Ich hab sie schon ein Waggon mit Seife gekost" (St.10,p.69), and here his efforts are deliberately aimed at hindering the Nazi war effort. We see again that Schweyk's success is gained from his total awareness of events going on around him and his knowledge of human nature. Schweyk exploits the soldier's ignorance as soon as he sees that he has an opportunity to do so, but in such a way that Schweyk will not suffer as a result.

Locked up in the "Zelle im Militärgefängnis" (St.10,p.93), Schweyk finds that he has another chance to be detrimental to the Germans. Here we see quite definitely that Schweyk feels that he can do more damage to the Third Reich from within Hitler's army than from without, for he actually exhorts his compatriots to join up with Hitler:

Schweyk: Wenn man euch zuhört, könnt man meinen, ihr wollts nicht in den Krieg, wo fir die Verteidigung der Zivilisation gegen den Bolschewismus gefiehr wern muB. (St.10,p.96)

and later he chides the authorities for not letting him out into the battlefield, where he can do the most damage:

Schweyk: . . . Und jetzt werd ich klingeln, daB sie sich mit ihrem Krieg etwas beeiln, ich hab meine Zeit nicht gestohlen . . .
(St.10,p.99)

Schweyk implores the various simulants to join Hitler's army, not so that they can help wipe out Bolshevism, which is threatening their existence, but so that they can sing Schweyk's version of the Horst-Wessel-Lied:

Hinter der Trommel her
Trotten die Kälber
Das Fell für die Trommel
Liefern sie selber.
Der Metzger ruft. Die Augen fest geschlossen.
Das Kalb marschiert mit ruhig festem Tritt.
Die Kälber, deren Blut im Schlachthof schon
geflossen
Sie ziehn im Geist in seinen Reihen mit.
(St.10,p.103)

Despite the fact that the simulants want their freedom more than anything else and hence are "niedergeschmettert" (St.10,p.104) when they find out that their hopes have not become reality, Schweyk knows that there is no possibility of this. He knows that they will all be helping Hitler on the Russian Steppes, and hence he acts accordingly. By getting them all to sing his version of the Horst-Wessel-Lied he is organising them into his own little force, all ready to march forward with the sole purpose of hindering Hitler's drive for total world supremacy. By getting them to sing h i s song he in effect transforms them into characters like himself, engages them in his campaign of "opponierendes Mitläufertum". When Schweyk tells Vojta: "Sie wern in den Kaukasus marschiern und aufn Hitler scheiBn" (St.10,p.100), he shows that the latter will do exactly the same thing on the Russian Steppes as he himself, who, when he meets Hitler in the "historische Begegnung", says:

Und ich sage dir ganz offen, daß ich nur noch
nicht weiß

Ob ich auf dich jetzt schieß oder fort auf dich
scheiß. (St.10,p.130)

It is also highly significant that Schweyk, at first glance quite farcically, characterises Bolshevism in the following way:

Schweyk: Wir sind grad beim Bolschewismus. WiBts Ihr, was der Bolschewismus is? DaB er der geschworne Verbindete von Wallstriet is, wo unter Fiehrung von dem Juden Rosenfeld im Weißen Haus unsern Untergang beschlossen hat? (St.10,p.97)

Schweyk characterises Bolshevism, the phenomenon which they are about to go and fight, as the "geschworne Verbindete von Wallstriet". In other words Schweyk maintains that the action which they are about to undertake will be partly against America. From Brecht's other plays there is no doubt that Brecht regarded America as the paradigm of capitalism³⁷---indeed Brecht had no difficulty in transposing Hitler to Chicago in Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui. If we take this just one step further, noting that the fighting which they are to undertake is therefore, in part at least, against capitalism, and look at Brecht's own writings on politics, then we see clearly what Brecht saw as the "geschworne Verbindete" of capitalism:

Der Faschismus ist eine historische Phase, in die der Kapitalismus eingetreten ist, insofern etwas Neues und zugleich Altes. Der Kapitalismus existiert in den faschistischen Ländern nur noch als Faschismus, und der Faschismus kann nur als Faschismus, und der Faschismus kann nur bekämpft werden als Kapitalismus, als nacktester, frechster, erdrückendster und betrügerischster Kapitalismus.³⁸

As we can see, Brecht sees capitalism and faschism as proceeding hand in hand. Thus if Schweyk is going out, along with the simulants, to fight capitalism, and from his speech he definitely sees "den Juden Rosenfeld im Weißen Haus" (St.10,p.97) as his enemy, he is also, by

token of the close relationship of capitalism and faschism, going out to fight faschism. Faschism, and thus Hitler, is the enemy whom they must defeat at all cost, and to emphasise this necessity Schweyk sings the song of the "Kanonier von Przemyśl im ersten Weltkrieg" who, significantly, was fighting against the Czar, another typical representative of the exploiting capitalist/faschist class, and who was willing to fight to the very last to preserve his freedom:

Bei der Kanone dort
 Lud er in einemfort.
 Bei der Kanone dort
 Lud er in einemfort.
 Ein Kugel kam behende
 Riß vom Leib ihm beide Hände
 Und er stand weiter dort
 Und lud in einemfort
 Bei der Kanone dort
 Lud er in einemfort. (St.10,p.97)

We have it then, albeit in a rather distorted form, yet a form which is typical of Schweyk's "listige" methods, from the horse's mouth as it were, that Schweyk's actions are indeed no less than "opponierendes Mitläufertum".

Schweyk's ambivalent attitude, a pretence at accepting his lot under a faschist regime, which is explicitly displayed in his never-ending struggle to go and help Hitler in Stalingrad, while at the same time exhorting others to hinder or damage the Nazi onslaught, is again exemplified in Schweyk's meeting with the would-be deserters on the Russian Steppes:

Erster Soldat: Und was hast du als Tscheche dort verloren?

Schweyk: Ich hab dort nix verlorn, ich komm zu
 Hilf und schütz die Zivilisation vorn Bolschewismus

....

Erster Soldat: Du möchtest ein Desertör sein.

Schweyk: Ich bin keiner, denn da mechtet ihr mich sogleich erschießn, weil ich meinen Soldateneid verletzt und nicht für den Fiehrer sterb, Heil Hitler. (St.10,p.106)

Despite the fact that the soldiers later hint that they are deserters, and give Schweyk a chance to accompany them, Schweyk refuses and pledges his intent to carry on to Stalingrad, even though to go with them could quite possibly mean a quick repatriation to his beloved Prague and his friends in the "Kelch". For Schweyk realises that his mission to fight the Nazis can best be accomplished from within their own ranks. Yet while Schweyk does not want to endanger himself in the event that they are disguised military police on the look-out for deserters, he is always loathe to miss an opportunity of furthering the cause of the "kleinen Mann". Thus, when they, in effect, ask for advice in the art of surrender, Schweyk, in his typical way of estranging the truth, finds a way to tell them how to act, without laying himself open to charges of treason:

Schweyk freundlich: Ich mecht euch lieber für brave Soldatn haltn, weil, wenn ihr Desertöre wart, mechtet ihr unbedingt was für die Russn mitbringn, ein Maschingewehr oder sowas, vielleicht ein gutes Fernrohr, was sie brauchn könn'n, und es vor euch hin hochhebn, daB sie nicht gleich schießn. So wirts gemacht, her ich. (St.10,p.107f.)

Schweyk's advice is, of course, designed to help the Russians in their effort against the Nazis. His attitude is, that if you are going to desert, then why not go the whole hog and take something with you, that they can use, so that at the same time as you are damaging one cause you are helping the other.

However the most impressive example of Schweyk's "opponierendes Mitläufertum" is to be found in the "Nachspiel" where the "historische Begegnung zwischen Schweyk und Hitler" (St.10,p.126) takes place. The action takes place basically on a symbolic level; everything has a dream-like quality about it, as noted in the stage direction:

" . . . als aus dem S c h n e e t r e i b e n
eine wilde Musik hörbar wird und eine überle-
bensgroße Gestalt a u f t a u c h t.
(St.10,p.126)³⁹

Yet despite all this, what happens during the course of this scene is of vital significance. I am totally in agreement with Klaus-Detlev Müller who says: "Nach Struktur und Thematik war das Stück von Anfang an auf diesen Wendepunkt [Nachspiel] angelegt."⁴⁰ Brecht himself hints at this when he says that the meeting between the two is "historisch". For it is a momentous occasion, at least as far as the play is concerned, for it is here, symbolically speaking, that we witness the beginning of the end for Hitler.⁴¹

Schweyk wastes no time at all in announcing the fact that he is on his way to Stalingrad to help the Führer:

Schweyk: Ich bin der Schweyk aus Budweis, wo
die Moldau das Knie macht. Und bin hergeeilt,
daß ich Ihnen zu Stalingrad helf. Sagens mir
jetzt bittschön nur noch: wo is es?
(St.10,p.126f.)

Yet having done so, Schweyk then proceeds to put Hitler into utter confusion:

Hitler: Versuchen wirs mit dem Norden.

Sie stoßen ein paar Schritte nach Norden vor.

Schweyk: Da is Schnee bis zum Kinn.
(St.10,p.128)

And one after another Schweyk announces that to Hitler all directions are blocked:

Hitler tritt schnell hintereinander nach allen
Richtungen. Schweyk pfeift ihn immer zuruck.
(St.10,p.129)

"Zwar ist Schweyk hier nicht mehr der 'Führer' des 'Führers'; dennoch hat er den Spieß umgedreht: vom 'großen' Hitler-Götzen zu einem lang-jährigen Hundedasein verurteilt pfeift nun der Hundefänger Schweyk Hitler selbst wie einem Hund und fängt ihn sozusagen in seinem eigenen Teufelskreis. Schweyk verurteilt Hitler, indem er ihm 'ganz offen' seine Meinung sagt; allerdings läßt er auch offen, was er mit ihm vorhat--und davon hängt schließlich für den 'kleinen Mann' alles ab."⁴²

Schweyk deliberately causes confusion in Hitler's stagnant brain. He realises that out here in the harshness of the elements rather than in the security of his "höheren Regionen" Hitler is utterly dependent on friendly aid, since as far as he knows the distance from Rostow to Stalingrad was "Nicht viel länger als mein kleiner Finger". (St.10,p.127). Schweyk proceeds to offer Hitler aid and then leads him a merry dance, plays with him as if he were a toy. The "überlebensgroße" Hitler is beginning to be demasked, beginning to look smaller than he really seems. Schweyk eventually passes judgement on Hitler, a judgement not only based upon Schweyk's victory over the Führer, but also a judgement symbolising the imminent destruction of fascism, symbolising the victory of the Schweyks of this world over all forms of oppression:

Schweyk fängt an zu singen:

Ja, du kannst nicht zurück und du kannst nicht
nach vorn.

revolutionary tradition of nineteenth century Russia, and the term was made famous by Lenin, who, after the revolution of 1917 when he was able to return to Russia, noted that he could now forget all about that "verfluchte Sklavensprache".⁴³ "Er [Lenin] konnte jetzt unmittelbar, ohne Umwegen und Listen, das aussprechen, was er für nötig hielt."⁴⁴ We see then that "Sklavensprache" is very much concerned with the expression of truth in times when that truth is outlawed, and that it is closely connected with the quality of "List" which Brecht felt was so important in the propagation of truth.⁴⁵ This view is supported if we take a Marxist definition of "Sklavensprache": "Sklavensprache streut keineswegs bloß Sand in die Augen der Machthaber, sondern auch direkt ins Getriebe ihrer Macht. . . . Sklavensprache geht darauf aus, der Sklaverei ein Ende zu bereiten und damit sich selbst überflüssig werden zu lassen."⁴⁶

Taking all this into consideration, it would seem that Schweyk's servility, his kneeling down before the authorities and kissing their hands, his "ich scheiß wie Sies wünschen" stance is much more than an attempt to guarantee his survival. It would seem that it is also a "listige" form of obstruction, an indirect method of attack. This view will be supported if we take a look at some examples from the text.

In the scene with the "Razzia" on the Kelch, Bullinger notes that he is being spellbound by Schweyk:

Bullinger ihn anstarrend: Ich weiß überhaupt nicht warum ich dir zuhore, und schon einmal vorher. Wahrscheinlich weil ich einen solchen Verbrecher noch nicht gesehen hab und wie hypnotisiert auf ihn hinstarre.

.
Ich hör dir immer noch zu. Ich kann mich nicht

wegreißen. (St.10,p.86f.)

We noted earlier that this hypnotisation was in effect a method of keeping Schweyk alive. But there is much more to it than just this, for otherwise Schweyk would not criticise policies of the fascist regime so often and seemingly at random. Schweyk's hypnotisation of Bullinger, and for that matter Brettschneider as well⁴⁷, is a direct and premeditated result of his "Sklavensprache". His servile stance, his "Sklavensprache" enable him to express the truth about the Nazis without retribution. It is in this context that Schweyk's seemingly insane criticism of fascism is to be seen. His "Sklavensprache" creates the situation where this form of resistance, where this expression of the truth can take place. His appetite for talking is not an aimless one. It does not just take him to any place. His appetite is for the truth, and just like Lenin and a good many other idealists including Voltaire, Confucius and Swift⁴⁸, "Sklavensprache" is his method of propagating that truth where it would be impossible by normal modes of expression. Let us take an example:

Schweyk: Jawohl, Herr Scharführer. Ordnung muß sein. Der Schleichhandel ist ein Übel und hört nicht auf, bis nix mehr da ist. Dann wird gleich Ordnung sein, hab ich recht. (St.10,p.88)

Such outright criticism of Nazi policy would, of course, not normally be tolerated by the likes of Bullinger. But Schweyk gets away with it scot free. Because his truth is placed behind a servile façade which the authorities are unable to notice let alone penetrate, a sort of hypnotisation takes place. This hypnotisation process starts and is completed with the "Jawohl, Herr Scharführer. Ordnung muß sein". At

this point Schweyk is free to express the truth about the Nazis' policies of supply and demand. It just does not happen that Schweyk very carelessly lets this criticism out, he does it deliberately, a fact which becomes more than clear in the light of so many examples of this type. For example, he compares Hitler with "der was den Hundedreck sammelt" (St.10,p.10); he calls Hitler "ein Trottel" (St.10,p.24); he calls the failure to assassinate Hitler "eine Nachlässigkeit" (St.10,p.23); he criticises the "Ordnung" which fascism has produced (St.10,p.11 and 88); he criticises the treatment of Nazi prisoners (St.10,p.30); he mocks Hitler's racial policies (St.10,p.34f.) and fascist anti-Semitism (St.10,p.35); he utters the truth about the hardship and consequences of being a political prisoner (St.10,p.38). All these examples certainly would not seem to signify that Schweyk just happened to express something critical as if by chance. On the contrary, they point to an organised, masked, indirect attack on the members of authority. It is a way of propagating the truth effectively in exactly the same tradition as Brecht's dissemination of his political treatise "Fünf Schwierigkeiten beim Schreiben der Wahrheit" which was produced and distributed in Nazi Germany under such titles as Satzungen des Reichsverbandes Deutscher Schriftsteller and Praktischer Wegweiser für Erster Hilfe.⁴⁹

Seen in this light, I feel that the character of Schweyk, his actions, his behaviour, his language, come clearly into focus. His whole attitude, as illustrated during the course of the play, conforms closely with a pattern, a pattern which is designed at a gradual erosion of Nazi power. His plan is basically the same no matter

whether he finds himself in opposition to an intellectually inferior member of authority, such as the drunken SS-Mann, SS-Mann Müller 2 or the soldier at the "Güterbahnhof", or a supposedly superior being such as Bullinger or Hitler. His mode of attack changes depending on the situation, yet the goal for which Schweyk is striving is always the same. It does not matter if the resistance is open and obvious to all except the intellectually inferior Nazi, or masked behind his "Sklavensprache". Schweyk is always aiming at this gradual erosion of power, which is described by Brecht, in what is most certainly one of his greatest lyrical achievements, "Legende von der Entstehung des Buches Taoteking auf dem Weg des Laotse in die Emigration", as being omnipotent and indefensible in this world:

[illegible]

Doch der Mann in einer heitren Regung
 Fragte noch: "Hat er was rausgekiegt?"
 Sprach der Knabe: "Daß das weiche Wasser in
 Bewegung
 Mit der Zeit den mächtigen Stein besiegt.
 Du verstehst, das Harte unterliegt."
 (G.4,p.52)

This then is Schweyk's mission, a mission which is as important to the Czech people as it is for Schweyk himself, a mission for which Schweyk is therefore willing to become part of the Nazi army, where his "Widerstand" will be all the more effective. At this point I feel that it must be stressed again that Schweyk's mission is never carried out to the detriment of his own existence. Thus Schweyk's

opposition to the fascists only takes place when it is safe, or at least relatively so. His life must be protected at all costs, for the Schweyks of the world are the ones who will form the backbone of the new society foretold in "Das Lied von der Moldau", which will emerge after the destruction of fascism. It is for this reason that Schweyk's individual contribution, as with the contribution of every individual "kleinen Mann", is, and must remain small. What must be remembered, however, is that he is contributing. His contribution may be small, but when combined with the contributions of all the other Schweyks⁵⁰ and the people whom they manage to convert by means of propagating the truth about fascism to their policy of "opponierendes Mitläufertum" the ultimate result will be the very destruction of fascism which they were seeking, and the emergence of that new society. That society is Schweyk's goal, and his contribution towards it is, I contend, large enough to justify the praise Daniel Frey bestows on him: "Schweyk . . . est l'un des personnages les plus positifs de toute l'œuvre de Brecht."⁵¹

Using the material from this investigation of the character of Schweyk, what I would finally like to do is to formulate some kind of definition of Schweyk, so that in our concluding remarks we can throw some light on the concept of the "Schweyk figure" and the "Schweykian philosophy".

Schweyk's whole plan of action is based upon his desire to propagate the truth about Hitler's regime and the damage it is causing the "kleinen Mann". When Schweyk attacks the bastions of fascist

power, he is first and foremost attacking lies, for lies are the basis of a fascist state. It is because of his belief in the ultimate freedom of man to hear and to tell the truth that he is at all times willing to cajole, persuade, and explain to people the justice of his cause, and to give them help and advice that will lead to the deterioration of Nazi power, and hence a chance for a little more truth to escape suppression.

Brecht makes very clear how he stands in respect to truth. In what is, almost certainly, his most significant political publication "Fünf Schwierigkeiten beim Schreiben der Wahrheit" he is very explicit:

Wer heute die Lüge und Unwissenheit bekämpfen und die Wahrheit schreiben will, hat zumindest fünf Schwierigkeiten zu überwinden. Er muß den Mut haben, die Wahrheit zu schreiben, obwohl sie allenthalben unterdrückt wird; die Klugheit, sie zu erkennen, obwohl sie allenthalben verhüllt wird; die Kunst, sie handhabbar zu machen als eine Waffe; das Urteil, jene auszuwählen, in deren Händen sie wirksam wird; die List, sie unter diesen zu verbreiten. Diese Schwierigkeiten sind groß für die unter dem Faschismus Schreibenden, sie bestehen aber auch für die, welche verjagt wurden oder geflohen sind, ja sogar für solche, die in den Ländern der bürgerlichen Freiheit schreiben.⁵²

It would seem therefore that these "fünf Schwierigkeiten" could apply very easily to Schweyk, who is, after all, attempting to fight the lies that fascism has produced. Brecht maintains here that to disseminate the truth successfully one must possess these five qualities. Well, as we have seen, Schweyk does propagate the truth successfully. It should follow, therefore, that Schweyk possesses these five qualities, and I maintain that they can help us form the basis of a definition of Schweyk. A cursory look at the plot of the play will

illustrate at almost every turn the fact that he possesses all of them. He has "Mut" as exemplified by the many occasions on which he comments critically on fascist policies, or by his saving of Baloun from almost certain death at the hands of Bullinger, when the former is caught with the package of "black-market meat" (St.10,p.83f.). Yet another example would be his protection of the poor Russian women from the avarice of the armed, but drunken Feldkurat (St.10,p.115f.). He has the "Klugheit" to recognise fascism for what it is, otherwise he would be unable to make any critical comments about fascism. The fact that he has the "Kunst" to make the truth workable as a weapon, the "Urteil" to choose those people in whose hands that truth will be effective, and the "List" to propagate it among them, is perfectly illustrated in his dealings with the German soldiers on the Steppes or in his dealings with Vojta and the simulants whom he manages to recruit for his campaign of "opponierendes Mitläufertum" (St.10,p.95ff.). The quality of "List", which Brecht deems to be most important,⁵³ is also displayed in the very nature of Schweyk's "Sklavensprache". And there are, of course, very many other examples.

It would therefore seem clear that these five qualities form a fundamental part of the character of Schweyk, and thus we are perfectly justified in using them as the basis of our definition. Yet there is more to Schweyk than just that, for as we have seen he is not just concerned with overcoming fascism, but also with protecting his fellow "kleinen Männer", something at which, because of his more than adequate supply of "List", he is particularly adept. We must therefore list such qualities as humanitarianism and compassion and an overriding

sense of loyalty to his fellow Czechs, displayed of course by the fact that he protects Vojta's "Dienstmädchen" from the wrath of her master, and best of all by the "rettung des fressers baloun".(AJ.2,p.569)

These eight qualities--"Mut", "Klugheit", "Kunst", "Urteil", "List", humanitarianism, compassion, and a loyalty to the members of his own class--are the essential features of Schweyk, a character whose vitality is unsurpassed in Brecht's writings, and who remains perhaps the most positive and certainly one of the most important characters Brecht ever created.

CONCLUSION

I have attempted in this study to put the play Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg into focus, and I feel that having done so I am justified in making some observations on a more general level about the terms "Schweyk figure" and "Schweykian philosophy". I believe that the terms must be taken separately because the term "Schweyk figure" seems to match character against character, whereas the term "Schweykian philosophy" is not nearly as specific as that, but is a more general term.

As far as the term "Schweyk figure" is concerned I would reject it as being a total misnomer and therefore utterly useless. Critics such as Esslin and Ewen call such figures as Mutter Courage, Galileo Galilei, Matti and Azdak "Schweyk figures", yet it seems to me to be quite obvious that none of these characters, with the possible exception of Azdak, would fit the definition of Schweyk that I have formulated. But they were never meant to. To call such characters "Schweyk figures" is in effect to reject their existence as characters in themselves, and is thus a completely futile exercise because what happens as a result is that the characters are matched together in dual combat. Brecht's dramas are not about characters but about society. Brecht did not create a character in Schweyk and then

for the rest of his life try to match this paradigm. Yet by rigidly calling such characters as Matti or Galilei "Schweyk figures" which they so obviously are not, the critics seem to be suggesting that this is the case. On the grounds that characters such as Galilei or Mutter Courage must be seen from within the framework of their own play and not compared with characters who appear in plays which portray society from a completely different standpoint, I would therefore certainly question the validity of the term "Schweyk figure".

The term "Schweykian philosophy" is somewhat different, since it is used more generally to express the attitude conveyed by the character Schweyk. Well it seems to me that although the individual characters of Brecht's other plays do not conform completely to the "Schweykian philosophy" (although all have some similarity to Schweyk on one level or another), the "Schweykian philosophy" is conveyed by the whole play--this certainly would be true of Der kaukasische Kreidekries in which both Azdak and Grusche have Schweykian elements, or Leben des Galilei in which Galilei despite being a negative figure also bears some Schweykian features--that the "Schweykian philosophy" is expressed by the whole play as an entity to the audience. The play itself is the catalyst, is the "Schweyk figure". Of course, it is difficult to draw too many conclusions on this subject without a really close analysis of Brecht's relationship to his audience, something which quite obviously was out of the scope of the study. Yet it seems to me that the term "Schweykian philosophy" enters to the very kernel of what Brecht wanted to express. If Schweyk is the character who

best expresses within a play what Brecht's plays themselves as entities wanted to display, then there is little doubt that the play Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg is of fundamental importance to a complete understanding of the world of Bertolt Brecht.

Taking all this into consideration, it seems to me that Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg has endured a truly unwarranted neglect. Some of Brecht's plays, notably Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder, have been misunderstood mainly because, being written in the form of a parable, they lost something in the translation to the society of the modern age, as it were. With Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg this does not happen. I would maintain that in the character of Schweyk Brecht expressed his own philosophy of life in its clearest, most unequivocal form, and that no character in all of Brecht's drama has Brecht quite so obviously behind him, as does Schweyk.

Introduction: Footnotes.

¹ Julian H. Wulbern illustrates this point well in his book Brecht and Ionesco (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971). On page 83 he states the following: "In the first place, it must be emphasised that the text was no more than a point of departure for Brecht. This observation is not meant to deprecate his efforts in the initial writing of the work, for even such a minor text as his adaption of Shakespeare's Coriolanus occupied him and the dramaturgical staff of the Ensemble for more than a year and a half. But it is meant to underscore the fact that the text of a work was never considered more than tentative until the actual work of production was well along, for during this phase scene after scene was polished, trimmed, recast, and occasionally even entirely dropped from the work. Probably the best known product of such a revisory process is his Mother Courage."

² Bertolt Brecht, Arbeitsjournal (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973), I, p.27. Hereafter cited as AJ. with volume number and page reference; eg. "gestern nacht von NY zurück". (AJ.2,p.569).

³ John Willett, The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht (Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions, 1959), p.102.

⁴ Fritz Sternberg, Der Dichter und die Ratio (Göttingen: Sachse & Pohl, 1963), p.13f.

⁵ Petr says: "Nachdem Brecht bereits an Piscators Bühnenfassung von 1928 mitgearbeitet hatte und acht Jahre später erneut mit dem Schwejkstoff in Berührung gekommen war, nahm er ihn wieder auf . . ." Pavel Petr, Haseks "Schwejk" in Deutschland (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1963), p.143.

⁶ My emphasis.

⁷ See AJ.2, p.568f.

⁸ Herbert Knust, "Brechts braver Schweyk", PMLA, 88 (1973), 219-32.

Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg: An Analysis of the main character:

Footnotes.

¹ Martin Esslin, Brecht: A Choice of Evils (London: Heinemann, 1970), p.32-34 and passim; Ronald Gray, Brecht (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1961), p.94 and passim; Julian H. Wulbern, Brecht and Ionesco (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), p.44f. and 117. Mentioned also in many other books and articles which are too numerous to list here.

² Esslin, p.33.

³ For the spelling of Schweyk (Schweik) see below p.7.

⁴ Charles W. Hoffmann and John B. Fuegi, "Brecht, Schweyk and Commune-ism", in Festschrift für Detlev W. Schumann, ed Albert R. Schmidt (München: Delp, 1970), p.337-49.

⁵ For example: Hoffmann and Fuegi; Herbert Knust, "Brechts braver Schweyk", PMLA, 88 (1973), 219-32. Hereafter cited as Knust I; Herbert Knust, "Schweik und kein Ende", Germano-Slavica, No.1 (Spring 1973), 65-85. Hereafter cited as Knust II; Klaus-Detlev Müller, "Das Große bleibt groß nicht . . .", Wirkendes Wort, 23 (1973), 26-44.

⁶ Esslin, p.33f.

⁷ Frederic Ewen, Bertolt Brecht: His Life, his Art and his Times (New York: Citadel, 1967), p.406.

⁸ Bertolt Brecht, Stücke X (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1957), p.20. Hereafter cited as St.10,p... In same way references to Brecht's Gedichte 9 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1960-65) and Schriften zum Theater 7 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963-64) will be cited after text: Gedichte as G.4,p... and Schriften zum Theater as

Sch.z.Th.4,p...

⁹ Ewen, p.406.

¹⁰ This conversational device which is a fundamental element of Hasek's Schweik is shown by Pavel Petr in his book Haseks Schwejk in Deutschland to have its source in Dicken's Pickwick Papers in the character of Sam Weller.

¹¹ As in many of Brecht's plays the theme of appetite is very important. Here, Schweyk's appetite for talking runs parallel in the play with Baloun's appetite.

¹² cf. St.10,p.33.

¹³ Thomas O. Brandt, Die Vieldeutigkeit Bertolt Brechts (Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm Verlag,1968), p.46.

¹⁴ Petr, p.173.

¹⁵ Ewen, p.401.

¹⁶ In the Russian monetary system 100 Kopeks make 1 Rubel.

¹⁷ Brecht shows us that there are many possibilities; Baloun's way--to join the German army; Vojta's way--collaboration; Schweyk's way. At the end of the play the audience should be left in no doubt that Schweyk's method is the correct one.

¹⁸ e.g. Petr, p.160f.

¹⁹ see AJ.I,p.165 & 172.

²⁰ Hans Mayer, Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition (Pfullingen: Neske,1961),p.82ff.

²¹ Knust I, p.223.

²² Petr, p.173.

²³ Ewen, p.401.

²⁴ Petr, p.175.

²⁵ see footnote ⁵.

²⁶ see footnote ⁴.

²⁷ Hoffmann & Fuegi, p.337.

²⁸ Knust I, p.221.

²⁹ Petr, p.167.

³⁰ Knust I, p.221.

³¹ Esslin, p.33.

³² For example, Schweyk steals the dog in such a way that the "Dienstmädchen" will not get blamed, and his treatment of the poor Russian women on the way to Stalingrad is another clear illustration.

³³ Petr, p.174.

³⁴ Mayer, p.89.

³⁵ Knust I, p.222.

³⁶ *ibid.*, p.222.

³⁷ cf. Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny, Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe, Die sieben Todsünden and Der aufhaltsame Aufstieg des Arturo Ui.

³⁸ Versuche 20/21 (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1958), Heft 9, p.90.

³⁹ My emphasis.

⁴⁰ Müller, p.40.

⁴¹ It is of course highly significant that the scene between Schweyk and Hitler, the beginning of the end for the Führer, should take place near Stalingrad where, according to most historians, in 1943 at the Battle of Stalingrad the beginning of the end for Hitler really did take place.

⁴² Knust II, p.76. In an earlier version of the "Nachspiel" Brecht had made Schweyk the "Führer des Führers".

⁴³ cf. Mayer, p. 82f., and Theo Buck, Brecht und Diderot (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1971), p.60f.

⁴⁴ Mayer, p.83.

⁴⁵ See Versuche 20/21, p.87ff., and especially pp.94-100.

⁴⁶ Buck, p.62 and 63.

⁴⁷ I contend that Schweyk's actions and language in front of Brettschneider, about whom Baloun remarks "Herr Brettschneider ist sonst so tüchtig" (St.10,p.42f.), also produce some kind of hypnotic effect, otherwise he must surely have been able to handle Schweyk a little better than he does.

⁴⁸ See Versuche 20/21, p.94ff.

⁴⁹ See A.III of Walter Nubel's Brecht Bibliography in: Sinn und Form, Zweites Sonderheft Bertolt Brecht, (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1957), p.489.

⁵⁰ The fact that Brecht envisaged Schweyk as just one of many is evident from a remark Sternberg makes. He tells how Brecht came to him in 1928 with the idea for a Schweyk production of his own, in which Ludendorff was to be seen directing his German armies in the upper portion of a double tiered stage while underneath hundreds of Schweyks hinder his plans. See Sternberg, p.13f.

⁵¹ Daniel Frey, "Études Brechtiennes 'Schweyk'", Études de Lettres, 9 (1966), p.145.

⁵² Versuche 20/21, p.87.

⁵³ *ibid.* p.94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary sources

- Brecht, Bertolt. Stücke. 14 vols. Berlin and Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1964-67.
- _____. Gedichte. 9 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1960-65.
- _____. Prosa. 5 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1965.
- _____. Schriften zum Theater. 7 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963-64.
- _____. Versuche 20/21. Heft 9. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1958.
- _____. Arbeitsjournal. 3 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973.
- Materialien zu Bertolt Brechts "Die Mutter". Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969.
- Materialien zu Brechts "Leben des Galilei". Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.
- Materialien zu Brechts "Der kaukasische Kreidekreis". Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1966.
- Hasek, Jaroslav. Die Abenteuer des braven Soldaten Schwejk während des Weltkrieges. Aus dem Tschechischen übertragen von Grete Reiner. Prague: Synek, 1926-27.

II. Secondary sources

- Alter, Maria P. "The technique of alienation in Bertolt Brecht's The Caucasian Chalk Circle", College Language Association Journal, 8 (1964), 60-65.

- Arntzen, Helmut. "Komödie und Episches Theater", Deutschunterricht, 21, Heft 3 (1969), 66-77.
- Bergstedt, A. "Herr Puntila, der 'gute Mensch' von Lammi. Eine Rollenstudie zu Bertolt Brechts Stück 'Herr Puntila und sein Knecht Matti'", Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der pädagogischen Hochschule Potsdam, 6, Heft 2 (1963), 97-108.
- Bird, Louise J. "The Comic World of Bertolt Brecht", Forum for Modern Language Studies, 4, (1968), 248-59.
- Brandt, Thomas O. Die Vieldeutigkeit Bertolt Brechts. Heidelberg: Lothar Stiehm Verlag, 1968.
- Buck, Theo. Brecht und Diderot oder über Schwierigkeiten der Rationalität in Deutschland. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1971.
- Bunge, Hans. "Brecht im zweiten Weltkrieg", Neue Deutsche Literatur, 10, Heft 3 (1962), 31-50.
- Butzlaff, Wolfgang. "Die Darstellung der Jahre 1933-45 im deutschen Drama", Deutschunterricht, 16, Heft 3 (1964), 25-38.
- Demetz, Peter, (ed). Brecht: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- Esslin, Martin. Brecht: A Choice of Evils. London: Heinemann, 1970.
- Ewen, Frederic. Bertolt Brecht: His Life, his Art and his Times. New York: Citadel Press, 1967.
- Frey, Daniel. "Études Brehtiennes 'Schweyk'", Études de Lettres, 9 (1966), 125-48.
- Fuegi, John, (ed). Brecht Heute·Brecht Today. Jahrbuch der internationalen Brecht-Gesellschaft, Vol. 1, Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1971.
- Geibler, Rolf, (ed). Zur Interpretation des modernen Dramas. Brecht. Dürrenmatt. Frisch. Frankfurt am Main: Moritz Dieserweg, 1961.
- Gray, Ronald. Brecht. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.

- Grimm, Reinhold. Bertolt Brecht: Die Struktur seines Werkes.
Nürnberg: Verlag Hans Carl, 1960.
- _____. Brecht und die Weltliteratur. Nürnberg: Verlag
Hans Carl, 1961.
- _____. Bertolt Brecht. 3., völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage.
Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971.
- _____, and Schmidt, Henry J. "Bertolt Brecht and 'Hangmen
also die'", Monatshefte, 61 (1969), 222-240.
- Hecht, Werner, Bunge, Hans-Joachim, and Rüllicke-Weiler, Käthe.
Bertolt Brecht: Sein Leben und Werk. Berlin: Volk und Wissen
Volkseigener Verlag, 1969.
- Hinck, Walter. Die Dramaturgie des späten Brecht. Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.
- Hoffmann, Charles W. "Brecht's Humor: Laughter while the Shark
Bites", Germanic Review, 39 (1963), 157-66.
- _____, and Fuegi, John B. "Brecht, Schweyk and
Commune-ism", in Festschrift für Detlev W. Schumann, ed.
Albert R. Schmidt, München: Delp, 1970.
- Hufner, Agnes. Brecht in Frankreich: 1930-1963. Stuttgart:
Metzler, 1968.
- Jacobs, Jürgen. "Die Rechtspflege des Azdak. Zu Brechts Kaukasischem
Kreidekreis", Euphorion, 62 (1968), 421-24.
- Jendreieck, Helmut. Bertolt Brecht: Drama der Veränderung.
Düsseldorf: August Basel Verlag, 1969.
- Kerz, Leo. "Brecht and Piscator", Educational Theatre Journal,
20 (1968), 363-69.
- Kesting, Marianne. Bertolt Brecht in Selbstzeugnissen und Bild-
dokumenten. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1959.
- Knopf, Jan. Bertolt Brecht: Ein kritischer Forschungsbericht.
Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1974.

- Knust, Herbert. "Brechts braver Schweyk", PMLA, 88 (1973), 219-32.
- _____. "Schweyk und kein Ende", Germano-Slavica, No.1, Spring 1973, 65-85.
- Kohlhase, Norbert. Dichtung und Politische Moral: Eine Gegenüberstellung von Brecht und Camus. München: Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, 1965.
- Lucke, Hans. "Schulpraktischer Kommentar zu Brechts 'Leben des Galilei'", Deutschunterricht, 20, Heft 3 (1968), 67-84.
- Lyons, Charles R. "The Life of Galileo: The Focus of Ambiguity in the Villain Hero", Germanic Review, 41 (1966), 57-71.
- Mayer, Hans. Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition. Pfullingen: Verlag Günther Neske, 1961.
- Milfull, John. "Herr Keuner and Herr Brecht", Germanic Review, 43 (1968), 188-200.
- Mittenzwei, Werner. Bertolt Brecht: Von der "Maßnahme" zu "Leben des Galilei". Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau Verlag, 1965.
- Motekat, Helmut. "Bertolt Brechts 'Flüchtlingsgespräche'", Orbis Litterarum, 20 (1965), 52-65.
- Müller, Klaus-Detlev. "'Das Große bleibt groß nicht ...': Die Korrektur der politische Theorie durch die literarische Tradition in Bertolt Brechts 'Schweyk im zweiten Weltkrieg'", Wirkendes Wort, 23 (1973), 26-44.
- Petr, Pavel. Haseks "Schweyk" in Deutschland. Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1963.
- Pohl, Rainer. Strukturelemente und Entwicklung von Pathosformen in der Dramensprache Bertold Brechts. Bonn: Bouvier, 1969.
- Poser, Hans. "Brechts 'Herr Puntila und sein Knecht Matti': Dialektik zwischen Volksstück und Lehrstück", in Theater und Gesellschaft: Das Volksstück im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, ed. Jürgen Hein. Düsseldorf: Bertelsmann, 1973.

- Qureshi, Qayum. Pessimismus und Fortschrittsglaube bei Bert Brecht.
Köln and Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1971.
- Schumacher, Ernst. Brechts "Leben des Galilei" und andere Stücke.
Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1968.
- Sinn und Form. Erstes Sonderheft Bertolt Brecht. Berlin: Rütten &
Loening, 1949.
- Sinn und Form. Zweites Sonderheft Bertolt Brecht. Berlin: Rütten &
Loening, 1957.
- Sorensen, Otto. "Brecht's Galileo: Its Development from Ideational
into Ideological Theater", Modern Drama, 11 (1968-69), 410-22.
- Spaethling, Robert. "Zum Verständnis Grusche in Brechts Der
Kaukasische Kreidekreis", Die Unterrichtspraxis, 4, ii (1971),
74-81.
- Speidel, E. "Brecht's 'Puntila': A Marxist Comedy", Modern Language
Review, 65 (1970), 319-32.
- Steer, W.A.J. "The Thematic Unity of Brecht's Der Kaukasische
Kreidekreis", German Life and Letters, 21 (1967-68), 1-10.
- Sternberg, Fritz. Der Dichter und die Ratio: Erinnerungen an
Bertolt Brecht. Göttingen: Sachse & Pohl, 1963.
- Willett, John. The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht: A Study from Eight
Aspects. Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions, 1959.
- Wulbern, Julian A. Brecht and Ionesco: Commitment in Context.
Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.