Wesleyan University Honors College

BERTOLT BRECHT'S
LEBEN DES GALILEI

by

Martin A. Nicolaus

Class of 1963

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Wesleyan University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Distinction
in the College of Letters

Middletown, Connecticut June, 1963

Ihr, die ihr auftauchen werdet aus der Flut
In der wir untergegangen sind
Gedenkt
Wenn ihr von unsern Schwächen sprecht
Auch der finsteren Zeiten
Der ihr entronnen seid

(Brecht--An die Nachgeborenen)

CONTENTS

Preface ii

INTRODUCTION: The Exile Years . . . 1

CHAPTER ONE: Origin of the Play and the First Fragments. 22

CHAPTER TWO: The First Complete Text . 38

CHAPTER THREE: The Necessity of Revision: 1945 . 69

CONCLUSION 107

Notes 119

Bibliography 127

PREFACE

In the not quite seven years since Brecht's death, the body of criticism dealing with his work has increased in proportion at an extraordinarily rapid pace. With the relative stabilization of political conditions in the two Germanys, the concentrated effort of new, respectively, re-construction, with the publication of Brecht's collected works beginning in 1955, and with the activity of the Berliner Ensemble, Brecht has become the subject of a controversy larger than any in his scandal-filled Weimar Republic days. If Brecht's antics in the 'twenties outraged the philistines of provincial Augsburg and cosmopolitan Berlin, Brecht's reaction to the 'thirties and their remnants in the post-war years makes him even today the subject of a dispute along clearly international lines. For example, Austria has only this year broken a ten-year boycott on Brecht in its state theatres, but even in this year, the Berliner Ensemble has been denied entrance to London to perform, of all things, Baal. In West Germany, Brecht seems to be the touchiest of subjects; not only is the critical literature emerging from that country for the most part saturated with polemical intention, but even

now, the letters-to-the editor columns of such periodicals as the in itself controversial Der Spiegel carry not infrequently quotations from Brecht and irate notices from outraged Bavarians about the "clannish" Brechtians. Nor has the United States remained aloof from the controversy; since the issue of Eric Bentley's volume of seven plays in translation and of Martin Esslin's clever work, small storms of protest and dispute have arisen in the periodical press, rising sometimes to most unscholarly peaks of nastiness. "Red-baiting" and its respectable variant, "totalitarian-baiting" are not rare occurrences in the literature, nor hyperbolic eulogies. Rarely has the Cold War announced its entry into another field of thought so clearly and openly as in the Brecht-literature.

In time, this entrance may come to be in certain ways fruitful and progressive. The Cold War, after all, is an historical phenomenon. To understand it, it is necessary to make forays into the fields of history, economics, political and social sciences; insofar as practitioners of the gentle art of literary criticism will be led by their involvement in the Cold War to become conversant in these fields, their craft will benefit. Perhaps the realisation that at least twentieth-century literature is deeply influenced by historical and social factors will one day drive home the conclusion that literature is more than a molecular agglomeration of oxymorons and

zeugmas. For the present, however, historical thinking in Brecht-criticism is still in its infantile stages, and has produced some of the peculiar phantasies associated with that period of human development. Eric Bentley, for instance, the tireless editor, anthologist, and director of modern drama, whose liberties with the Brecht-texts in his volume of translations seem to have drawn so much criticism that he has concluded that Brechtians are "one and all persons positively possessed by aggression,"[1] is also of the opinion that "if the Nazis had never existed, Brecht would have invented them."[2] One might as well say that, had the Guelphs and Ghibellines never existed, Dante would have invented them; or that Sophocles was just the kind of neurotic who would have invented Athens, had it never existed.

Peter Demetz, editor of the anthology of criticism to which Bentley contributed these remarks, writes (1962) that "whether Brecht wanted it or not, his Galileo has become a major document of what Soviet ideological language terms revisionism . . . ."[3] In 1961 the German Democratic Republic's Werner Mittenzwei, writing under the auspices of the central-committee of the SED, had this to say: "Gerade der Galilei beweist deutlich, dass die Grösse der deutschen klassischen Dramatik heute nur noch von der sozialistischen Literatur fortgesetzt wird."[4] Apparently Mr. Demetz is a harder Stalinist than Mr. Ulbricht!

Hannah Arendt, politically more sophisticated, objects to "socialist realism." Mr. Bentley, however, would be horrified to learn that she sees a prime example of this formalistic vice in --The Private Life of the Master Race.[5] And, she says, in this work Brecht "presented hunger and unemployment . . . just when both had disappeared from the social reality of Nazi Germany."[6] The fact is, the work does not present unemployment at all, but precisely the Nazi "solution" to unemployment. Private Life appeared in 1938; it is surprising to hear from such an otherwise informed commentator that hunger had disappeared from the social reality in that year. There are persons still alive who had a different experience, and not only the inmates of concentration camps.

Martin Esslin, who sees in Private Life of the Master Race "brilliant proof that Brecht could write in the conventional, naturalistic style,"[7] is much more critical of the Nazis, going so far as to admit that there was indeed a shortage of butter or oranges in those years.[8] It is perhaps understandable that he should see in the Soviet Union the "strongest military power in the world"[9] in view of the fact that he wrote his book during the time when official Western statements were full of the "missile gap," which has since turned out to have been fictional. But when he compliments Brecht on his "uncanny sense of timing" in dying ten weeks before the outbreak of the Hungarian

uprising,[10] and again on his "staggering" "intuitive anticipation of the essence and the methods" of brainwashing, in Mann ist Mann,[11] then Esslin is contributing to the bin of Cold-War Curiosities for which a great deal of the Brecht-criticism is destined.

Entertaining oddities of this sort, and some not so entertaining, could be multiplied. Perhaps one day an historian of ideas will collect together a hundred of the best of these in a small volume entitled "Galgenhumor." In order that such a perspective may be attained, however, literary critics will have to become more conversant in history and politics than the Cold War has led or allowed them to become. Such assertions as: it is a curious paradox that Brecht was a Communist and also a great poet; or: capitalism is incapable of producing great artists; and their numerous overt or covert variants do not appreciably raise the level of understanding. Whereas Brecht assumed and required a great deal of intelligence in his audience, many of his critics assume and require the opposite. Brecht-controversy on this Cold-War level contributes to nothing but ignorance; the task of criticism is to contribute to understanding.

*

The literature on Brecht is still in its infancy. A number of very good introductions to Brecht are available, notably Willett's and Grimm's (see bibliography for

exact references), and surveys, superficial biographies, critical essays dealing with this or that aspect, structural analyses, many polemics have been published, most of them stamped with the sign of euphemerality. So far the best, though not the most entertaining study of Brecht which has been published is Ernst Schumacher's voluminous work, Dramatische Versuche Bertolt Brechts. Though dry and pedantic, the book contains the wealth of information and depth of scholarship with which the whole case of Bertolt Brecht will have to be appraised, if criticism is ever to outgrow its infantile stages. No matter how many of his conclusions are eventually to be questioned, Schumacher's work will remain the one indispensable reference to the early works of Brecht. A similar work, dealing with Brecht's post-1933 writings, has not yet appeared; the nearest approach to such a goal has been Werner Mittenzwei's Bertolt Brecht. Von der Massnahme zu Leben des Galilei. By comparison with Schumacher, however, Mittenzwei's work suffers heavily. He lacks the cogency and intellectual discipline as well as the scholarship of Schumacher, and his work is saturated with polemic in such a manner that the Brecht and the Brecht-plays with which he deals come out rather flat and unattractive. Typical of him is his interpretation of Galilei; when dealing with the play's social message, expressed mostly in Galilei's long speeches at the end, he is able to seize on the

important sentences without difficulty, but he does not begin to cope with the many complexities presented by the figure of Galilei in its many contradictory actions. Had Galilei been a fervent social revolutionary, Mittenzwei would have had no difficulty; but the problem, as will be seen, is precisely the fact that Galilei is not such a revolutionary. But this is not the place for a detailed critique of Mittenzwei's sometimes contradictory findings; suffice it to say that the play appears less clear after reading him than before. The chief value of the work, and the one on which this study relies heavily, particularly in the first chapter, is in the material cited. Mittenzwei had access to the Brecht-Archiv and quotes at length from unpublished notes and fragments which are very useful.

The present study confines itself to one play not out of a taste for detail and a dislike for general surveys, but because the study originally planned swelled out of all proportion and had to be reduced in scope. Originally I envisaged a survey dealing with the development of Brecht's thinking from beginning to end, but later came to realise that the task, if done properly, would be monumental. Even limiting the study to the greatest plays --St. Joan of the Stockyards, Galilei, Sezuan, Mother Courage, perhaps Puntila and the Caucasian Chalk Circle-- proved to be insufficient: there was too much to say.

Finally, with the discovery that a first complete, unpublished version of Galilei was available, the problems of that play alone turned out to be more than sufficient for an attempt of this scope. Sixty pages of textual comparison between the 1938 version and the final German text, originally planned as a long footnote to this study, have had to be omitted for financial reasons. Nor can the claim be made that the possibilities of research and criticism of Galilei have been exhausted. Only this much has been attempted: to chart the development of the play from 1938 to 1955 and to offer some explanation of the revisions which occurred; finally to sketch the outlines of an interpretation which will, hopefully clarify the play's most evident difficulties. (Rather) the study has thrown open a number of topics of investigation from which much could conceivably be learned; for instance

1) A study of Galilei's sensual relationship to the world and to science, in terms of alienation, along Marxist or Hegelian lines;

2) A comparison of Brecht's Galilei with the historial Galilei presented in Brecht's sources, notably Emil Wohlwill's standard reference work; in order to learn about the dramatic appropriation of history.

3) In what way is the use of an historical figure in Galilei different from that in St. Joan of the Stockyards? Where is the boundary line between an "historical play"

and an historical parable?

4) Brecht's Galilei as sensualist: how does he differ from other sensualists in literature? Falstaff? Gangantua and Pantagruel? What relationship between sensuality and politics? Asceticism and politics?

5) Friedrich Dürrenmatt, who claims that he learned much from Brecht, has written a new play, Die Physiker, which I have not yet seen. How does the Swiss bourgeois face up to the scientific era? Compare.

*

A note on textual sources: fragments and early outlines cited are all from Mittenzwei's work, loc. cit. References to the first complete version (1938) are to a photostatic copy of the original typescript, with Brecht's handwritten corrections, Brecht-Archiv number 143. This text, which has never before been made the basis of a textual comparison, is regarded as the Urschrift.[12] References to the American version have been avoided except where clear differences between it and the 1955 German version exist. The American version, under Bentley's editorship is severely cut in length, although nothing vital, for once, is missing. All the long speeches have been cut by half or more; whether for the performance or for publication is uncertain. References to the final version are to the Suhrkamp single edition, for the reason

that it is the most generally available.

I have in my possession both the photostat of the Urschrift and a detailed textual comparison of the 1938-1955 versions which I would be happy to place at the disposal of any interested person.

My thanks are due to the following for their help and guidance: To my tutor, Arthur Wensinger, for his invitation to participate in a seminar with his students to discuss Galilei; for his faith and tactfulness in permitting me the independence I required; and for sharing my enthusiasm for this project.
To my employer, Norman Rudich, for discussing Brecht with me on numerous occasions; and to his wife, for preparing the Lucullan meals which made these discussions supremely enjoyable.
To my colleague, John Coatsworth, for arguing about Galilei with me for three consecutive twenty-four hour periods.
To Helene Brecht-Weigel, Liesa Kiel, and Benno Slupianek of the Bertolt-Brecht-Archiv, Berlin, for permission to use the photostatic copy of the Urschrift, and for setting an example of peaceful international co-operation by the courtesy and friendliness of their correspondence with me.
To Eric Bentley, for his assistance in finding a translation of the 1938 version, and for his kind offer of reduced

group rates for his New York production of Mann ist Mann.

To the librarian of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, for his co-operation.

To the Wesleyan library, for its patience.

To the Thorndike Fund, for its money.

INTRODUCTION: THE EXILE YEARS

Was erhofft man sich?
Dass die Wahrheit durchsickert.

(in Mitz 153)

An entry in Brecht's journal, dated November 23, 1938, notes that Leben des Galileo has been completed.[12] Brecht was then forty years old; he was in the sixth year of his exile.

On the evening of February 27, 1933, the evening of the Reichstag fire, "truckloads of storm troopers roared through the streets all over Germany, breaking into homes, rounding up victims and carrying them off to SA barracks, where they were tortured and beaten. The Communist press and political meetings were suppressed; the Social Democrat newspapers and many liberal journals were suspended and the meetings of the democratic parties either banned or broken up."[13] Brecht's house was among those searched that night, but neither he nor his family were at home.[14] The next day they managed to escape from Germany.

Ever since the beginnings of his career, Brecht's writings had provoked not only scandals among the philistines, but also bitter enmity among those political forces which came to power in 1933. As early as 1915, Brecht is said to have been in danger of expulsion by school

authorities for an anti-war essay written as a class assignment.[15] The publication in 1919 of the "Ballad of the Dead Soldier" indelibly marked Brecht as a "cultural bolshevik" in the eyes of the right-wing and veterans' organizations. Already at the time of the beer-hall putsch in 1923, Brecht ranked fifth on the Nazi liquidation lists.[16] From 1919 to 1920 he was theatre critic for the Augsburger "Volkswille," which during that time became an organ of the German Communist Party.[17] In 1926, Brecht's Mann ist Mann provoked renewed accusations of bolshevism.[18] In 1927 he began his study of Marxism, both independently and in evening courses.[19] In the same year he became part of the staff of Piscator's theatre, whose stated aim was "subordination of all artistic intention to the revolutionary goal: conscious emphasis on and propagation of the idea of class struggle."[20] 1927 was also the year of the Hauspostille, again containing the Ballad of the Dead Soldier, again provoking loud indignation from German Nationalists of all shades.[21] The Three-Penny Opera did nothing to endear him to reactionary circles, and his didactic plays of 1929 again caused a scandal. Die Massnahme of 1920 was enthusiastically performed by the proletarian theatre groups of the time; although it caused some intense discomfort in Communist intellectual circles then, performances of it occurred as a rule under police supervision and at least once were

broken up.[22] 1932 was the year in which Brecht's film, Kuhle Wampe, did not pass the censor uncut because of its outspoken tendency;[23] it was the year of Brecht's dramatization of Gorki's novel of the 1905 revolution, The Mother; it was the year in which his St. Joan of the Stockyards could no longer find a stage.[24] In August of the same year, Brecht's name figured with that of nearly every other writer of any achievement on the Index of the Nazi organ, "Voelkischer Beobachter."[25] Recovered files of the Berlin criminal police indicate that Brecht had been under close official surveillance as "Communist playwright" ever since 1923.[26] It was evident that Brecht could no longer remain in Germany under a Nazi regime. Overnight he became an exile.

Some of the problems which Brecht faced as an exile can be enumerated -- no theatre, no audience, few publishers, a foreign language, a family, financial insecurity, the uncertainty of the future -- but the best description of these years is provided by Brecht in his poems.

> . . . Vertriebene sind wir, Verbannte.
> Und kein Heim, ein Exil soll das Land sein, das uns
> da aufnahm.
> Unruhig sitzen wir so, möglichst nahe den Grenzen
> Wartend des Tags der Rückkehr, jede kleinste Verände-
> rung
> Jenseits der Grenze beobachtend . . .
> . . . keiner von uns
> Wird hier bleiben. Das letzte Wort
> Ist noch nicht gesprochen.[27]

Brecht's first stop in exile was Prague, then Vienna, then Zurich, then a short stay in the village of Carona on Lake Lugano. But none of these locations held him for long.

> Gingen wir doch, öfter als die Schuhe die länder
> wechselnd
> Durch die Kriege der Klassen, verzweifelt
> Wenn da nur Unrecht war und keine Empörung.[28]

Already in the spring of 1933 he was in the south of France, at a meeting of prominent anti-Nazi writers, including Thomas, Heinrich, and Klaus Mann, Lion Feuchtwanger, Arnold Zweig, Ernst Toller, in "the first of innumerable similar gatherings, all devoted to the earnest and searching examination of the problem of what writers could do to bring about the downfall of Hitler."[29] At some time in May of the same year, Brecht and his family moved to Denmark at the invitation of the Danish novelist Karin Michaelis, a friend of Helene Brecht-Weigel.[30] For a while they were guests of the writer on the island [illegible]rö, but soon moved into a farmhouse on the shores of the island Langeland[31] or (according to another version) Fünen,[32] in Skovsbostrand, in Svendborg province. Here, in a converted stable, Brecht worked in great seclusion interrupted only by occasional journeys abroad, and devoted himself to his work. The epigraph of the <u>Svendborger Gedichte</u> reveals his situation:

Geflüchtet unter das dänische Strohdach, Freunde
Verfolg ich euren Kampf. Hier schick ich euch
Wie hin und wieder schon, die Verse, aufgescheucht
Durch blutige Gesichte über Sund und Laubwerk.
Verwendet, was euch erreicht davon, mit Vorsicht!
Vergilbte Bücher, brüchige Berichte
Sind meine Unterlage. Sehen wir uns wieder
Will ich gerne wieder in die Lehre gehn.[33]

Another poem describes the tension of his "pastoral idyll:"

Ein Ruder liegt auf dem Dach. Ein mittlerer Wind
Wird das Stroh [illegible]cht wegtragen.
Im Hof für die Schaukel der Kinder sind
Pfähle eingeschlagen.
Die Post kommt zweimal hin
Wo die Briefe willkommen wären.
Den Sund herunter kommen die Fähren.
Das Haus hat vier Türen, daraus zu fliehen.[34]

There Brecht remained until 1939, when the advance of the German armies forced his retreat to Sweden, Finland, and finally, via Moscow, to the United States.

From the general scope and purpose of Brecht's writings in these years before Leben des Galilei, one thing becomes evident, and that is that despite the peaceful and pastoral setting of Brecht's stay, despite the opportunities he had to withdraw into a passive isolation from the stream of events and devote himself to writing landscape poems, Brecht was extraordinarily active as a writer and speaker in furthering the cause of the anti-fascist refugees and in doing all within the powers of a poet to contribute to the downfall of the Hitler regime. He did not, however, subscribe to the illusion that poets are

the unacknowledged legislators of the world. He did not, as one commentator has it, "cherish the illusion that he could influence the course of events by his writing;"[35] in fact, he had quite opposite thoughts:

> Die Kultur, lange, allzulange nur mit geistigen Waffen verteidigt, angegriffen aber mit materiellen Waffen, selber nicht nur eine geistige, sondern auch und besonders sogar eine materielle Sache, muss mit materiellen Waffen verteidigt werden.[36]

he said in a speech before the second International Congress of Writers for the Defense of Culture, in Madrid in 1937; and added that

> Der Gewalt der einzelnen, wie der privilegierten Klasse, muss die Gewalt, die volle zerschmetternde Gewalt des Volkes entgegengesetzt werden.[37]

As he appears in this speech, he was too experienced with Nazi politics to hold on to romantic misconceptions about the potency of his own writings. The realization of the ineffectiveness of his words against the weapons of the fascist armies was most strikingly expressed in his poem, "Gedanken über die Dauer des Exils":

> Lass den kleinen Baum ohne Wasser!
> Wozu noch einen Baum pflanzen?
> Bevor er so hoch wie eine Stufe ist
> Gehst du froh weg von hier.
> . . .
> Tag um Tag
> Arbeitest du an der Befreiung
> Sitzend in der Kammer schreibst du.
> Willst du wissen, was du von deiner Arbeit hältst?

Sieh den kleinen Kastanienbaum im Eck des Hofes
Zu dem du die Kanne vol Wasser schlepptest!38

The incredible patience necessary for the work Brecht carried on ~~are~~ is succinctly expressed in the gesture of watering a small tree. But despite his so very limited possibilities, despite the growing threat of war, Brecht maintained the pace of his political writings of his earlier years in Germany.

The publication, in Paris in 1934, of Brecht's Lieder Gedichte Chöre was clearly politically motivated. Contained in this collection are all of Brecht's most political and polemic poems from 1919 to 1933, including the already famous Legend of the Dead Soldier, in addition to strictly political poems dating from the Nazi seizure of power. Very much in the spirit in which St. Joan of the Stockyards uses Schiller and Goethe, Brecht wrote biting anti-Hitler texts to the most well-known Protestant church melodies of Germany, which were sung over the Deutsche Freiheitssender. The political songs from The Mother and from the Measure Taken are also included, and the collection ends with the bitter lyric, Deutschland (O Deutschland, bleiche Mutter! . . .). In the same year, Brecht for the last time occupied himself with the stuff out of which the Three-Penny Opera had been created, in his Three-Penny Novel (Dreigroschenroman).

Here, the identity of businessman and robber which Brecht had elaborated in the Opera, is considerably sharpened by a bitter use of irony molded on Swift's A Modest Proposal; the relations between businessmen and the Navy Department are shown as very much analogous to those between the gangsters of Der aufhaltsame Aufstiegdes Arturo Ui, and show the military application of the Three-Penny material.

Die Horatier und die Kuriatier which Brecht wrote in the same year, (though not published until 1938) is the last of his didactic plays in the spirit of 1927 and Brecht's introduction to Marxism. It belongs with Die Sieben Todsünden der Kleinbürger which was performed in Paris and London the previous year; both are driven to a high purity of form and abstractness of content, and neither is expressly related to the anti-Nazism struggle.[39]

Also dating from 1934 is the essay, Fünf Schwierigkeiten beim Schreiben der Wahrheit. In following its own advice, the essay was distributed in a decoy-edition under the title of "Satzungen des Reichsverbandes Deutscher Schriftsteller,"[40] or, as a conflicting version has it, as "Hints on First Aid."[41] Since this piece deals essentially with part of the same complex of problems as does Galileo, a brief analysis is in order. The first of the difficulties is the necessity for courage. Since in times of great oppression it is very difficult not to bow

to the powerful and very profitable to betray the weak, and since to express disagreement with the possessors is to give up possessions, and to be infamous with the powerful is often to renounce fame altogether, courage is evidently necessary. It takes courage to speak of little and low things when official talk is of heroism and great ideals of self-sacrifice; it is courageous to be practical and concrete, and to resist the temptation to bewail a general outbreak of evil. But courage is not enough; in order to speak the truth, one must be able to find it, and find the right truth. The truth that rain falls downwards and not upwards, for instance, is not worth writing and accomplishes nothing. To find effective truths takes research and hard work, and while it is possible to find truth without a method and even by chance, no thorough conception of truth which will enable men to know how to act can be achieved without a knowledge of materialistic dialectics, of economics, and of history. Truth has the sole object of allowing men to change the world. Yet a third difficulty exists; to make the truth into a weapon; for truth must be said only for the sake of its consequences. To say that fascism is a natural force, or that fascism stands over and above capitalism and socialism is to make a fascist assertion; fascism can be fought only as capitalism, as extreme capitalism. The fourth difficulty is to place the weapon of truth into the hands of those who can best

use it; something said must always be something said to somebody, and to somebody who can make use of it. Truth about bad conditions must be said to those for whom conditions are bad; even the hangmen can be talked to as soon as their pay is withheld or the danger becomes too great. The final difficulty is that of having the cleverness (List) to spread the truth widely. To this end, various methods have always been employed whenever truth was suppressed; from an unknown Egyptian poet's use of objective reporting, through the alterations of words in a calendar by Confucius, to the Utopia of Thomas More, from the irony of Voltaire and Swift to the Aesopian attacks of Lenin, not to discount the simple advantage of good style and beauty of presentation. The essay is a treatise on ethics, and insofar as it forms part of the body of Brechtian preoccupation with matters of ethics, is of high importance to a study of his work.

In 1935, Brecht traveled a great deal. Probably in the spring of that year, he was in Moscow; it is possible that much of Brecht's fascination with Oriental, particularly Chinese theater and philosophy dates from his visit to the theatre of Mei-Lan Fang, then in Moscow.[42] In June, he attended the first meeting of the International Writers' Congress in Paris and made a brief speech which ends with the exhortation to speak of "relations of property" when combatting fascism.[43] In November he was in New York for

a performance by the Theatre Union of an adaptation of The Mother, and came away generally dissatisfied with what had been made of his play.[44]

In 1936, Brecht, Lion Feuchtwanger, and Willi Bredel became co-editors of one of the numerous anti-Nazi refugee magazines of the time, called Das Wort, published in Moscow, edited by mail. Much of Brecht's current poetry was published here, and probably provided Brecht with some additional income. The journal ceased publication in 1939.[45] In November of the same year, Brecht's Die Rundköpfe und die Spitzköpfe was performed by an exile theatre group in Copenhagen. The play, "the parable-type of a non-aristotelean drama"[46] was a reworking of the earlier Die Spitzköpfe und die Rundköpfe. It clearly intended to parabolize the coming into power of the Hitler regime, and to reveal the dynamics of Nazism. Like Shakespeare's Measure for Measure, which provided the stimulus out of which Brecht's play grew, there is much food for thought in it, and it would be irresponsible to set aside the play's depiction of the Hitler-landowner alliance and the use made of the racial theory as "political naïveté".[47] Yet, as the Nazi regime unfolded its full horror with the swift course of the years, as millions and millions were worked to exhaustion in slave labor camps and then exterminated, Brecht's play fades perceptibly; he did not dream of horror in such magnitude.

In 1937, Brecht attended the Second International Writers' Congress for the Defense of Culture, and again made a speech. This time what he had to say was shorter, less theoretical, and expressed in less veiled language than his speech at the First Congress, two years before. The first speech concluded with a suggestion that one speak about property-relations, the second is a call to arms; "on these wars . . . war must be declared."[49] It is evident that as the international situation grew more critical and as the policies of Nazi Germany became more openly aggressive, Brecht's political utterances became more intransigeant.

The same direct and concrete tone marks Die Gewehre der Frau Carrar which Brecht wrote in 1937, and which was performed the same year in Paris. Intentionally in the "naturalistic" mode of theatre, the play abandons all attempts at defamiliarisation (Verfremdung) as well as all tendencies toward abstraction or parable. The play quite clearly has a moral, the same as that explicitly stated in Brecht's address to the Second Writers' Congress; at the end of the play, Senora Carrar herself is convinced of the impossibility of remaining impartial in the Spanish Civil War in which her husband and son have been killed, and takes up her rifles to fight against the Franco army.

The succession of scenes entitled Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches, first performed in May, 1938, is also

in the naturalistic mode. In twenty-four scenes of varying length, Brecht displays a number of aspects of life in Nazi Germany. The title of the series is apt; fear and misery form the dominant themes in these scenes, joined by a third capitulation. From the second scene on, the characters of whatever social background are bribed, terrorized, or beaten into capitulation to the Nazi regime. Especially -- and here the theme of the "Five Difficulties in Writing the Truth," and of Galilei appears -- the intellectuals suffer the burden of Brecht's exposure. In the eighth scene, two physicists discuss in conspiratorial whispers a letter dealing with the theory of gravitation received secretly from Albert Einstein. When one of them accidentally pronounces Einstein's name aloud, they are horror-stricken that someone may have overheard them. The other, to cover up, shouts that it is "real Jewish sophistry," and asks loudly, so that he might be overheard, what that has to do with physics?[50] In the ninth scene, the Jewish wife of a doctor, knowing that she will have to leave her husband or he will lose his job, packs her bags and practices what she will say to him when he arrives. She says, "What kind of people are you, yes, you too! You invent the quantum-theory and the 'Trendelenburg' and take orders from half-savages to conquer the world, but you can't have the wife you want . . . . You're monsters or toadies of monsters!"[51] When the husband arrives, he

rationalizes his capitulation: "In the long run, they can't keep us intellectual animals down altogether. With completely spineless wrecks they can't make war. Either these people aren't so rigid when you oppose them firmly."[52] But he never does face them firmly, nor does he firmly face the fact that his job means more to him than his wife, but lets her leave. In the tenth scene, a teacher who has inadvertently let slip something which might be construed as criticism, wails his frustration: "Of course I'm ready to teach everything they want taught, but what do they want me to teach? If I always knew that!"[53]

Besides the numerous poems, some translations, and several theoretical articles which Brecht wrote during the years of exile before he wrote Galilei, the works just discussed form all of his output. Among these works, there is only one major play, Roundheads and Peakheads, and that clearly not among his best. There is nothing, in these years, of the stature of a St. Joan of the Stockyards, or of The Mother, or even of The Measure Taken. There is, understandably, nothing at all of the sardonic gaiety or of the abandon of Baal, of Man is Man, or of the Three-Penny Opera. In his poetry of the period, even in the "non-political" poetry, there is nothing of the fascination with degeneration and corruption of the earlier poetry. Exile had altered Brecht.

While in Germany, Brecht had been in opposition from within. His position was that of a member of a society -- no matter how estranged from its aims -- whose aim had been to criticize a regime from within. He had his audience, he had a wide circle of friends, he had notoriety and fame, he had publishers and stages until very near the end, and he had his subject matter around him and was in it. In exile, nearly the opposite was true. His audience consisted mostly of other exiles; though he had friends, all his former friends were scattered throughout the world; he had little chance to become notorious and less chance to become famous. He could publish only in ephemeral exile magazines of very limited circulation, and his broadcasts over the "German Freedom Station" could be jammed; he had no theatre to work with, and few stages which would even perform his plays. He was separated from the everyday language; but worst of all, he was separated from the life of his country. He was outside; what happened, happened without him. No personal consequences could ensue from his protests, personal rebellion could bring no punishment; the refusal to capitulate could result in no hero's or martyr's ordeal; he was frustratingly safe. His life situation had radically altered; he had to begin again. The years 1933-1938 mark the period of that readjustment for Brecht.

Not by chance, with a writer so sensitive to the historical situation, these years were years of transition for Germany, also. It will be remembered, or ought to be remembered, that from the Nazi accession to power in 1933 to the spring of 1938, the changes which took place were largely internal to Germany herself. They were the years of "Nazification," when the economic, social, and political groundwork was being laid inside of Germany for the war that was to come, but when these preparations for war, the intentions of war, and the possibility of war were daily and publicly denied by the German government. The regime was untested; it was all plan, all emphasis on an eternal future. Its fanaticism was suspect, its methods of terror could not indefinitely be supported. The regime's economy was not free of trouble, and -- left-wing opposition having been systematically eradicated -- potential opposition from the middle class, from the land-owning aristocracy, from the peasantry, from the regular army, from professional groups, was untested or unknown ~~of~~; the attitude of foreign governments was as yet uncertain. It was possible, in brief, to hope and to believe that the regime would collapse of its own weight or would provoke effective opposition from within. It was plausible to believe that the "Third Reich" would be simply a chapter in the chronicle of governmental administration, and not an era of world history.[54] Even if one were convinced that there would be war, it was

possible to believe that the Western democracies and the Soviet Union would quickly put a stop to it. Seen from the perspective of exile, one could believe in the possibility of returning to Germany in the not-too-distant future, to recommence the work one had left off.

These hopes are clearly reflected in Brecht's work of the period. He was, it is apparent, quite firmly convinced that the continuation in power of the Nazi regime would mean war. The very first of the Svendborg Poems goes to great illustrative lengths in describing the military preparations being taken. But he did have hope that internal opposition could be mobilized to the point of effectively weakening the regime. At the end of the first poem, he exhorted:

> Wenn der Trommler seinen Krieg beginnt
> Sollt ihr euren Krieg fortführen.
> Er wird vor sich Feinde sehen, aber
> Wenn er sich umblickt, soll er
> Auch hinter sich Feinde sehen:
> Wenn er seinen Krieg beginnt
> Soll er um sich lauter Feinde sehen.[55]

All of his poems from that period which urge solidarity upon the workers and unity in the left-wing political organizations, his open letters and speeches to various organizations in support of the popular-front[56] as well as the plot-ending of Rundköpfe und Spitzköpfe, of Carrar, of the last scene of Furcht und Elend, are all unthinkable if Brecht did not cherish the hope that the Nazi regime

would be overthrown before a world war began. His poem "Gedanken über die Dauer des Exils" from which the second, less optimistic section has already been quoted, in its first half makes clear Brecht's conviction that his exile is merely a period of transition:

> Schlage keinen Nagel in die Wand
> Wirf den Rock auf den Stuhl!
> Was [illegible] vor morgen für vier Tage?
> Du kehrst morgen zurück.[57]

Yet toward the end of 1937 and throughout 1938, the international situation grew darker. Particularly the Spanish Civil War, for which Brecht had written Carrar and which he watched with fierce interest since it represented the only instance of general armed resistance to fascism, --that war was gradually being won by the Franco forces, with the help of massive military aid from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy.[58] By early 1938, when German preparations for war became more and more open and no effective sign of resistance from within had materialized, there was every reason for a man in Brecht's position to feel that the worst was still ahead. Even the boundless faith in his return to Germany which possessed Brecht was somewhat dampened in this period. Significantly, the last two of the three sections of Brecht's poem "An die Nachgeborenen", the last poem of the Svendborg collection, are written in the past tense. It is not impossible that Brecht

considered this poem to be his last will and testament. Even the title suggests that the author foresees the imminent end of his life, and the repetition of the refrain, "So verging meine Zeit/die auf Erden mir gegeben war" in the second section indicates already the detachment of a man whose life is passing in final review. The third section, finally, is altogether detached from the poet's contemporary life, and is addressed not to an audience of the time, but to posterity, to an audience in a time still far away, when "der Mensch dem Menschen ein Helfer ist."[59]

The lead poem in the Steffinische Sammlung (poems selected by Brecht's co-worker and ideological teacher, Margarete Steffin) is another clear indication of the depression which Brecht's immediate hopes suffered. Entitled "Frühling 1938" and written on Easter Sunday, -- that is, a few days after the rape of Austria -- the poem is a sensitive and lyrical piece, in which the natural beauty of early spring vegetation hangs in a fine tension.

> . . . In das Gezwitscher der Stare
> Mischt sich der ferne Donner
> Der manövrierenden Schiffsgeschütze
> Des Dritten Reiches.
>
> In den Weiden am Sund
> Ruft in diesen Frühjahrsnächten oft das Käuzlein.
> Nach dem Aberglauben der Bauern
> Setzt das Käuzlein die Menschen davon in Kenntnis
> Dass sie nicht lang leben. Auch
> Der ich weiss, dass ich die Wahrheit gesagt habe
> Über die Herrschenden, braucht der Totenvogel davon
> Nicht erst in Kenntnis zu setzen.[60]

This, then, was approximately Brecht's vision of the future. It was a vision, as the poem to posterity shows, not without hope nor without faith. But the hope and the faith had been driven out of the present by the advance of preparations for war, and had become directed to a point in time beyond the author's life-span:

> Die Kräfte waren gering. Das Ziel
> Lag in weiter Ferne
> Es war deutlich sichtbar, wenn auch für mich
> Kaum zu erreichen.
> So verging manche Zeit
> Die auf mich gegeben war.[61]

*

It is probably that it was at this point, in early 1938, that Brecht's period of adjustment to exile was complete. There then began in Brecht's development a new phase, based on a new vision both of Brecht's personal future and of the short-range movement of history. What Brecht left behind him during these months of the Anschluss, of the Franco victory, of Munich, and of the end of Czechoslovakia, was the restlessness of the exile convinced of his imminent return home, convinced of the transitoriness of the regime of injustice which had banished him. He had lived a life which he was careful to keep always provisional, and which, his hopes convinced him, was to be but an interlude. Corresponding to this vision of his life situation was his literary output of the period:

plays with a concrete and immediate purpose, based directly or parabolically on the current political situation, having for their aim to contribute in however small a way to altering that situation; poems with few exceptions explicitly designed as weapons, however puny, for the anti-Hitler resistance movements. But gradually, during the spring of 1938, he could no longer have that strong faith in his return to Germany, nor was the end of the wave of barbarism which was spreading over Europe visible in Brecht's lifetime. Doom began to take on epochal, epic, dimensions, and it seemed as if a new era of darkness were descending upon Europe. The political situation no longer appeared in the guise of single episodes of terror, but as a new period of history itself, based on terror as a fundamental principle.

CHAPTER ONE: Origin of the Play And the First Fragments

To ~~this~~ the aspect of continuing Nazi successes, Brecht responded by adapting his tactics. In the earlier years of exile, his work had been calculated to the dimensions of the opposition. If Goebbels made a speech, Brecht would write a satire on it. Did Hitler promise peace? Brecht would point to the munitions factories. Did Nazi policy make use of a racial mystique? Brecht wrote a play exposing its social-class basis. Did Nazi propagandists sing the praises of Germany in the West? Brecht wrote a succession of scenes which pierced the propaganda. Did Republicans of the Spanish Civil War need volunteers and arms? Brecht wrote a play designed to win new sympathizers. And now that these hopes of Nazi defeat were slowly, one after the other, proving fruitless? What were Brecht's tactics at a time when "the goal / lay at a great distance / clearly visible although / hardly within my reach?" What is a proper position when "strength is low"?[62] What are the tactics for those who have been successfully suppressed and defeated?

Brecht gave his answer to these painful questions in Galilei. In probably the darkest year outside of war

itself in the history of Europe, at a time when the European Left could point to nothing but a series of bitter and costly defeats, Brecht set about writing a play dealing with probably the brightest and most hopeful of historical periods, showing in what manner even defeat could harbor within it the seeds of victory. At a time when immediate prospects both for himself and for the realization of his beliefs were gloomy as they had never been before, Brecht's optimism about the long-term course of history became stronger than at perhaps any previous time in his life. "Refugees are the sharpest dialecticians," he wrote several years later;[63] there is no better and more serious illustration of the truth of this statement than the nature of the task which he set himself in Galilei. And, like most dialectical processes, Brecht's did not come easily but involved a considerable struggle. In his (inedited) foreward to Galilei, written at the same time as the play, Brecht gives a measure of the heaviness of his thoughts:

> Inmitten der schnell wachsenden Finsternis über einer fiebernden Welt, umgeben von blutigen Taten und nicht weniger blutigen Gedanken, der zunehmenden Barbarei, die unhemmbar in den vielleicht grössten und furchbarsten Krieg aller Zeiten zu führen scheint, ist es schwer, eine Haltung einzunehmen, die sich für Leute an der Schwelle einer neuen und glücklichen Zeit schicken mag. Deutet nicht alles darauf hin, dass es Nacht wird, und nichts, dass eine neue Zeit beginnt? Soll man also nicht eine Haltung einnehmen, die

sich für Leute schickt, die der Nacht entgegen gehen? . . .
Soll man sich also an die alte Zeit halten? Soll man von dem versunkenen Atlantis reden?

Liege ich schon auf meinem Nachtlager und denke, an den Morgen denkend, an den, der vergangen ist, [illegible] nicht an den zu denken, der kommt? Beschäftige ich mich darum mit jener [illegible]che der Blüte der Künste und Wissenschaften v[illegible] Jahren? Ich hoffe, nicht.[64]

In the face of war, Brecht was already thinking about the peace that would follow; in writing about the Renaissance, he was thinking not only of the one which has passed, but about the one yet to come. In his foreword to the American version of the play, written seven or eight years later, he terms this, with typical understatement, "ein anstrengendes Unternehmen, da jedermann ringsum überzeugt war, dass unserer eigenen alles zu einer neuen Zeit fehlte."[65]

*

To anyone even superficially sympathetic with Brecht's intention at this moment of history, the choice of Galilei as standard-bearer of resistance to an authoritarian regime and as herald of a new age would be almost a spontaneous reflex. In Emil Wohlwill's standard reference work on Galilei, which Brecht consulted, he encountered a scholar's dispassionate but impassioned admiration for his subject, expressed in phrases which could only have served to fan Brecht's admiration also; as for instance:

> Aus der gleichen leidenschaftlichen Hingebung an die grosse Erkenntnis, die ihn zu solchem Wirken und Werben als Forscher, Lehrer und Schriftsteller begeisterte, ging für Galilei auch der überwältigende Antrieb hervor, mit seiner Person für die Sache der Wahrheit den Mächtigen der Erde sich gegenüberzustellen und so in seiner Überzeugung sein Schicksal zu finden.[66]

The figure of Galilei the great enquirer, clarifier, teacher, propagator, heroic defender of a new and scientific world system, had an appeal for Brecht which remained with him all of his life, even when he had come to take a much more critical position toward the end-result of the great man's achievements. Even Galilei's "re-invention" ofthe telescope, revealing as it does a certain laxness in matters of intellectual property, must have had its appeal for Brecht. "I believe that there is no greater hate in the world than that of ignorance for knowledge," the real Galilei had said.[67] Are these not words with which Brecht's own experience had brought him into profound agreement? Precisely three hundred years after Galilei's works were put on the papal Index in 1633, Brecht's own appeared on another and more ominous index. Was not Brecht also, and with him the German Left, an enquirer, clarifier, teacher, propagator, defender of a new and scientific world system? Was there not an infinite set of parallels between Galilei's effort and that of the whole generation of German writers, artists, scientists, intellectuals of all varieties who were sent

to concentration camps, exterminated, or who were able to flee from persecution? Did they not all suffer as Galilei had suffered?[68]

Perhaps even more important than these general aspects of the parallel between Galilei and Brecht's generation was the fact that Galilei's cause, as Brecht's, had been severely defeated. The arrest of all progress, the renewed boldness of the inquisition, the resurgence of the "counter-reformation," the prohibition of monuments and the denigration of Galilei's memory were all consequences of Galilei's defeat which must have had the bitter taste of familiarity to Brecht in his time. The veritable reign of darkness and war which followed Galilei's defeat was a fitting parallel to the approaching darkness in Germany following the defeat of its Left.[69]

But probably the most important aspect of Galilei's history for Brecht's purposes was his conduct <u>after</u> the recantation. A prisoner of the inquisition in his villa in Arcetri, not far from Florence, Galilei was under the closest supervision by the authorities, who trusted in the potency of their degree no more than they trusted the sincerity of their prisoner's recantation. However--and the following sentences from Wohlwill's work must have had a special appeal for Brecht:

> . . . aber trotz aller Vorsicht und Klugheit wurden sie [die Herrscher] von ihm hintergangen,

> wie nur jemals Kerkermeister von ihren Gefangenen hintergangen sind.[70]

Under the noses of the inquisition, Galilei wrote and smuggled out his Discorsi, the most important of all his works, containing

> . . . den Kern aller neuen Bewegungslehre. Wenn ein einzelnes Werk in solchem Sinne genannt werden kann, so gibt es keines, dem nächst dem Buch des Copernicus ein grösserer Anteil an der völligen Erneuerung der Naturwissenschaften zukommt, als diese Discorsi . . . . Hatten die frommen Väter in Rom eine Ahnung von der gewaltigsten aller Revolutionen, die aus dieser mathematischen Methode hervorwachsen sollte?[71]

In the particular historical situation in which Brecht encountered the Galilei-material, it was no doubt this aspect of Galilei's life which interested him most. In this manuscript, written under the most severe conditions and smuggled out despite the strictest prohibition, Brecht saw the dramatic concretization of that dialectic which was the hope of the exiles. From the deepest defeat Galilei created his greatest victory. It is for this victory, after all, that Galilei is chiefly today remembered; while the popular legend that, after signing the recantation, Galilei is supposed to have mumbled "Eppur si muove!" (nevertheless it moves!) is almost certainly an invention,[72] yet the smuggling of the manuscript, which accords with historical fact, is the equivalent expression of the same sentiment in a much more potent and effective form. This

courage and skill in the face of defeat, this turning defeat into eventual and overwhelming victory, was the most important lesson which Brecht could impart to the discouraged exiles in the dark days before the second World War.

Evidently, Brecht's original conception of Galilei was not drawn from the same source, nor did it have the same intention, as the depiction of the spineless "beasts of brain" who capitulated without a squeak to the Nazi regime, in his Furcht und Elend des Dritten Reiches. His intention there had been to expose and condemn; his intention with Galilei was to instruct by means of an admirable example. Rather, this Galilei who emerges from the first fragments -- as well as much of the Galilei of the first complete version -- is in the spirit of such exemplary figures as The Mother, as Carrar. The figure of Galilei served as concrete example and demonstration of the lessons which Brecht had collected in theoretical form in his essay, Fünf Schwierigkeiten beim Schreiben der Wahrheit; whether that essay was in fact smuggled into Germany under the title of "Hints for First Aid" is a matter of dispute. Clearly, however, both that smuggle and Galilei's are illustrations of the same tactic; with the difference that the essay was written when optimism about the immediate future was still possible, (1934) while Galilei

belongs to a period when the only possible optimism fixed itself to the farthest future. The essay depicts tactics for victory, the play depicts tactics after defeat, for eventual victory.

*

The figure of Galilei which emerges from the first outlines of scenes and partially complete sections (and here the analysis limits itself to a summary of Mittenzwei's presentation) is of a great and robust chief-engineer of the famous Venetian Arsenal. Several planned scenes were to show Galilei in this, the mostmodern shipyard of its time, surrounded by his craftsmen, metalworkers, lathe-operators, carpenters; demonstrating by the example of a crane loading a cannon onto a ship his discoveries regarding the great and small machines.[73] The shipyard is shown to be the source of many of Galilei's most far-reaching speculations, as indeed it was,[74] and his thought is shown to have had the concreteness derived from practical experience with mechanics.[75] Very much in this spirit, Brecht prepared an outline of the play, entitled "Fassung für Arbeiter."[76] Its last three scenes, in Brecht's summary of their content, are significant insofar as no mention is made of Galilei's self-condemnation:

12. Die Schüler erfahren den Widerruf.
13. Galilei forscht weiter.
14. Ein Buch überschreitet die Grenze.[77]

The relationship of Galilei's conduct to the lessons of Brecht's essay, Five Difficulties . . . is made explicit in the following fragment, a projected scene:

> Schwierigkeit, die Wahrheit zu finden-- der Triumph. Die Schwierigkeiten der Gebirge sind überwunden, es beginnt die Schwierigkeit der Ebenen.[78]

To counter these difficulties, the originally-planned Galilei rises to peaks of wrath, threatening to mobilize the entire people:

> Niemals, sage ich euch, hat eine einzelne Wissenschaft wie die unsers eine solche Mission zuerteilt bekommen, einem ganzen Volk die Waffe der Vernunft gegen seine Unterdrücker zu schleifen.[79]

The Galilei of these and other fragments presented by Mittenzwei appears as a robust, vigorous, and conscious revolutionary. Yet, because Brecht presented him in this light, he began to have difficulties with the problem of the motives for Galilei's recantation. In the dramatic presentation of these motives, Brecht had two choices: either the recantation was intentional, for the purpose of completing Galilei's work; or it was not intentional, motivated by fear of death. In the first case, the parallel to the German Left would disappear; in the second, the

revolutionary wrath of the character would have to be contradicted. This problem of motivation became particularly acute in the first version, as will be seen; the following is part of an incomplete scene not taken over into the first version:

> Ich will nicht behaupten, dass ich nicht der Folter wegen, sondern um meine Bücher zu retten und neue zu schreiben, also der Leben wegen, widerrufen und mein Gesicht verloren habe, aber wer will das Gegenteil behaupten? Die Folter stand, unter uns, an der falschen Stelle, sie sagten: Schwöre ab, sonst töten wir dich und vernichten dein Werk. Da schwur ich ab. Hätte es geheissen: Wir töten dich, wenn du nicht abschwörst, aber dann soll dein Werk leben, und ich hätte dann abgeschworen, dann wäre ich sehr verächtlich geworden. Aber natürlich, das Werk lebt nicht von dem, was ich schwöre oder abschwöre, es steht auf eigenen Beinen, es wendet mir den Rücken zu, nicht eine weggeworfene oder selbst mitleidige Bewegung mir und spaziert fort, in ve[illegible]

Such an exposition is still very much in the spirit of the popular legend, except that the last sentence seems to be the beginning of a realization that something is wrong with the legend; but no clear conclusions are arrived at. The fact is that the recantation made the work possible; the problem is, was the work worth the recantation, did the work cancel or transcend the effects of the recantation? As the historical effects of both the work and the recantation began to make their ominous appearance toward the end of 1938, these questions became ever more urgent, and it became ever more difficult for Brecht to reconcile

his original conception of Galilei as a great exemplary figure with the Galilei who now began to appear: the man who abandoned the scientist's commitment to humanity. The version completed in November of 1938 is the battleground of this contradiction.

CHAPTER TWO: The First Complete Version

If the decline of the Spanish Republic, the absence of internal effective opposition to the Hitler regime, the Anschluss, Munich, and the unmistakeable preparations for war depressed Brecht's immediate horizon and led him to see in Galilei an heroic opponent of the authorities, who turned his greatest defeat into his greatest victory, the discovery that a new source of energy of enormous destructive potential had been discovered by Germany introduced a new element into Brecht's conception of the great Renaissance scientist. The discovery that science, the same science of which Galilei was certainly one of the most important founders, threatened to become Germany's greatest weapon led Brecht immediately into a conflict with his earlier (and concurrent) admiration.

The reverse title page of some of the German editions of Galilei[81] carries the terse note that "the newspapers had brought reports of the splitting of the uranium atom by German physicists."[82] Later, in reviewing his plays, Brecht elaborated on a similar experience:

> Vor dem Krieg erlebte ich vor dem Radioapparat eine wahrhaft historische Szene: das Institut des Physi-

kers Niels Bohr in Kopenhagen wurde interviewt über eine umwälzende Entdeckung auf dem Gebiet der Atomzertrümmerung. Die Physiker berichteten, dass eine neue, ungeheure Kraftquelle entdeckt sei. Als der Interviewer fragte, ob eine praktische Ausnutzung der Versuche schol möglich sei, bekam er die Antwort: Nein, noch nicht. Im Tone der grössten Erleichterung sagte der Interviewer: Gott sei Dank! Ich glaube wirklich, dass die Menschheit für die Übernahme einer solchen Kraftquelle noch absolut nicht reif ist! Es war klar, dass er sofort nur an die Kriegsindustrie gedacht hatte."[83]

The fact that Brecht considered this a truly historic scene is significant in understanding the difficulties which plagued Brecht in the first complete version of the play. Surely plaints about the destructive power of scientific inventions are as old as gunpowder itself; but Brecht had been living in an age when the negative aspects of science had not yet come to full popular consciousness, or had been forgotten or buried with the memories of the first World War. Science, in Brecht's Enlightenment philosophy, he had begun by seeing as little more than the great benefactor of mankind, man's greatest ally against the forces of nature. In the years when Charles Lindbergh's successful crossing of the Atlantic made him an international <u>cause célèbre</u>, Brecht too joined in the paeans, going so far as to devote an entire <u>Lehrstück</u> to the flight:

> Selbst auf den ältesten Steinen
> Fanden wir keine Zeichnung
> Von irgend einem Menschen, der
> Durch die Luft geflogen ist

Aber wir haben uns erhoben.
Gegen Ende des 3. Jahrtausend unserer Zeitrechnung
Erhob sich unsere
Stählerne Einfalt
Aufzeigend das Mögliche
Ohne uns vergessend zu machen: das
Unerreichbare.[84]

There are, symptomatically, in this Flug der Lindberghs, lines very similar to Galilei's opening speech:

Viele sagen, die Zeit sei alt
Aber ich habe immer gewusst, es ist eine neue Zeit.
Ich sage euch, nicht von selber
Wachsen seit 20 Jahren Häuser wie Gebirge aus Erz
Viele ziehen mit jedem Jahr in die Städte, als
erwarteten sie etwas
Und auf den lachenden Kontinenten
Spricht es sich herum: das grosse gefürchtete Meer
Sei ein kleines Wasser.[85]

In having thus appraised the development of technology, Brecht was very much of his time. Commenting on the literary mainstream of the nineteen twenties, the "Neue Sachlichkeit," Ernst Schumacher explained its bases in terms of the new historical developments of the period:

Die Beherrschung der Natur durch neue technische Erfindungen--Auto, Flugzeug, Elektrifizierung, Radio, Film--führte zu einem neuen Lebensgefühl. Die Rationalisierung, in der das Prinzip der Technik zum Ausdruck kam, hatte ihren Gegenpol in diesem noch nie dagewesenen Triumph der Rationalität.[86]

Negative social elements of science are almost completely ignored in the Lindbergh play. The struggle of Lindbergh was against the elementary force of nature; it was the

struggle of an individual against his physical limitations. Disappointment with these hopes in science, however, began to appear in Brecht's writing very soon after, in 1929. In the Badener Lehrstück vom Einverständnis, the subject matter of flight, of conquest of nature, is again taken up, with at least two obvious differences. The somewhat mysterious line of the Lindbergh play, "das Unerreichbare" is replaced by the more polemic "das noch nicht Erreichte," and the (unnamed) pilot is shown not after flight, but after having crashed--no doubt a more appropriate structure for the year 1929. The pilot and his three mechanics say that

> Uns hatte erfasst das Fieber
> Des Stadtebaus und des Öls.
> Unsere Gedanken waren Maschinen und
> Die Kämpfe um Geschwindigkeit.
> Wir vergassen über den Kämpfen
> Unsere Namen und unser Gesicht
> Und über dem geschwinderen Aufbruch
> Vergassen wir unseres Aufbruch's Ziel.[87]

Then the leader of a "learned choir" asks what benefit the great advances in science and technology have brought to mankind:

> Viele von uns haben nachgedacht
> Über den Gang der Erde um die Sonne, über
> Das Innere des Menschen, die Gesetze
> Der Allgemeinheit, die Beschaffenheit der Luft
> Und den Fisch der Tiefsee.
> Und sie haben
> Grosse Dinge gefunden.

But the learned choir is forced to respond,

Das Brot wurde dadurch nicht billiger.
Sondern
Die Armut hat zugenommen in unseren Städten
Und es weiss seit langer Zeit
Niemand mehr, was ein Mensch ist.[88]

The conclusion, after a grotesque clown-act in which a giant clown is disassembled by his fellow-men, is that man does not help man. After much dark metaphysical brooding, the pilot, who insists on his fame and on the exterior aspects of his individuality and of his feat, is expelled from the stage, and the three mechanics are exhorted to join themselves with the flow of things, with the aim of changing the world. After the airplane crash, they are to proceed to a reconstruction of the airplane, likewise of the world.

While this summary does not do justice to that very curious little play, the main point here to be learned from it is that one set of negative characteristics of the uses of science had become apparent to Brecht, namely its dehumanizing effects and the inequalities of distribution of the products of science. Yet basically, despite its flirtation with what appears to be Christian asceticism,[89] the play ends with the same rationalist message as did the Lindbergh play, except that the message is now phrased in the imperative and syncopated with exclamation marks.

That there had been a deep reaction of disappointment in the scientific age, beginning not surprisingly with the Great Depression, is even more apparent in Brecht's long poem, "Verschollener Ruhm der Riesenstadt New York." Here the tone is of ironic disillusionment with the promises of progress which had been emanating, like Lindbergh, from the United States:

> Ihre Maschinen nämlich, heisst es, liegen in riesigen
> Haufen (den grössten der Welt!)
> Wie die Maschinen der alten Welt (in kleineren Haufen).
> 90

The disillusionment grows deeper with time. In his profoundly ironic "Ballade von der Billigung der Welt," dating from approximately 1933, Brecht summarizes his attitude toward the state of scientific progress:

> Die Wissenschaft, stets unser Wissen mehrend
> Welches dann wieder unser [illegible] und [illegible]
> Verehre man wie die Religion, die unsere
> Unwissenheit vermehrt, und die man auch verehrt.[91]

This is a critique of the misery produced by scientific progress, but it is not yet an indictment of scientists as murderers and accomplices of murderers; the first seeds of such an intention are in the already-cited scene from Furcht und Elend, which was written in the same year as Galilei. In 1940, the theme is already quite clear:

Aus den Bücherhallen
Treten die Schlächter.
Di[illegible]der [illegible]h drückend
St[illegible] die [illegible] und durchforschen entgeistert
De[illegible]mel [illegible]h den Erfi[illegible]n der G[illegible]ehrten.[92]

The most instructive example of the profound change which Brecht's attitude toward science underwent in the course of his life is his 1950 revision of Flug der Lindberghs. Because of Charles Lindbergh's overt pro-fascist activities in the US before the war, Brecht wrote in a letter to the South-German radio network that Lindbergh's name must be extirpated from the play and the title changed to Der Ozeanflug. A prologue, added for the radio performance of the thus revised version, draws the moral of the story:

Hier hört ihr
Den Bericht über den ersten Ozeanflug
I[illegible]. [illegible] junger [illegible]h
Vollführte ihn. Er triumphierte
Über Sturm, Eis, [illegible] gefräßige Wasser. Dennoch
Sei sein Name ausgemerzt, denn
Der sich zurechtfand [illegible] weglose Wassern
Verlor sich im Sumpf unserer Städte. Sturm und Eis
Besiegte ihn nicht, aber [illegible]itm[illegible]ch
Besiegte ihn. Ein Jahrzent
Ruhm und Reichtum und der Unselige
Z[illegible]gte den [illegible]tlers[illegible]lächtern das Fliegen
[illegible] tödlich[illegible] Bom[illegible]. Darum
Sei sein[illegible]me ausg[illegible]t. Ihr aber
Seid ge[illegible]t: Ni[illegible] noch Kenntnis
V[illegible] [illegible]nd Seel[illegible]n [illegible]en den Asozialen
I[illegible]d.[93] (emphasis added)

This is very much a part of the message which Galilei, in its final version, seeks to impart; but it was a lesson

which in 1938 had not yet been driven home to Brecht in the fullness of its force. In the first complete version of Galilei, completed on November 23, 1938, the beginnings of this lesson are clearly visible in sharp contradiction to the Heldenlied which was Brecht's original vision of the play.

Consequently, the notion prevalent in much of the critical literature that the first version of Galilei represents Galilei's recantation of his teachings as "a deliberate act of calculation and cunning"[94] must after a scrutiny of the original text be amended. It is not true that Brecht's decision to paint Galilei as a criminal occurred "shortly before Brecht died";[95] from the texts it becomes apparent that the process of "bringing out the criminal in the hero"[96] began not late in Brecht's life, not even only after Hiroshima, but was already uncomfortably entrenched in the complete first version of November 1938.

If, for example, the incomplete fragment not taken over into the first version (quoted above), in which Galilei leaves open the possibility and even suggests that he recanted under pressure of the Inquisition in order to save his work and continue to write, such a comfortable interpretation of his case is clearly undercut in the first version:

ANDREA: Ihre person betreffend wurde eine zeit lang viel disputiert. einige unter früheren freunde [illegible] Sie hätten [illegible] die [illegible] physik, am [illegible] zu [illegible] hätten. solcher werke wegen, die [illegible] schreiben können.

GALILEI (barsch): solche werke gibt es nicht. (143/122)*

If there are, as Brecht sees it, no works which only one man can write, then he who publicly denies the truth in order to write becomes, as the early fragment has it, "very contemptible."[97] Why did Galilei recant, in the first version?

nach sorgfältiger erwägung aller umstände, der entschuldigenden wie der andern, kann man nicht der meinung sein, dass jemand aus [illegible] zu einem solchen - gehorsam [illegible] aus einer zu grossen furcht vor dem tode. . . . nicht weniger als die bedrohung mit dem tode ist gewöhnlich nötig, einen menschen von dem abzubringen, was er sein verstand gebracht hat, gefährlichste aller gaben des allgütigen. ([illegible])

Fear of death is certainly not a heroic motive for recantation; as Brecht has structured the situation, such an unheroic motive is the only one open to Galilei. Nor is Galilei incapable of giving a sharp and succinct analysis of his own case, of condemning his recantation and expelling himself from the ranks of science, precisely as he does in the final version:

---

* The numbers beginning with 143 refer to the Brecht-[illegible] numbering system, and are pages of the [illegible]ift. [illegible]ht capitalized only pronouns of direct address.

> . . . . die wissenschaft kann menschen, die es versäumen, für die vernunft einzutreten, nicht brauchen. sie muss sie mit schande davon jagen. denn sie mag soviele wahrheiten wie immer wissen, in einer welt der lüge, wo sie keine besitzt, wenn diese und die sie besitzt ihr gelegentlich und ohne weiteres an die gurgel greift, wird sie sich nicht scheuen müssen. das ist der grund, warum die wissenschaft einen menschen wie mich nicht in ihren reihen dulden kann. (140/126)

And this self-expulsion from the ranks of science is sharpened and concretized in reference to Andrea, who now is himself a teacher. Galilei, as Andrea takes the manuscript, speaks of this act as an "enteignung," (143/128) a philosophical term here used as a pun: Galilei has provoked Andrea into taking the manuscript, into stealing it from him (<u>expropriation</u>); and Galilei has indicated that the author no longer belongs to the scientific world, and must be <u>disowned</u>. Brecht visualizes the process in the brief moment when Andrea offers his hand to Galilei, and Galilei

> (nimmt sie nicht, unsicher): mein augenlicht ist schlecht, andrea. ich sehe nicht mehr, ich glotze nur. (143/128)

Then, just before the end of the scene, Galilei states why he did not take Andrea's hand:

> als er mir die hand reichte, dachte ich daran, dass er jetzt ja selber lehrt. (143/130)

It is an effective self-condemnation; Galilei's hands are soiled, and the scientific world can have nothing more to do with him.

Of importance to an understanding of the unstable mixture of this text is the fact that Galilei's failure, his capitulation, is presented not only as traitorous simply to science, but to society. Galilei analyses his case quite as he does in the final version, as an abandonment of the social responsibility of thought.

> ANDREA: . . . viele sahen auf Ihre astronomische [illegible], die ihren [illegible] so [illegible] [illegible] eifer, weil [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] dass die [illegible] [illegible] auf [illegible] fakten über[illegible]. [illegible] sagen, da[illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] und das [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], wie nun ge[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]kugeln und we[illegible] von ihnen sich dr[illegible]n. . . .
>
> VIRGINIA: davon darf nicht gesprochen werden.
>
> ANDREA: sondern darauf, dass davon gesprochen werd[illegible]fte. . . .

This episode, which corresponds strictly to historical probability,[98] brings home sharply to Galilei the consequences of what he has done.

Andrea tells Galilei quite plainly the effects of his recantation: scientific research has completely ceased in the catholic countries, and has suffered severely even in the non-catholic countries. "Ihr name ist auf den lippen aller derer, die in dem ungehemmten fortschritt der naturwissenschaften eine bedrohung der allgemeinen ordnung sehen," Andrea reports. (143/122) And Galilei recognizes the fact:

> ich bin der meinung, dass ich alles zerstört habe—was es an versuchen gab, die dem blinden glauben schädlich [illegible]. ([illegible]26)

To sum up--the elements of Galilei's social failure, his criminality, his condemnation through Andrea and his self-condemnation, expulsion from science and discredit in the eyes of the world, are all present in the first version. As will be seen, they are not presented as sharply there as in the final text, nor is the final text without additional inventions designed to further lower Galilei's appeal, but these elements are present nonetheless.

Opposite these elements of condemnation and in sharp dissonance with them is the stream of episodes and speeches which shows Galilei in the light of a great resistance-fighter, capable of turning his defeat into a great victory. This is the Galilei of the first fragments, whose actions are dramatizations of Brecht's essay Five Difficulties in Writing the Truth. Despite the fact that Galilei denounces himself, his manner of denunciation is undercut and the smuggling of the manuscript is presented as a victory, which, while not untainted, is still a victory.

The chief manifestations of this attitude are, as will be shown, in the ninth scene and the penultimate scene. However, it must be pointed out that many of Galilei's actions which are preserved in the final version (such as the re-invention of the telescope, the eight-year silence) could

also be interpreted in this positive light--except that in the final version, these are depicted as unsuccessful tactics. Insofar as the first version considers Galilei to have been successful against great odds in smuggling out the manuscript, these previous tactics must be interpreted in the light of a subversive and highly admirable intention. Before proceeding to an analysis of the contradiction of these two tendencies, and the methods Brecht used to bridge that contradiction, an analysis of Galilei's successfully subversive actions must be given.

The first of Galilei's acts to advance his own cause --and the cause of science--while hoodwinking the authorities is, of course, the presentation of the telescope (previously invented in Holland) to the Republic of Venice as his own invention. In the 1938 text, the episode is prefigured by the end of the first scene, in which Galilei and Andrea focus the newly improvised invention onto the street, only to see the bailiff rapidly approaching to collect the milk bill. Galilei has just received 45 skudi from Doppone (the precursor of Ludovico Marsili); when he sees the bailiff, he tells Andrea to quickly stick the money in his pocket. The implication is that Galilei will be searched; his disregard for the "ethics of a business society" has a comic touch. The same comic air pervades the presentation scene. Here Galilei gets the better of

the venerable officials by not even having to read his own statement of presentation; the hated curator reads it for him. The ending (Cf. 143/120) with Doppone's incurable stupidity borders on the slapstick; the final version adds seriousness to the matter with Ludovico's statement that he is beginning to understand something about science.

In the first version, Galilei's move to Florence is motivated singly and uniquely by the necessity to gain time ("zeit, zeit, zeit, zeit, zeit!" (143/31)) to work out the proofs of the Copernican hypothesis. The intention is therefore clearly subversive; Galilei intends to make use of the wealth of the court in order to enable him to combat its influence. When his scheme shatters on the incredible stupidity and cowardice of the court scholars, he utters an uncharacteristic "geht zum teufel!" (143/42) While the plague is raging, he continues his observations, precisely as in the final version. That this is heroism there is no doubt; in the final scene, Andrea reminds Galilei of this episode, but receives the nonchalant reply, "oh, die pest ist nicht so tödlich." (143/123)

The fruits of his perseverance Galilei receives when the Collegium Romanum confirms the accuracy of his observations. Here Galilei is at his peak, and his tactics of dissimulation seem to have brought success, only to be shattered immediately by the news that the Copernican doc-

trine has been put on the Index. Bellarmin warns him to cease and desist from further teaching of the rotation of the earth as a fact, but leaves Galilei the loophole that he is free to treat of this doctrine in the form of a mathematical hypothesis. That this way out is no way out to Galilei, Brecht makes clear in the following scene of the first version, where Galilei is in extremely low spirits. "ich bin ein verbrecher," Galilei says (143/75) and the little monk agrees: yes, Galilei is disturbing the tranquility of the souls of the unfortunate peasants of Italy by casting doubts upon the infallibility of the church. Here Galilei explodes (as in the final version), but important for his development is that he realizes (in the first version) that he is being followed as a criminal. The implication is clear that Galilei, having joined the persecuted, will adopt the tactics of the persecuted.

This expectation is immediately rewarded. Having been forbidden to assail the authority of the ancients concerning the rotation of the earth, Galilei in high spirits again assails their authority in other realms of physics. The church and Aristotle are in the embarrassing position of being founded on errors of such magnitude that investigations in nearly any field will prove them wrong, as Galilei demonstrates with the pieces of ice and an iron needle. As the housekeeper (Sarti) says:

> Jetzt legt er nur eisstücke aufs wasser, da kann nicht viel schlimmes dabei herauskommen.
>
> VIRGINIA: ich weiss nicht. (143/80)

Virginia is right. Then, after the condemnation of Mucius (which occurs in both the first and the final texts), Andrea begins to provoke Galilei to investigate the sunspots, by means of which a rotation of the sun could be proved. The "elder scholar" warns, after Andrea has maliciously implied that Galilei lacks the courage to take up the investigation, that further silence on the part of Galilei would have serious consequences:

> der schaden des päpstichen dekrets, das den copernicus auf den index gesetzt hat, ist riesig. die wissenschaften in den katholischen ländern gehen zurück. soll man wirklich schweigen? (143/[illegible])

Galilei's response to this important question reveals the full extent of Brecht's involvement with the "positive" sides of the figure. For anyone acquainted with Brecht's work, Galilei's method of answer is instantly recognizable. Galilei replies by telling a story about a philosopher named Keunos, who was visited one day by an agent of an oppressive regime who demanded complete servitude of him. Without ever saying a word of agreement, the philosopher served him for seven years. Then the fat and lazy agent died; Keunos removed his body, cleaned the house, let out a breath of relief, and said, no; I will not serve you. (143/83) The

story, of course, and the name Keunos, are derived directly from the Geschichten von Herrn Keuner, which appeared as early as 1930 in Versuche I. These little stories, which contain some of Brecht's most thought-provoking writing, seem to have played the function of a note-book; while not overtly autobiographical, nevertheless they are familiar in tone and show Brecht at his philosophically most intimate. The story which Galilei here tells his disciples is taken from the earliest published Keuner-Geschichte; it is entitled, "Massnahmen Gegen die Gewalt," and is set in precisely the same context as in Galilei:

> Als Herr Keuner, der Denkende, sich in einem Saale vor v[illegible]en [illegible]en die G[illegible] aus[illegible]ach, m[illegible]te er, wie di[illegible] Leute vor ihm [illegible]wich[illegible] und we[illegible]ingen. Er blickte sich um und sah hinter [illegible] steh[illegible] die Gewalt.
>
> "Was sagtest du?" fragte ihn die Gewalt.
>
> "Ich sprach mich für die Gewalt aus," antwortete He[illegible]nner.
>
> Als H[illegible] Keuner weggegangen war, fragten ihn seine Schüler [illegible] se[illegible]m R[illegible]. [illegible]r Keuner sa[illegible] "Ich habe kein [illegible] Verschlagen. Gerade ich muss [illegible]ger leb[illegible] die [illegible]t."[99]

And then Keuner tells the story which Galilei repeats. The next item in the Keuner-stories is entitled "Von den Trägern des Wissens" and is also clearly applicable to the case of Galilei:

> "Wer das Wissen trägt, der darf nicht kämpfen; noch die Wahrheit sagen; noch einen Dienst erweisen; noch [illegible]rungen [illegible]gen; [illegible]ch kennt[illegible]

Wer das Wissen trägt, hat von allen Tugenden nur eine: das er das Lassen taugt", sagte Herr Keuner.[100]

The consequences of Galilei's telling this precise story as a reply to the crucial question are extremely difficult to assess. Certain it is that on the grounds of an ethic which allows the individual (in this case, the intellectual) any public denial of his real beliefs for the sake of survival, no condemnation can be levelled against Galilei. If the context of the play and the further development of the plot allows this ethic to stand, then it is impossible to consider Galilei's eight years of silence and his final recantation as criminal; for, after all, Galilei's recantation (in the first version) did in fact save him from death and in fact enabled him to lay the foundation of two new branches of science, a feat of tremendous historical importance. <u>Does Brecht allow this ethic to stand</u>? That, again, is the central question of the play in all its versions. When Galilei has finished his story, the text has it, the disciplies laugh. Then, "Nur Andrea schüttelt den Kopf." (143/83) Does Brecht here criticize the applicability of his Keuner-tactics to Galilei, or does he criticize Andrea's disapproval? Andrea in the first version has been the impatient one, eager to begin an investigation of the sunspots and to re-enter the political battlefield. He has not approved of Galilei's eight-

year silence, but has begun on his own to investigate the sunspots. He became downright nasty (the text indicates: böse (143/83)) to Galilei when the latter pointed out the danger of further overt research. Thus, Galilei's little parable appears to him as further evasion of responsibility, and as an excuse for further silence. Therefore his disapproval, the shake of the head. What follows after this is not entirely clear.

> GALILEI: ich habe es nicht verstanden in rom, wisst ihr. ich habe ([illegible] EINER RIN[illegible] GESTE, WELCHE ANDEUTEN SOLL, [illegible] MAN SICH [illegible] UND EIN-[illegible] EIN [illegible]NTE) in allen fingerspitzen diesen wapp, mi[illegible]em man sich überall einschlängeln kann. aber [illegible]t das einmal [illegible] meinen zwei zentnern! (Lachen, (143/84)

What precisely did Galilei not understand in Rome? That his previous plan of simply presenting evidence to back up the Copernican hypothesis was not sufficient? That Bellarmin's warning did not make further research impossible? That he would now have to adopt Keuner-tactics? That these tactics will be difficult, but necessary? The context here gives few clues to an understanding of these passages, nor is further disapproval on the part of Andrea ~~indrea~~ indicated.

In any case, when Ludovico arrives and tells the news of the Pope's imminent death, and of Barberini's chances to be the successor, two significant things happen. First,

Andrea discovers by Galilei's impaired vision, and Galilei admits, that he has been secretly conducting observations of the sunspots. In other words, he has been unable to observe the papal decree not to mix himself further into the rotation affair, but had decided to go ahead, even at the risk of his eyesight. The second event, Galilei's decision to carry on his research openly, is motivated by new political circumstances, and is worth quoting:

> die zeit des schweigens ist vorbei! er hat mir damals recht gegeben in der jupitersachel er hat recht, sagte er, seine jupitermonde sind ein harter brocken für die theologen. wir brauchen Sie, sagte er. er hat.?. mathematic gelesen. damit beginnt ?eine neue zeit? der Künste und wissenschaften, nicht weniger. es wird keine furcht mehr geben. das wissen wird eine leid[illegible]schaft sein und die forschung eine wollust. was ist das für eine zeit, wo, zu sagen was ist, als eine untat erac[illegible]t wird! (14[illegible]/[illegible])*

And he continues to rave enthusiastically. A little later on,

> da wird wieder von sonnendünsten geschwatzt und von planeten, die die flecken machen sollen, lauter unsinn und ich soll schwe[illegible]en? sollen sie sagen, galilei wagt nicht den mund aufzutun? nach mir sieht man hin, mensch. die erde dreht sich, das bin ich, der das sagt, verstanden? wenn ich schweige, bleibt sie wieder stehen! (143/89)

And then, after Ludovico has left Virginia, Galilei puts his arm around Andrea's shoulder, and the real explosion occurs:

---

*The question marks indicate illegible or doubtful words.

dann werden wir die dummheit niedertrampeln, wie, mein junge? wir werden ihr die haut abziehen und sie vor uns her tragen. wir werden mit blut darauf schreiben: hütet euch! das heißt, mit tinte! mit tinte! welche gefährlicher ist! endlich wird man diese engstirnigen köpfe zusammenstossen dass sie zerknallen wird vielleicht das erste mal in der geschichte sein, dass grausamkeit gegen die unwissenheit gerichtet wird. ein historisches datum!

ANDREA: und werden Sie das buch über die weltsystem schreiben?

GALILEI: ja und nicht in lateinisch für die wenigen, sondern in florentinisch für die vielen, denn dieses buch sollen alle verstehen. dafür brauche ich leute, die mit den händen arbeiten. denn wer sollte sonst wissen wollen, was die ursachen der dinge sind. . . . das volk, das sich jetzt an allen gassen rührt, werden auf die sonne zeigen und sagen: das ist kein goldenes adelswappen, sondern ein hebel. wir bewegen uns, weil sie sich bewegt. (143/89,91)

One could ask for nothing more. Galilei as he here appears is the most determined, grim and intransigeant revolutionary Brecht had ever depicted. His motivation is not, as in the final version, clouded with elements of sensuality, but is social; Galilei acts voluntarily, in full consciousness of his social and historical position and importance. The scene is immediately followed by the carnival scene, which reveals the extent of strength which Galilei's teachings have gained in the populace. Galilei now is at the zenith of his power.

And then he falls. He does not consider escaping from Italy, but believes that Florence will be forced to protect him. Brought to Rome, he believes to the last minute that

the pope, formerly cardinal Barberini, will oppose an ironclad negative to all attempts to threaten him; Galilei is shown in a brief scene waiting for the Pope in order to demand that his scientific proofs and results be subjected to thorough scrutiny before any action is taken. Outside is the shuffling of countless feet of the members of the papal congregation come to condemn Galilei. He cannot bear the noise and asks to be moved to another room, but it is denied. He does not eat; out of blindness he spills a glass of water. He is treated coldly. In the next scene he recants.

At this point, Brecht's difficulties with the dramatic appropriation of Galilei's recantation present themselves. The figure of Galilei which derived from Brecht's Keuner-stories, from the pages of Five Difficulties in Writing the Truth, the impotent prisoner who nevertheless in the long run conquers his imprisoners, the master of the tactic of victory through passive compliance[101]--this vision of Galilei necessarily had to clash with Galilei seen from the standpoint of the catastrophic social consequences of the recantation. Galilei did smuggle out a most important manuscript, and it was the recantation alone which enabled him to do so--but he also said to Mucius, "He who knows the truth and calls it a lie, is a criminal." The Galilei derived from Keuner, and with it the purpose of the play as a

parable designed to teach tactics in the fact of oppression, clashed with the Galilei seen by Andrea, the man whose recantation permitted the inquisition a free hand; in other words, the parable, the didactic play clashed with the historical and social vision. There were two effects of the recantation: social catastrophe and scientifically revolutionary manuscript. The former, Brecht could not but condemn, the latter he still greatly admired.

That Brecht's thinking had led him into a difficult dilemma shows itself clearly in several elements of the first version. The first of these is the structure of the recantation. Was Galilei tortured? The text does not say. The pope and the cardinal inquisitor do not, as in the final text, come to an agreement on this matter, nor do they even discuss it. When Galilei speaks of the recantation to Andrea, he says that he was convinced by the "unwiderstehlichen argumente der inquisition." (143/126) While in the final version this same phrase stands for the instruments of torture (in the eighth scene), here and in this context it is not clear. Again, Galilei says, and more plainly,

> nichts weniger als die bedrohung mit dem tode ist für gewöhnlich nötig, einen menschen von dem abzubringen, zu was ihn sein verstand gebracht hat, dieser gefährlichsten aller gaben des allmächtigen. (143/123)

So apparently the "arguments of the inquisition" were not instruments of torture, but threats of death. But again, the structure of the scene casts doubts on Galilei's veracity here: Virginia, the spy of the inquisition, is present and listening to every word, as Galilei is fully aware. The suspicion of both Virginia and the officials of the inquisition has already been shown to be aroused (143/116), and Galilei's trickery has also been revealed (143/117)--could this not be more of his double-talk, more slave-language in the style of Aesop? By this structure of the scene, the possibility is even left open that Galilei's recantation was <u>intentional</u>; if he denied the truth in order to save his works and write new ones, he must do so again in front of Virginia, or risk a thorough search of the house. In view of the incomplete fragment already twice quoted, and in view of Galilei's assertion that there are no works which only one man can write, it does not seem likely that Brecht intended to make Galilei's recantation appear intentional without making him appear--in following the logic of the fragment--as despicable also, which is not the case. But, intended or not, Brecht has built ambiguity into the scene.

A more serious, because overt, ambiguity appears in the entire handling of the manuscript smuggle. Brecht's dilemma, whether the subversive writing and smuggling of

the manuscript outweighs the social catastrophe caused by the recantation, necessarily finds its dramatic center in the treatment of the manuscript. The scene (XIV) opens on a note of intrigue: Virginia pretends to leave the room in which Galilei is sitting, but remains behind in order to watch his actions when he believes himself alone. Galilei sits down at the desk (he is almost completely blind now, but not as blind as he pretends to be; cf. 143/118) and is about to begin writing. But then he feels the draft (Virginia has left the door open) and suspiciously calls for Virginia. She leaves silently. Galilei then begins to write. Outside in the anteroom, Virginia tells the guard that Galilei is writing, but that she is turning over every page to the inquisition. The guard reveals that the manuscripts have already been smuggled out, and that a letter announcing a further manuscript has been intercepted. Who smuggled out the manuscripts, he asks? The next line of the text:

> HEREIN EIN GROSSER, BREITER MANN, DER HAFNER.
> ER TRAEGT WERKZEUG. (143/116)

This unmistakably proletarian figure, shoulders, toolchest and all, has come ostensibly to repair the chimney, but turns out to be one member of Galilei's network of agents engaged in smuggling out manuscripts for him. He has brought

back a manuscript which he was unable to smuggle out; he has brought it back because "sie wissen, es ist draussen, suchen es also hier nicht." (143/117) In a half-whispered, half-shouted conversation they discuss the state of their network; then, with the manuscript still not hidden, a knock comes on the door.

> GALILEI (steht, gehetzt, mit den blättern): wohin lege ich es jetzt?
> DER HAFNER: offen auf den tesch. GALILEI TUT SO.
> (143/117)

Thus, throughout the scene until Andrea takes it, the manuscript lies unprotected on the table; while Virginia comes in with the oculist, the oculist takes the top sheet of the manuscript to test Galilei's vision (and is deceived by him). Again, when the oculist leaves, Galilei picks up the manuscript to find a hiding place--again Virginia comes in, and he hurriedly drops it. Thus, throughout the scene the manuscript is the focus of tension. Will it be discovered? That is the question which, in a performance of the play, would occupy the audience, overriding all other considerations. This constant intrigue with the manuscript is certainly an indication of the importance which Brecht attached to the smuggle; it is perhaps also an indication of his own fascination with the uncertain value of the manuscript as against the social catastrophe which made its production possible.

The clearest indication of all of Brecht's solution to his dilemma is the structuring of the manuscript smuggle relative to Galilei's self condemnation. This is the sequence of events in the first version: Andrea enters, with Virginia present. Andrea relates the complete cessation of scientific and other free inquiry after the recantation. Galilei condemns himself and expels himself from the ranks of science. Virginia leaves. Galilei reveals that he has the manuscript. Andrea takes the manuscript and leaves. Thus, the condemnation of Galilei occurs <u>before</u> the smuggle of the manuscript! Seen from the perspective of the final version, what is missing is Andrea's construction of the "new ethic," against which Galilei (in the final version) directs his murderous analysis; with the sequence of events of the first version, the consecutive con- and destruction of the new ethic is not possible. Therefore Galilei's self-condemnation relates only to the retrogression of science following his recantation. Galilei does not condemn either himself or Andrea for taking the manuscript. Rather, the happiness and friendliness of teacher and pupil as they part (143/128-129) indicates that a difficult and trying project has just successfully been completed. It is not quite, but almost, a happy end.

However, not all is well. The dilemma into which

the convergence of two separate visions of the figure of Galilei--one parabolic, one historical--had brought Brecht, was not so easily resolved by leaping from one horn to the other in the middle of the scene. In the first part of the conversation with Andrea, in which Galilei condemns himself, Brecht was seeing his figure historically, i.e. from the standpoint of historical progress toward a betterment of the human condition. In the second part, after Virginia has left, Brecht saw in Galilei a figure who parabolically applicable to the situation of Brecht's audience in 1938. The difficulties of this simple division of the scene are apparent in every instance in which Brecht begins to evaluate the second part in terms of the first; i.e. when he evaluates Galilei's exemplary feat of deceiving his prison guards in terms of what it has contributed toward historical progress. The question is, how will the damage be repaired? Four times in the scene Galilei takes up this problem, and four times Brecht is forced into most un-Brechtian refuges. Here is the first of these instances:

> GALILEI: sicher, die physic und die astronomie vermögen über meinen fall zur tagesordnung überzugehen.
>
> ANDREA: bestimmt, nach einer weile. (143/123)

Andrea's hesitant and sceptical reply immediately reveals

the weakness of Galiei's argument (whether Brecht intended it or not) and marks it as a rationalization. Of course science will eventually pass on to other matters on the agenda, but the more important question is, when, and to what good? Galilei's rejoinder is a measure of the thinness of the ice on which Brecht is treading:

> . . . freilich, bis dahin, was sollte noch für diese kühnen neuen lehren sprechen, nachdem ich, eine ihrer autoritäten, sie der lüge geziehen habe? sie scheiden ganz aus der welt. nichts mehr spricht für sie, ausgenommen einige fakten. (er hat angefangen, mit einem kleinen, aus der tasche gezogenen stein zu spielen. . . er lässt ihn auf den boden fallen.) (143/123)

The phrase "except for a few facts" and the play with the Beweisstein are both futile attempts at salvage; had not the same few facts existed in Aristotle's time, and had Galilei himself not received sufficient demonstration by the Florentine academicians and the inquisition that a few facts and a falling pebble are not sufficient weapons? Does it not follow that a few facts and the fall of a pebble described in a manuscript will be no greater aid? Thus the first intersection of Brecht's two visions of Galilei resulted in an attempt to diminish the gravity of the social damage done by the recantation to the implied benefit of the manuscript, but at the expense of the most important lessons which Galilei had learned. It appears that Brecht was not at all satisfied

with this solution. In a fragment which has its chronological place somewhere between the 1938 version and the American version, he himself exposed its difficulties:

> Ganz von selber, heisst es, werde die Wahrheit und das Nutzliche sich durchbringen. Deshalb konne die Wissenschaft sich ruhig von den Machtigen den Mund zustopfen lassen und mit einem andern Korperteil fruchtbar sein. Bei kuhlem Nachdenken ist das jedoch eine zwar angenehme, aber falsche Annahme.[102]

The fianl version puts the matter very succinctly and very differently from the first version:

> Es setzt sich nur so viel Wahrheit durch, als wir durchsetzen. (94)*

This was the first instance in which Brecht was forced to resort to a precarious argument in order to uphold his "happy end" in the first version. The second instance fared no better in subsequent revisions:

> GALILEI: einige erlebnisse hätten dich auf eine ganz falsche ansicht bringen können über das, was wir immer die zukunft der vernunft gennant haben. aber natürlich, ein einzelner mann kann sie weder zur geltung noch in verruf bringen. sie ist eine zu grosse sache, als dass sie in <u>einem</u> kopf platz hätte. die vernunft ist eine sache, in welche die menschen sich teilen. sie ist nämlich die selbstsucht der gesammten menschheit. diese selbstsucht ist noch zu schwach. aber selbst ein mensch wie ich kann ja noch sehen, dass die vernunft nicht am ende ist, sondern am anfang. (143/129)

---

* Page numbers not preceded by 143/ refer to the Suhrkamp single edition.

Here Galilei's argument takes place on the level of metaphysics; it is in fact strangely reminiscent of pages out of Fichte's Grundprinzipien der Neuzeit or Hegel's Philosophie der Geschichte. This in itself is a weakness; did not Brecht always test the truth by its concreteness? But even so, the argument will not allow Galilei an escape. The principle that an individual can neither establish reason nor bring it into discredit is plainly belied by the facts; Andrea has already reported the virtual extinction of all scientific thought after Galilei's recantation, at least in the Catholic countries. The fact is, Galilei has brought reason into discredit. And the argument condemns Galilei even while he seeks justification by it: if reason is the egoism of all humanity, then the denial of reason becomes the denial of all humanity's legitimate aspirations. This metaphysical justification, or affirmation, contains inherent problems to which Brecht had not penetrated in the first version. In the subsequent texts, this Hegelian deus-ex-machina was cut. Immediately after the previously cited passage, Galilei continues:

> ich bleibe auch dabei, dass dies eine neue zeit ist. sollte sie aussehen wie eine blutbeschmierte alte vettel, dann sähe eben eine neue zeit so aus! der einbruch des lichts erfolgt in die allertiefete dunkelheit. während an einigen orten die grössten entdeckungen gemacht werden, welche die glücksgüter

> der menschen unermesslich vermehren müssen,
> liegen ewr grosse teile dieser welt ganz im
> dunkel. die finsternis hat dort sogar noch
> zugenommen! (143/129)

The accurate sentence is the second, and it is this sentence only which survived into the American version. The old age did indeed resemble a bloodsmeared old hag, and insofar as Galilei recognizes this, he has arrived at a truthful understanding of the consequences of his recantation. But immediately his argument takes a different turn. If the first troublesome passage here cited was a mere rationalization, and the second showed that rationalization elevated to the metaphysical plane, this passage rises to the symbolic. Mittenzwei is quite correct in terming this passage a "grossartiger Humnus" to the new era;[103] but perhaps it is no coincidence that Galilei (and Brecht) here makes use of a literary form which in religious usage serves the purpose of what Kenneth Burke calls "symbolic manipulation." What is the purpose of the light-darkness symbolism? Its purpose is to indicate that the approaching era, the bloodsmeared old hag, is actually getting darker only because the light (manuscript) has broken in. The coming era of darkness, it says, is in fact only a period of intense contrast; in time, the passage implies, the light will prevail. It must be said of Brecht that when he employs an image which gives an in-

correct picture of reality, he does so (whether consciously or not is not at issue) with radical consequentiality. His image, in fact, is not drawn from optics, but from opthadmology. The effect of increasing darkness upon the break of light is not founded in the nature of light, but in the structure of the eye. The effect which Galilei is describing is not a process in the reality perceived but in the perceiver. The increase of darkness as due to the breaking in of light is, in brief, an optical illusion. Galilei, who ironically is almost completely blind at this point, has superimposed his perception of reality onto the reality itself. This victory of the subjective over the objective has the result that he is now completely free to ignore his own subjective participation in the objective event and is able to overlook the vital fact that it was the recantation which produced the darkness, and not the breaking in of any light.

And thus Andrea hears Galilei analyse his own case, hears science without humanistic commitment condemned, hears Galilei read himself out of the scientific world which suffered an enormous setback from his teacher's recantation. And then, as Galilei reveals that he has a copy of the manuscript which will found two new branches of science, at the pivotal point on which the scene turns from one to the other horn of Brecht's dilemma, Andrea

weeps. (143/127)[104] Whether these for Brecht's theatre extremely extraordinary tears are intended to indicate joy, relief, shock, or some other emotion, their location at the center of Brecht's dilemma shows Brecht's almost fantastic dramatic instinct; had Andrea been fully aware of the contradiction which Brecht was attempting to bring into fusion, his tears would have been the result of hypertension. At any rate, he soon recovers his composure. For a short while he attempts to resist Galilei's open provocation to "steal" the manuscript, but then, his manner betraying "begierde nach der neuen arbeit seines lehrers, des grössten physikers der zeit," (143/128), he gives in and hides the manuscript under his coat. Having thus "enteignet" (expropriated) his teacher's work and "enteignet" (disowned) its author, having promised not to fear danger all-too-much, he is happy that he came, and leaves, Galilei's "magnificent hymm" ringing in his ears.

> GALILEI: wie ist die nacht?
> VIRGINIA: hell.
> GALILEI: das ist gut. da kann er seinen weg sehen.
> (143/130)

These are the closing lines of the scene, a magnificent example of the compression into a few words of a world of meaning. Galilei was first seen in the morning, he is last seen at night. He who taught Andrea to see must now see through Virginia's eyes. Virginia, who is filled with

the eternal light that passeth understanding, does not know what meaning the light has for Galilei and for Andrea. Finally, Galilei gives his benediction to Andrea's journey with the manuscript, knowing that there is enough light for him to see his way. In this last recurrence of the light-darkness motif, all the elements of the play are brought together in a symbolic fusion: yes, it is night, but already there is enough light for the path of the carrier of truth to be clearly visible.

The heart of this fusion, the last line, did not survive into the next version.

Given the content of the contradiction with which Brecht was confronted, no form of conclusion was possible other than a symbolic fusion of its terms. One could not see the social effects of the recantation historically and also see the manuscript and its smuggle as a parabolic example worthy of imitation at the same time without having recourse to forms which serve as well to conceal as to reveal reality:

> Über diesen grauenvollen Schlund
> Trägt kein Nachen, keiner Brücke Bogen,
> Une kein Anker findet Grund.
>
> --Schiller, "Ideal und Leben"

But if one is tempted to criticize the tendency toward a "happy end" which this first version reveals, it is well

to remember the epigraph which follows the title page of this study. That Brecht, in the "finsteren Zeiten" in which he wrote, could still foresee and believe in a happy end to the era of doom and destruction which Nazi Germany was on the point of introducing to the world is a feat worty of notice and respect. Brecht's resolution in holding to his vision of the manuscript smuggle as an exemplary action which turned present defeat into even-tual, long delayed victory, did not proceed from a Holly-wood formula nor from a propaganda manual, but from the knowledge that hope in the future was the only weapon which could keep Brecht and his limited audience from defeatism and despair.

In the next year, 1939, Brecht returned to the his-torical material at the point where he had left it in Galilei. Mother Courage, a chronicle from the Thirty-Years War, has little of the optimism which suffused Galilei. War had broken out and Brecht began to retreat before the advancing German armies. In 1940, in Finland, he praised its beauty:

> Der Flüchtling sitzt im Erlengrund und nimmt
> Sein Schwieriges Handwerk wie auf: das Hoffen.[105]

In July of 1941 he arrived in the United States; in 1945, with Germany defeated, he set about revising the work for an American production. In the midst of that process came Hiroshima.

CHAPTER THREE:

The Necessity of Revision: 1948

Galilei had its world premiere in the *Züricher Schauspielhaus* on September 9, 1943, under the direction of another former student of Fiscator, Leonard Steckel.[106] Meanwhile Brecht had been attempting to interest the American theatre in his works, with only limited success.[107] *Galilei* was most fortunate of all; as early as 1948, two "renaissance men" in their own right,[108] Orson Welles and Charles Laughton, had expressed their interest in the play and had planned a joint production. However, that plan soon failed "when the clash of these two strong temperaments led to the inevitable quarrel."[109] A screen adaptation with Mike Todd as producer-director was also planned, but came to grief over Todd's insistence on Hollywood "renaissance" settings and props; Brecht insisted on simplicity.[110]

But Laughton's interest remained strong, and by 1945 an English version for the American stage, based on an existing translation of the 1938 text, had been commissioned and completed. In the meantime, however, Brecht had begun to revise the play and together with Charles Laughton created the text which forms the basis of the final German edition.[111] Laughton's and Brecht's was a curious collaboration due to the fact that Laughton spoke no German and Brecht little English; they translated everything by gesture, in the manner of the party game, charades.

> Wir trafen uns zur Arbeit für gewöhnlich in L.s grossem Haus über dem Pazifischen Ozean, da die Kataloge der Synonyme zu schwer zum Herumschleppen waren. Er gebrauchte diese Folianten viel und mit unermüdlicher Geduld . . . . Wir benötigten solche ausgebreitete Studien, da er kein Wort Deutsch sprach und wir uns über den Gestus von Repliken in der Weise einigen mussten, dass ich alles in schlechtem Englisch oder sogar in Deutsch vorspielte, und er es dann auf immer verschiedene Art in richtigem Englisch nachspielte, bis ich sagen konnte: Das ist es. Das Resultat schrieb er Satz für Satz handschriftlich nieder. Einige Sätze, viele, trug er tagelang mit sich herum, sie immerfort ändernd.[112]

Then, in the middle of this pleasant and instructive collaboration, came the event which was to result in a radical revision of the play:

> Das "atomarische Zeitalter" machte sein Debut in Hiroshima in der Mitte unserer Arbeit. Von heute auf Morgen las sich die Biographie des Begründers der neuen Physik anders. Der infernalische Effekt der Grossen Bombe stellte den Konflikt des Galilei mit der Obrigkeit seiner Zeit in ein neues, schärferes Licht. Wir hatten nur wenige Änderungen zu machen, keine einzige in der Struktur.[113]

And in the concluding remarks to the American performance, Brecht describes the general reaction of mourning and shame which followed the dropping of the bomb, the feeling that this victory was a defeat, and the consequent secrecy and restrictions on free scientific investigation and publication imposed by the authorities.[114] Galilei had again become very timely, but in a different way.

Before proceeding to an examination of the revision, the question must be asked and answered why Brecht did not proceed to change the play immediately in 1938 when he learned of the discovery of the process for splitting the uranium atom by German physicists? The brief note relating this event, which precedes some of the German editions of the play, would have made very little sense in front of the version of 1938. The answer is that an era may well be born in a laboratory, but it must make its debut in public. When the bomb fell on Hiroshima, it brought out into the open the full potential of that laboratory discovery of 1938. Then it not only created a new version of Brecht's play, but it also created an audience for tha t new version. The aim of Brecht's 1938 audience—victory over Nazi Germany—had in 1945 been achieved. With Hiroshima, the conflict of scientists with authority assumed a measure of present and public interest probably greater than at any time since 1633. Brecht had written the play

in 1938 in order to reach a specific audience; he rewrote it in 1945 for the same reason. Not only had his vision of Galilei changed, but his audience had changed also.

*

The text which emerged from the Brecht-Laughton collaboration does not sufficiently differ from the final 1955, 1956, and 1957 German editions to merit consideration as a separate and distinct version in its own right. With two exceptions which will be noted, the English text and the final German text have the same content and the same message; the major difference between the two is that the English text has been severely condensed in order not to provoke the impatience of the American audiences.[125] Especially the long monologues in which the play abounds have been drastically shortened by comparison both with the 1939 and the final texts. Nor, as would be expected after translation, is the text identical in every respect where it has not been condensed. Some speeches have been inserted in a somewhat different sequence, one minor character has a different name (the iron-founder; Matti in U.S.), and other unimportant differences appear. For the reasons a) that the U.S. text and the final German text do not represent different versions, and b) that the U.S. text lacks the fullness and richness of phrase and expression which the German text has, the assessment of the revisions which follows

is based on a comparison of the two German texts, one of 1938 and the other of 1955. It is understood throughout that reference to the "final" text or version means both the German and the American texts, unless the changes which Brecht introduced between 1945-47 (American performance) and 1955 are specifically noted. There are in addition a few very minute discrepancies between the text published in 1955 and the text appearing in the Modellbuch, but as these are of no contentual consequence whatsoever, they will be ignored. Page numbers in parentheses throughout refer to the Suhrkamp single edition as the most generally available text.

*

When Brecht said that he and Laughton had to make only a few changes, none at all in the structure,[116] he is understating the case somewhat. In fact the sequence of scenes has been left undisturbed (with one half-exception) and exactly the same events in Galilei's life are treated in both versions, but the changes which were introduced were certainly more than a few. These changes do not amount only to a few rephrasings or minor alterations, but reveal a thoroughgoing and consequential rethinking of the entire play along new lines, radically altering its tendency. On the basis of a detailed comparison of the two texts it can

be said that the 1945 revision affected, approximately speaking, three general areas.! While a rigid classification of the revised elements is neither possible nor desirable, yet the following outlines emerge:

I. "Dramatic improvements." These are changes that did not materially alter the content or tendency of the play, but sharpened and polished its expression. They are changes which (one supposes) would have been made in any case, apart from the event of Hiroshima.

II. "Reconstruction of the social conflict." These are changes, in some cases crucial, in some cases trivial, which alter the structure of the political conflict, increase or decrease Galilei's politifal acuity, sharpen the social expression or alter the structure of the self-condemnation. These are the changes most evidently motivated by the coming of the atomic eral

III. "Solution of the motivation problem!" These are changes, on the whole important, which introduce into Galilei's motives in acting an element of sensuality or instinctuality. These are changes made possible and necessary by the reconstruction of the social conflict.

It is readily evident that the important changes are those of the second and third groups. For the present, each of the three areas will be examined separately, an attempt will be made to reconstruct and analyse the reasoning which

led Brecht to make these revisions, and the differences between the versions will be noted in some detail.

I.

In the absence of all the notes and fragments, including presumably the scraps of paper which Laughton carried around in his pockets for days and days, it is not possible to say how much of the play had already been revised when the bomb fell. But in at least the one case of the fragment dating from between 1939 and 1945 (quoted in the last chapter), Brecht had already begun to revise before Hiroshima. Perhaps in some measure the precariousness of the conclusion of the first version had become apparent to him without external stimulus. Nevertheless, the revisions of the second and third group derive so clearly from Hiroshima that by and large one must conclude that the revisions of the first group date from before Hiroshima or, in any case, had little connection with that event. Such a revision, a "dramatic improvement on the 1938 text is, typically, the addition of Federzoni, the lens-grinder who cannot read Latin. In the first version, Galilei's determination (in the ninth scene) to write his works in the common language appears as mere spontaneous rhetoric. In the final version, because Federzoni's inability to read Latin prevents him from participating in the sunspot controversy, Galilei's

decision arises naturally out of the action of the scene and becomes dramatically comprehensible. Then Federzoni is substituted for the "elderly scholar" of the first text; a familiar character has been put in the place of a nameless and faceless one, and the play has gained in color and in characterization. Of a similar effect is the elimination of a Doppone, the very stereotype of a flippant and stupid son of the aristocracy who provided little in the first version but comic relief and was useless in the later scenes. By having the more serious Ludovico Marsili—no less a son of the aristocracy—appear in Doppone's stead, Brecht saved himself and his audience the difficulty of introducing an important character in the middle of the play. The same tightening-up of characterization and of plot is evident in the elimination of a hint of a sub-plot involving Andrea in a love affair of his own. Similarly, the subtle touch of changing the masks of the cardinals Barberini and Bellarmin from those of a fox and an asoto those of a lamb and a dove adds a measure of serious irony to the proceedings; although this change could perhaps also be classified under the second heading. Clearly simply improvements are the several occasions when monologues in the first version have been broken up into dialogues, especially at the beginning of the ninth scene. Most of the emendations in the fourth scene, the restructured dialogue of the seventh scene, all

serve to clarify the dramatic progress. Particularly in the handling of minor characters these revisions add greatly to the play's color and consistency.

II.

From one day to the next, Brecht said, the biography of the founder of modern physics read differently; the infernal effect of the Big Bomb set the conflict of Galilei with the authorities of his time in a newer and sharper light. On the basis of what has been learned from the first version, and as a result of the detailed investigation of the differences between the texts it is possible to reconstruct this new vision and to add specificity to Brecht's general statement.

Brecht's terminology already gives the vital clues. He speaks not simply of Hiroshima, but of the significance of that event; he uses the term, "atomic era." Although this phrase in 1968 is already little more than a cliche, it had special meaning for Brecht in his revision of the play. In commenting on the 1938 version, he said that it had been one of his intentions there to give "ein ungeschminktes Bild einer neuen Zeit."[117] One of the elements which

had made Galilei attractive to Brecht at that time was his identification with the renaissance, with a new era of hope. Consequently the debut of yet another age, a new "new era," was a matter of the deepest concern to Brecht in relation to his work of revision. The vision of a new age of hope, of a night--but a bright night!--with which the first version had concluded, would have to be re-examined in the light of this latest new age of terror and fear in order to discover the resemblances or relationships between them. The second clue which Brecht's wording gives reveals the nature of the relationship more specifically. He does not say, "the biography of Galilei," but he says that "the biography of the founder of modern physics" read differently. The use of the description rather than of the name, and the use of that particular description, already indicates a certain distantiation. Now Brecht thought of the central figure of his play not in terms of the applicability of one of his actions to the present day, but in terms of the historical relationship between all his actions and the present day. It is one thing to see in Galilei a great and clever physicist and man (which he was), and another thing to see in his historical action of over 300 years ago the source of the present age of atomic precariousness. Consequently, Brecht was forced to revise his admiration for the exemplary smuggle

of the manuscript; he could no longer (and no longer had any occasion to) evaluate that action in terms of its tactical enviability, in terms of its worthiness for emulation, but in terms of the results it produced. His vision was therefore entirely pragmatic, and entirely historical. The following statement in its precision and definite tone makes clear the content of that new vision:

> Die Atom-bombe ist sowohl als technisches als auch soziales Phänomen das klassische Endprodukt seiner wissenschaftlichen Leistung und seines sozialen Versagens. 118

Thus a direct line had been established between Florence, Rome, and the devastation of Hiroshima; from not only the recantation, but also from the smuggle, to the atomic bomb. What were its implications?

With the intention of making the Galilei-material useful to his potential audience by portraying as exemplary the manner in which the defeated prisoner deceived his captors, Brecht in the 1938 version had encountered difficulty in reconciling this intention with the undeniable fact that the recantation had resulted in a social catastrophe. The tactics of Keuner fitted ill with the historical facts of the case. Had Brecht originally chosen a different example, taken an example from literature (as in <u>The Mother</u>), or had he invented an example (as he largely did

in Carrar), then these difficulties might never have been encountered. But Brecht in 1938, at the moment when Fascism began to assume historical, epochal dimension to him, was attracted to the case of Galilei precisely because of one aspect of its historical reality: Galilei had been the standard-bearer of a new age and had been able, in the face of defeat and of the approaching era of darkness, lay the foundations of a new and different age and eventually defeat his captors. Such characteristics are not found in fiction and cannot easily be invented, as is evident, given the difficulty of inventing a fictional herald of a real historical period. But, having once touched upon historical reality, the play had to penetrate fully into it or not at all; (a little history is a dangerous thing.) The attempt to incorporate this particular didactic element (the smuggle as example for the present) into this particular historical subject (the life of the founder of modern physics) was only half-historical and therefore a precarious mixture. The attempt, as was seen in the last chapter, necessitated the resort to a) a rationalisation contradicting what Galilei had already learned about socio-historical struggles, b) a vision of history as the inexorable march of a metaphysical principle, c) an image of historical periodicity based on an optical illusion, and d) a symbolic affirmation

of a new historical period in terms of a natural phenomenon. All these forms have one thing in common: they view history unhistorically. Only in this way was it possible to salvage the didactic element of the smuggle as an exemplary action.

When the bomb fell and established for Brecht a clear and unambiguous historical line from both the social catastrophe and the manuscript—both results of the recantation—to the atomic era, these unhistorical elements in the first version could no longer be tolerated. As Brecht remarked, although the atom bomb of 1945 represented victory for the United States in the Pacific campaign, it was received by the people he observed with all the shame and dismay of defeat.[19] A radical revision of the 1938 version along historical and pragmatic lines was called for.

Brecht began revising along these lines in the first scene. In both versions Galilei begins as very much the "man of the renaissance," a great and many-sided figure, vigorous in his thinking and in his movements. The social orientation of his thought and his optimism about the new era are clear from the start. A small addition to the first text, seeming actually to draw on one of the fragments belonging to the preparations for the first version, but

not included in it: Galilei says that he had known that a new era had arrived ever since in his youth he had observed construction workers revise a centuries-old method of arranging ropes, after a dispute of five minutes. (page 10). The little anecdote not only serves to accent his divergence from the stereotype of the spiritualized and bookwormish scholar,[120] but to indicate the social stratum from which Galilei drew this conviction. In the same long introductory speech, another small addition to the first text sharpens the social and historical concreteness of the struggle which is taking place:

> Denn es wird diesen neuerungs-süchtigen Menschen unserer Städte gefallen, dass [illegible] neue Astronomie nun auch die Erde sich bewegen lässt. (10)

The reference to the cities indicates the social content of the new astronomy; it will not simply be a new way of seeing the universe, but a science needed by someone for practical tasks. In this case as throughout the speech, social historians will recognize constant reference to the conditions of the Italian renaissance: the voyages, the development of the cities, new inventions and new processes of manufacture, changes in religious sentiment, the breaking up of hierarchical or monocentric conceptions, etc. After the far Galilei frustrating conversation with the curator, another addition shows Galilei warning the child, Andrea, not to talk about "their" ideas to other people, because

the authorities have forbidden it. He explains what seems to the child a contradiction by pointing out that the Copernican doctrine is no more than a hypothesis and has not been proved true or false. As the dialogue with Sagredo in the third scene (in both versions) shows, Galilei believes in the sufficiency of this explanation. This belief in the sufficiency of evidence against authority remains unshaken throughout the scene in which the Florentine academicians refuse to look through his telescope; in the final version, typically their dispute with him ends on a point of social class snobbery. (59) The plague-scene and the scene in which Clavius confirms Galilei's findings are essentially identical in both texts, as is the development of the social conflict in the scene in which the cardinals announce to Galilei the decree setting the Copernican hypothesis on the index. The eighth scene (conversation with the little monk), besides having been considerably sharpened and lengthened in the final version, contains three interesting revisions. One is that Galilei now has already begun to fear the instruments of torture; another is the trenchant remark already cited in connection with the difficulties of the first version:

> Es setzt sich nur so viel Wahrheit durch, als wir durchsetzen; der Sieg der Vernunft kann nur der Sieg der Vernünftigen sein. (94)

The third addition is one of the few instances in the play

in which Galilei's language becomes violent:

> Zum Teufel, ich sehe die göttliche Geduld ihrer Leute, aber wo ist ihr göttlicher Zorn?
> DER KLEINE MÖNCH: Sie sind müde! (95)

The net effect of these additions is to show Galilei as more insightful (for the moment) and as more impatient than in the first version, but also as more depressed, both by the spectre of torture and by the divine fatigue of the peasants.[121]

The ninth scene reveals a set of very important revisions. Most striking of all is the fact that the entire Keuner (Keunos) episode, together with all hints in its direction, have been cut. The Keuner story, in the first version, functioned as answer to the question whether it were wise to remain silent in view of the great need for clarification of the sunspot controversy. In the final version, Galilei answers the same question with

> Ich kann es mir auch nicht leisten, dass man mich über einem Holzfeuer röstet wie einen Schinken. (101)

The spectre of torture and the memory of the fate of Giordano Bruno here have taken the place of Keuner in a most significant way. Galilei has not kept silent in the hope of outlasting his oppressors (as did Keuner) but out of fear. In carrying through this revision consequentially, Brecht removed all traces of subversive intention from Galilei's secret observations in the attic; they were the result of his <u>Wissensdrang</u>. The same line of revision is

evident in the following addition:

> So treten wir ein in die Beobachtung dieser Flecken an der Sonne, welche uns interessieren, auf eigene Gefahr, ohne zuviel auf den Schutz eines neuen Papstes zu zählen. (112)

Thus the ascent of a new pope is not the ultimate justification for the re-entry into the controversy. The change in political circumstances is not here the real cause of Galilei's decision, but only the trigger which released at this particular moment the sequence of events to which Galilei's Leidenschaft would have driven him sooner or later in any case.[122] The net result of these revisions is to shift Galilei's motivation away from the political-subversive—as will be seen in more detail under the third heading. Only when the decision has already been made does Galilei foresee the social changes which it may wreak, and here the violence of his language in "keine Gnade mehr mit denen, die nicht geforscht haben . . ." (113) is far more controlled than the veritable outburst of righteous sadism of the first version.

In the tenth scene the ballads have been completely rewritten but without change of content or force. One subtle addition sharpens the social concreteness of the popular demonstration: in the first version, the scene was simply a carnival street-scene; in the final version, it has become the official carnival procession of the craft-guilds. (114)

In the eleventh scene, and uniquely as a result of the 1945 revision, Galilei has definitely begun to backslide politically and socially. There is in the final version nothing left of his wrath of the ninth scene. The first version, however, showed him rather outraged at the reception he receives, typically:

> da arbeitet man und arbeitet man. für die katze. in der letzten zeit frage ich mich, wie die gründe sein müssen, mit denen man ihnen beikommen könnte. vielleicht könnte ich ebensogut strauchdieben, wucherern und meuchelmördern 10 gründe aufzählen, die ihre sünden schlecht machen und dann hoffen, sie liessen ihr handwerk. als ob sie es nur betrieben, weil sie es für ehrenvoll halten! (148/98)

It showed him also as being avoided by everyone as if he had the plague, including an "artilleriefeldzeugmeister" who formerly had always been very friendly. But in the final version, and very significantly, the relationship is exactly reversed. A new figure appears, Vanni, the iron-founder, intelligent and politically acute representative of the rising urban industries. Vanni offers Galilei all his support and cooperation, and warns him of measures imminent against him--But Galilei rejects his help, refuses his analysis of the danger imminent, and loudly disassociates himself both from Vanni's cause and from the guild-demonstrations shown in the previous scene.[128] Galilei remains firm in his belief that the grand-duke of Florence, his former pupil, and the pope will absolutely protect him from any measures aimed against him. Only when Cosmo receives him coldly, and it is too late, does Galilei think

of escape. As a result of the revision, the scene has an entirely new tendency. In the first version he had been the victim of deception and rejection; in the last, he deceives himself and others are the victims of his rejection and ignorance.

Brecht undertook another incisive revision in the scene showing the conversation between the pope and the cardinal inquisitor. Added is the information that Galilei has powerful friends not only in the North-Italian seaports but also abroad, at Versailles and the Viennese court. Added also is the decision that Galilei is not to be tortured, but only shown the instruments. As a result, the whole balance of power between Galilei and the authorities has been changed in the revision. Whereas the first version saw Galilei slowly exhausting every means of defense only to be finally delivered powerless into the hands of the inquisition and presumably (though not with certainty—the text is ambiguous) tortured, the final version sees Galilei rejecting one after another every means of defense save his evidence, and at the crucial moment, unaware of his real political power, recanting before an impotent bluff. He is no longer the victim of forces greater than his, but victory lay within his reach.

The same line of revision dictated the elimination of a half-scene, ("Verwandlung") immediately after the

conversation of the pope and the inquisitor, showing Galilei waiting in an antechamber waiting for the arrival of the pope for a private audience, expecting as promised to have his scientific evidence thoroughly examined before the session. With Galilei showing open signs of physical weakness and of discouragement and intimidation at the sound of the shuffling feet of countless ecclesiastical dignitaries come to condemn him, one of his guards remarks:

> es muss für ihn sein, was es für einen mann war, der vor der sintflut einen frühjahrsregenschauer erwartete und dann kam ein schnürlregen und dann kam ein unendlicher guss und daraus wurde die sintflut, nicht? (143/108)

Since the pope does not appear, Galilei here appears as the victim of betrayal, overwhelmed by forces too great for him to have imagined. In eliminating this half-scene, the final version drives toward a sharper interpretation of Galilei's case; he is not to appear as the victim of others, but others will appear as the victims of his betrayal. Thus Brecht had exactly reversed his judgment of the case.

The capitulation scene, while not exactly identical, shows only subtle revisions under this heading. Of the following sentences in the final version,

> ANDREA: Sie werden ihn umbringen. Die Discorsi werden nicht zu Ende geschrieben. (132),

the second is an addition. Here Brecht is subtly baiting the audience, holding out in Federzoni's manner of reply, "verstohlen: Meinst du?" the hope that Galilei will recant in order to complete the Discorsi. It is a subtle provocation to the audience to build up the "new ethic" which Andrea will proclaim in the following scene. In the first version Brecht's own thinking was not on a solid enough footing to allow such a provocation.

The next scene contains the most important revisions of all; central among these is the structure. In the first version, as was seen in greater detail in the second chapter, Galilei had in Virginia's presence condemned himself and expelled himself from science, and then after Virginia had left, he proceeded to the matter of the manuscript, after which his tone lightened and brightened considerably. But in the final version the order of these vital elements, condemnation and smuggle, is reversed. By means of this actually very simple inversion, a scene so inherently unstable that it became sentimental (Andrea's tears) was turned into what is probably the most severe and murderous critique of the present state of civilisation which the Brecht-opus has to offer.

In the first version, Galilei's self-condemnation had been motivated entirely by the news of the scientific and social catastrophe caused by the recantation. When Andrea

finished his account, Galilei had spent his ammunition against himself and becomes almost benign. But in the final version, the report of the social catastrophe (which has also been considerably sharpened, particularly in its reference to Descartes) elicits from Galilei nothing but defensive provocation (as in "Meine Oberen sehen meiner seelischen Wiedergesundung entgegen") or the attempt to salvage something positive out of the recantation's effects (as in "Leider gibt es Länder, die sich der Obhut der Kirche entziehen. Ich fürchte, dass die verurteilten Lehren dort weitergefördert werden") or else long and painful silences. Then Virginia leaves, or rather, Galilei throws her out; she has been present only during an extremely hostile series of interchanges revealing to her only that Andrea is Galilei's enemy. And then, with extreme difficulty, battling against himself with every word, out of vanity, with true cowardice, and in a nasty tone (see hereto Brecht's stage directions)[124] Galilei reveals the existence of the manuscript copy. At once and without tears or the least "provocation" (as in the first version) Andrea snatches the manuscript out of its hiding place. With the foundations of a new physics in his hands, he instantly begins to construct a new ethic to match. Galilei, momentarily interested, lets him build stone after stone on his edifice, up to the very top:

> Hätten Sie in einer Glorioie von Feuer auf dem Scheiterhaufen geendet, wären die andern die Sieger gewesen. (149)

This had been the crux of the first version, to show that Galilei's defeat at the hands of the inquisition was converted into a victory by means of the smuggled manuscript. But at this point Galilei cuts Andrea off and begins to send his shining edifice crashing about his ears. "Sie sind die Sieger." With that, the hopeful vision at the end of the first version has been demolished. Speaking academically, his hands folded over his belly, Galilei reviews his case point for point, leaving no rationalizations, no metaphysical hymns, no lyrical glosses, no symbolic fogs unexamined or intact. The self-condemnation is a condemnation of the "new ethic" and thus of the manuscript; all avenues of escape back to the first version have been consequentially cut off.

In other ways also the scene has been sharpened. Instead of reading Montaigne (or in a variant, the passage from the Discorsi about the large and small machines) to Galilei, Virginia reads sentences from the scriptures to which Galilei is obliged to dictate a commentary showing his complete subservience to the social policies of the church, in opposition to his convictions of the first scene. The whole "manuscript-fetishism" of the first version, with broad-shouldered proletarian agent, oculist's examination,

and the cloak-and-dagger suspense have been eliminated. Logically, the friendliness of both greeting and parting of teacher and pupil in the first version has been replaced by mutual cold hostility at the beginning and, for Galilei curt impatience, for Andrea repulsed fascination, at the parting. Brecht had followed all of the implications of the first version to their logical conclusions and then put these in the mouth of Andrea in the form of the "new ethic," delivering through Galilei a pitiless historical critique of the ahistorical, unhistorical conclusions of the first version. By penetrating fully into the historical reality of his subject matter, he had exactly reversed his earlier judgment.

Consequently, the problem of the new era had to be resolved in a different manner. Of the mixture of metaphysics and symbolism which affirmed the new age in the 1938 version, all that survived into the American version was:

> Well.—This age of ours turned out to be a whore, spattered with blood. Maybe, new ages look like blood-spattered whores.[125]

The light-darkness imagery had been eliminated both because it was fallacious, held out false hopes, and because it was no doubt a reference to Nazi Germany, which by that time was no longer quite so Nazi. Blood-spattered whore was perhaps too extravagant an image, but essentially accurate. However, in the final German version, all that remained of even that image was one word, "Puah." According to

Brecht's collaborator and disciple, Käthe Rülicke, the basis for this somewhat cryptic one word is given in Galilei's self-condemnation; "die Mühe und der Spass, sie aufzufinden, bleiben dem Leser."[126] But it is not necessary to engage in a literary treasure hunt in order to find the secret clue which, with perhaps too much of the List der Vernunft, she has concealed. The entire self-condemnation is in itself the description of the way in which a new age began, and of its essential characteristics. It is a description by the founding father of modern science of that period which the "children of the scientific era" are privileged to be able to call the present. When Andrea said, in parting,

> Ich kann mir nicht denken, dass Ihre mörderische Analyse das letzte Wort sein wird (154)

he was expressing another historical truth. Despite that murderous analysis, the new era which produced the atomic bomb and used it is the era founded on Galilei's social failure and his scientific contributions; the new era is the era founded on Andrea's new ethic. It is not quite the same new era nor the same new ethic which Galilei had proclaimed in the first scene of the play, but nevertheless, doch, it is a new era.[127]

By adding to it in 1945 a few lines of verse, Brecht completely inverted the meaning of the final scene, in which Andrea crosses the border. Without the verses, it reads

like a tableau on "Truth escaping from Oppression"; with the verses the perspective is inverted: "Truth escaping from the Oppressed."

> Wir, die wir wissensdurstig sind
> Er und ich, wir blieben dahint'. (155)

Finally, even that was too ambiguous a conclusion after the resounding climax of the previous scene; Brecht omitted this scene from the performance text.[128]

III.

If full penetration into the historical reality, or in different words, the thoroughly historical vision of the life of Galilei allowed Brecht to come to different and clearer conclusions about the processes which lay at the foundation of a new era, it also allowed him to come to grips with another problem which had plagued the first version, namely the motivation of Galilei's actions. Galilei's motives in the first version, up to the recantation, were straightforwardly political. To usher in a new order of society, a new age, he needed to prove the Copernican hypothesis. To prove that hypothesis, he needed time. To win back the time wasted instructing the Doppedes and Marsilis, he needed the money they brought in. To get

the money, he plagiarized the telescope. With the telescope he made discoveries which demanded more time. To gain more time, he moved to Florence. When the papal decree made further publication impossible, he kept quiet until the politically opportune moment which, perhaps a la Keuner, he knew would arrive. With a new pope but with the decree still in effect, he put pressure on the pope from below by popularizing his teachings. Then, the first version has it, inexplicably everyone abandoned him (i.e. the "artilleriefeldzeugmeister"), the pope refused to see him, and he recanted. But why did he recant? To that question the first version was not able to give a satisfactory answer. The explanations "irresistible arguments of the inquisition" or "threat of death" are not only inherently unclear, not only doubly suspect in view of Virginia's presence, but clearly contradict Galilei's earlier consistently political behavior. Nowhere in the first version is there a hint that Galilei might be a physical coward. Nor, if it is correct to believe that Brecht in 1938 intended to impart a lesson in tactics to the German exiles and therefore had in mind a parallel between Galilei and the German anti-fascists, would such a motive have been thinkable.[129] If on the other hand Brecht chose the only remaining alternative, that Galilei's recantation was an intentional and deliberate act

of cunning designed to allow completion of the manuscript which would found a new era of science, then Brecht collided with the historical fact that that act had had catastrophic consequences. The manner in which Brecht in the first version was able to bridge this dilemma after the recantation has been seen. However, having created a "symbolic fusion" of this polarity after the recantation, Brecht found his contradiction split [illegible] at the other end, before the recantation. While with his "happy end" he managed to reconcile the antagonistic consequences of the act, the possible motives of the act renewed their internecine warfare. Given the requirements of the "happy end," neither cowardice nor cunning were acceptable motives. Therefore the ambiguity of Galilei's explanation and its double ambiguity in the presence of Virginia were not accidental oversights or chance flaws, but entirely necessary and indispensable constructions. Leaving the motives hanging tensely in midair was a necessary means of upholding the "happy end." Having abandoned concreteness after the act, Brecht had to abandon it before the act also.

When the atomic bomb exploded Brecht's "happy end," the ambiguity of motive could be dispensed with. The catastrophic consequences of the recantation moved into the foreground, the manuscript smuggle had lost its fascination; his audience was no longer composed of fragments of the defeated German Left, and cunning as a motive for the recantation

had completely lost its point, and, of course, its commendability. Brecht was thus able openly to declare the other motive, physical cowardice, and to concentrate on it. It would be necessary to review the figure of Galilei in the light of this fleshly weakness of his; thus Brecht introduced elements of fleshly weakness into nearly all of Galilei's motives. The logical manner of accomplishing this task was to make of Galilei a sensualist, a prey to the delights of the flesh. But Brecht, in a stroke of genius and of biographical accuracy went one step further. He simply ignored the supposed mind-body dualism which had formed the mainstay of European psycho-logical philosophy since Descartes by showing Galilei as prey both to the delights of the flesh and the delights of the mind. Brecht used Galilei's sensuality to motivate not only his fleshly weakness but also his intellectual power.

Sensuality had not been absent from the 1938 version, but had taken no part in the chain of motivation. As a result of the revision, sensuality is not only an element in every decision which Galilei makes or does not make, but has come to permeate his thought to a marked degree. For example, the first scene in both versions shows Gali-lei washing and breakfasting and in both versions contains the demonstration using an apple, the subtle dilemma for Andrea. But already toward the end of the first scene,

an addition to the 1938 text emphasizes Galilei's sensual bent of mind: to explain to Andrea what a hypothesis is, he uses the example of a woman nursing her child at the breast; does the milk flow from woman to child or from child to woman? This example is only one of the great number of instances (many of them additions to the 1938 text) in which milk appears in the play, both as a simple material necessity and as an object of sensual gratification. Galilei never distinguishes between the two categories; for him sensual pleasure is a material necessity.

As early as the third scene, sensuality becomes a part of Galilei's motivation. Justifying to Sagredo his plagiarism of the telescope, Galilei cites need of money and time (as in the first version); but something has been added to the text:

> Und dann, ich kaufe gern Bücher, nicht nur über Physik, und ich esse gern anständig. Bei gutem Essen fällt mir am meisten ein. (38)

An addition is also the following very important line:

> Das Denken gehört zu den grössten Vergnügungen der menschlichen Rasse. (40)

And Galilei's move to Florence, in the first version due solely to need of time, has in the final version become motivated partly by sensual considerations:

> Und ich will die Fleischtöpfe. (43)

Nothing shows more clearly Galilei's identification of

science with sensual pleasure than his treatment of the Florentine academicians in the next scene. As Sarti says in the opening speech, she had advised him to feed them a decent supper before proceeding to his observations, but no, he said, he had something else for them. Galilei thinks that the pleasure of discovery will be sufficient pleasure for the academicians in one evening. The scene thus shows not only their stubborn ignorance, but their sensual perversion when compared to Galilei's universal capacity for taking pleasure. The fact that the part of Sarti's speech dealing with the decent meal is an addition to the 1938 text shows with what consequential subtlety Brecht revised the play in order to show Galilei as sensual as.

He pursues his science even in the greatest adversity, as the plague-scene shows. Not that he remains in the city because of his sensual pleasure, but he does know that if he leaves now, all his earlier discoveries will have been in vain and he will have to start anew. Thus the scene also shows Galilei's capacity for physical heroism, but this is heroism in the grip of his passion for science. Sensuality is also very much present in this scene. Sarti remains behind also, in order to cook his meals; when Sarti becomes ill and Galilei has nothing to drink, an old woman from across the street sets a pitcher of milk before his door, so that Galilei is not forced into

an ascetic existence which might strain his courage beyond its limits.

Additions of sensual elements continue in the seventh scene with the introduction of Lorenzo di Medicis' poem, perhaps one of the most sensual in all of Western literature. Its purpose here is to set an atmosphere of Rome in Spring, of flowering and blooming. But it has a direct thematic relationship to the action also:

> Die schöne Jahreszeit geht schnell vorbei:
> Pflücke die Rose, noch ist es Mai. (84)

"Schöne Jahreszeit" refers to Galilei's triumph: it was brief. Interesting also is a further appearance of the milk-motif, again an addition to the original text. Barberini tells Galilei of the origins of Rome:

> Zwei Knäblein, so geht die Mär, empfingen Milch und Zuflucht von einer Wölfin. Von der Stunde an müssen alle Kinder der Wölfin für ihre Milch zahlen. Aber dafür sorgt die Wölfin für alle Arten von Genüsse, himmlische und irdische; von Gesprächen mit meinem gelehrten Freund Bellarmin bis zu drei oder vier Damen von internationalem Ruf, darf ich sie Ihnen zeigen? (80)

This nicely cynical interpretation of the legend is a subtle offer of bribery. In effect it means that for a small price, Galilei will be offered all sorts of delights. The fact that Galilei is not receptive to this proposal is a clue that his sensuality is not a lechery, a pleasure but not a vice. The same distinction between healthy and decadent sensuality occurs subtly in the

next scene. In another addition to the 1939 text, Galilei is made to reject the beauty of the pearl, produced in a life and death struggle by the oyster. He prefers the healthy oyster, no doubt on his dinner table, and "to hell with the pearl." (92) The little priapus in the garden and the quotation from Horace are further clarifications of his aesthetic:

> Herr, mein Schönheitssinn wird verletzt, wenn die Venus in meinem Weltbild ohne Phasen ist! (94)

This is probably a unique sentence in the literature of social criticism, to which this play without a doubt belongs. Galilei is a man who fights for the truth not only because the untruth is a tool of social injustice, but also because the untruth is ugly to him, simply aesthetically unpleasing. That his aestheticism is not of the contemplative, spiritualistic variety (as for instance in the lines "Beauty is truth, truth beauty,") is self-evident. The fact that Galilei chooses as his example the little god of fertility and such a very mundane ode is further indication that his aesthetic also forms part of his very corporeal sensuality.

As the last lines of the scene make clear, it is also partly Galilei's sensuality, here in the guise of Wissensdrang, which drives him on in his fight with the authorities. It is this "vice" which later becomes so

problematical for him; but his Wissensdrang, his aesthetic, his mental and corporal sensuality are all different sides of the same thing, not antagonistic to one another in themselves but only so under great pressure, as after the recantation. This identity is made almost pictorially clear in the ninth scene, when the announcement of the pope's imminent death loosens from Galilei a veritable flood of thirst both for wine and for knowledge.[130] All the passages dealing with wine and olives in this scene are additions to the 1938 text, as is Galilei's earthy humor in speaking of his daughter. What science means to him, the following passage indicates:

> Barberini im Aufstieg! Das Wissen wird eine Leidenschaft sein und die Forschung eine Wollust. Clavius hat recht, diese Sonnenflecken interessieren mich. Schmeckt dir mein Wein, Ludovico? (106)

Already his wine tastes better, and his future son-in-law becomes less appealing with every sip. This identity of science with sensual pleasure will pursue Galilei to the end; as Ludovico says, in departing,

> Sie werden für immer der Sklave Ihrer Leidenschaften sein. (111)

Thus, despite the dangers which lie ahead, Galilei can contain himself no longer and plunges into research as Virginia in her bridal gown faints heartbroken at his side:

> Ich muss es wissen. (113)

From then on, sensuality comes to occupy an ever more central point in the play. To the iron-founder, Vanni's advice that Galilei flee Florence, he gives two responses: one, that he believes the pope to be his friend and protector, two, that he cannot see himself as refugee because he values his comfort; one political and one sensual reason. Then, trying to decide whether or not to follow Sagredo's invitation to Padua, he rejects the plan again for two reasons, one of which is sensual: his favorite Sicilian wine will not stand the transport. Finally, when it is too late, he intends to carry through his own private plan of escape: to be smuggled out of town in an empty winebarrel. It is a wine-fixation carried to its dialectical conclusion, in a neat touch of irony. All these plans of escape with their sensual elements are additions to the 1938 text.

From then on in the play, all references to sensuality are products of the 1945 revision and show a clear progression toward the recantation. Confronted with the vague danger of the plague, Galilei held fast; but confronted with the direct and immediate threat of torture, he collapses. His sensuality has not changed character or become degenerate, but it has been confronted with a situation with which it cannot by nature cope. The cardinal inquisitor in the twelfth scene accurately pinpoints the church's advantage:

> Man wird praktisch bei ihm nich weit gehen müssen. Er ist ein Mann des Fleisches. Er würde sofort nachgeben.
> DER PAPST: Er kennt mehr Genüsse als irgendein Mann, den ich getroffen habe. Er denkt aus Sinnlichkeit. Zu einem alten Wein oder einem neuen Gedanken könnte er nicht nein sagen. (130)

These lines (additions to the 1938 text) show once more the union of bodily and mental pleasure which drives Galilei onward. Here Brecht has clearly broken through the ambiguity of motivation which plagued the first version, and Galilei's later statement that he recanted out of fear of physical pain has been stripped of all nebulousness.

Andrea's heated accusation after the recantation for the first time assesses the negative qualities of this sensuality:

> Weinschlauch! Schneckenfresser! Hast du deine geliebte Haut gerettet? (137)

Now Galilei's sensuality, formerly his greatest asset and his great positive quality, has turned into a monstrous perversion, a vice of catastrophic consequences. Throughout the last scene, it is precisely as a vice that Galilei thinks of his <u>Wissensdrang</u>. All the sensual elements of that scene are additions to the 1938 text, consequentially eliminating from Galilei's writing and smuggling of the manuscript all traces of a cunning or subversive intention. He has written again out of a deeply-rooted <u>Laster</u>;

"Barberini nannte es die Krätze." (146) He is, as Ludovico had predicted, a slave of his passion. As Brecht commented, he is like a cat who cannot stop mousing, and he hates himself fanatically for this vice, since it means the sacrifice of the last remnants of his comfort.[131]

The coarseness of Galilei's language in reply to Andrea's defense of the central principle of the "new ethic," scientific contribution, is a measure of the perversion to which the sensual pleasure of discovery has degenerated with the recantation:

> Willkommen in der Gosse, Bruder in der Wissenschaft und Vetter im Verrat! Isst du Fisch? Ich habe Fisch. Was stinkt, ist nicht mein Fisch, sondern ich. Ich verkaufe aus, du bist ein Käufer. O unwiderstehlicher Anblick des Buches, der geheiligten Ware! Das Wasser läuft im Mund zusammen und die Flüche ersaufen. Die Grosse Babylonische, das mörderische Vieh, die Scharlachene, öffnet die Schenkel, und alles ist anders! (150)

It is the expression not simply of a selling-out of all social values but also of the end and perversion of the kind of sensuality which Galilei embodied before the recantation. The whore of Babylon functions not only as a symbol of the all-embracing market but also as the antithesis to Galilei's earlier principle, "thinking is one of the greatest pleasures of the human race." The conditions of the market equate the pleasure of scientific discovery with other pleasures bought and sold on the market place; a new physics, an old whore. Both are commodities but neither gives pleasure.

Meanwhile Virginia has prepared the geese which were brought in at the beginning of the scene (also additions) and comes in with a bowl of gooseliver with apples and onion (although Galilei had demanded thyme) which she sets before him. He begins to eat and is still stuffing himself when the scene ends. Not only has his pleasure in scientific discovery turned into a bitter addiction, but the pleasure of eating also has turned to gluttony; he had already had his supper.

This element was sharpened by Brecht between the American and the final German versions. In the U.S. version there is only one goose, and Virginia urges Galilei to eat again, but he replies,

> I had my dinner. Are you under orders to finish me off with food?[132]

In the German version, the degeneration of sensuality after the recantation is carried through with greater consistency.

CONCLUSION

Although the chief purpose of this study, which was to attempt to follow the development of the play from its origins to its final revision, has been completed, the study would end prematurely without an attempt to draw together and offer one or two conclusions at which one may arrive about the play as it stands. Naturally, an analysis of all of the problems of characterization, language, image structure, dramatic structure, literary and other sources and precedents, or the like, cannot here be attempted; and only a superficial attempt will be made to assess the significance of this play in relation to the rest of Brecht's literary opus and to assign it a place in the development of the entire complex of Brecht's thought. Hopefully, a perspective can be offered which will prove fruitful to other readers in understanding the play for themselves.

If there is one thing which this study has been able to indicate, it is that the most important point, the focal point of Brecht's concern with the play, lies in the recantation. This action was the fulcrum of the contradictions of the first version and the act from which the subsequent major revision departed and to which it had to return. It was the recantation from which both a social catastrophe and a scientifically revolutionary work had resulted; Brecht was deeply enmeshed in the paradox of that act, and on the manner in which he finally constructed the motives and consequences of that action depends the play itself. Consequently, of the numberless ways of approaching any play, the most direct and useful for this play will be to plunge straight into its center, into the recantation. If one is to understand the play, one must understand what is involved in the recantation. What is, to speak with Brecht, the Grundgestus of this action?

Two forces are opposed to one another, Galilei and the inquisition. The latter, with its threat of torture, is bluffing. Because of Galilei's political support both at home and abroad, actually to torture him is impossible. But Galilei is ignorant of his political strength. And Galilei, the sensualist, fears physical pain. Therefore he recants. Had he not been ignorant of his political position, he would not have feared torture. Had he been

ignorant but fearless, the bluff would have been exposed. The absence of either his political ignorance or of his sensuality at this moment would have produced a different result. These two elements together are at the bottom of the recantation. Insofar therefore as the recantation contains in it all of the elements of importance in the play, one can base on this analysis a "central description" of the play: Galilei depicts the experience of a sensual and politically ignorant man in the center of a social crisis. From this, one can proceed:

There are a great many clues in the play about the nature and origins of Galilei's political ignorance. In order to understand Galilei's limited vision of politics one can begin with the first scene, in which Galilei, after his frustrating dispute with the curator of the university, explains to Andrea that their ideas should not be talked about to other people:

> ANDREA: Warum nicht?
> GALILEI: Die Obrigkeit hat es verboten.
> ANDREA: Aber es ist doch die Wahrheit.
> GALILEI: Aber sie verbietet es. — In diesem Fall kommt noch etwas dazu. Wir Physiker können immer noch nicht beweisen, was wir für richtig halten. (24)

Does it seem that Galilei is simplifying the matter for the child's sake? No; in the course of further developments it turns out that Galilei was not simplifying. He actually believes that the only barrier to official acceptance of the truth is the lack of empirical evidence. In

his thinking, the only reason why he and others are prevented from teaching the truth is the lack of Beweise. The argument in the third scene between Galilei and the politically more sophisticated Sagredo brings out this vision of progress in history with great clarity. He has just explained some of the implications of his discoveries to his horrified friend:

> SAGREDO: Wie der Verbrannte gesagt hat?
> GALILEI: Wie der Verbrannte gesagt hat!
> SAGREDO: Darum ist er verbrannt worden! Vor noch nicht zehn Jahren!
> GALILEI: Weil er nichts beweisen konnte! Weil er es nur behauptet hat! . . . .
> SAGREDO: Und du glaubst, das macht einen Unterschied?
> GALILEI: Allen Unterschied! Sieh her, Sagredo! Ich glaube an den Menschen, und das heisst, ich glaube an seine Vernunft! . . . . Ja, ich glaube an die sanfte Gewalt der Vernunft über die Menschen. Sie können ihr auf die Dauer nicht widerstehen. . . . Dazu ist kein Mensch imstande. Die Verführung, die von einem Beweis ausgeht, ist zu gross. Ihr erliegen die meisten, auf die Dauer alle. Das Denken gehört zu den grössten Vergnügungen der menschlichen Rasse. (39-40)

The same belief in the omnipotence of Beweise continues to grip him:

> . . . ich werde Beweise dafür bringen, Beweise für jedermann, von Frau Sarti bis hinauf zum Papst. (48)

And again:

> Auch die Mönche sind Menschen, Sagredo. Auch sie erliegen der Verführung der Beweise. (44)

Even after his frustrating experience with the Florentine academicians, he persists. While the plague is raging, he

remains behind for his Beweise:

> Ich kann diese Beobachtungen nicht im Stich lassen. Ich habe mächtige Feinde und muss Beweise für gewisse Beobachtungen sammeln. (63)

That explains the seeming contradiction in him, that he could be heroic in the face of the plague and cowardly before the inquisition; he is heroic within his sphere, and that sphere is his scientific work. For his Beweise he would risk his life again and again (so long as no starvation was involved), but when he faces the inquisition, later, all of his Beweise have long been collected and worked out. Unfortunately the inquisition is not in the least interested in his Beweise; most likely even his Beweisstein has been taken from him, as Federzoni fears:

> Dahin, wo sie ihn hinführen, geht man ohne Taschen. (133)

If his Beweise are ineffective, he is out of his element altogether. When all the possibilities of Vernunft have been exhausted, he is left helpless and he succumbs. He is, in brief, a Vernunftheld, but not a social revolutionary.

This is not to deny him social insight before the recantation. He realizes very well, for example in his conversation with the little monk, that his struggle is not a matter of planets but of peasants, that the astronomic question is in reality a social question. And he realizes also that he was wrong, after Clavius had confirmed his

findings, to have ascribed this victory to Vernunft, rather than to himself as Vernünftiger. He realizes also that his eight-year silence has brought him great fame and reputation, and that this fame puts him in a position of power—but when the time comes to act on this knowledge, he cannot or will not; or as Brecht put it, he simply forgets. Brecht intentionally structured the learning-process of his chief figure in leaps and bounds:

> Er sagt manchmal Gescheitheiten. Zum Beispiel in der 9. Szene erklärt er seinen Schülern, dass der Klerus ihm diese grosse Reputation verschafft habe, weil er geschwiegen hat. Aber er hat sie jetzt, und dann vergisst er wieder, dass er sie hat. Ich glaube, das ist völlig realistisch.[133]

Such a structure does not make the play easier to understand at first sight, but Brecht is probably not far wrong in saying that it is fully realistic. Once, when Galilei decides to write his work on the sunspots in the common language, he acts out of a purely social-political motive and with insight. But immediately thereafter, he falls back on his Beweise and withdraws from the social upsurge which he has created. That scene, in which he rejects the iron-founder's advice and help, is the forerunner of the actual recantation, as Brecht intended it to be,[134] and carries the same two motives as the later recantation: sensuality and political ignorance. But here the reliance on Beweise reveals its social treason, as an <u>insistence</u> on Beweise and nothing but Beweise. The popular uprisings

threaten to carry the conflict to a different level than the scientific-intellectual, and he disassociates himself from them:

> Ich habe ein Buch geschrieben über die Mechanik des Universums, das ist alles. Was daraus gemacht wird oder nicht gemacht wird, geht mich nichts an. (123)

Thus from beginning to end he insists on carrying the fight forward with one weapon only, the sanfte Gewalt der Vernunft.

Sensuality, the second element (on the side of Galilei) in the recantation, can be described with exactly the same phrase, "sanfte Gewalt der Vernunft." Galilei thinks that "thinking is one of the greatest pleasures of the human race" because it is undoubtedly true of himself. As the pope correctly observed, Galilei "denkt aus Sinnlichkeit." Genuss and Vernunft are synonymous in his vocabulary; he could not differentiate the pleasures received from fresh breezes from new shores, a glass of milk, a new era, an old wine, a new star, a Horatian ode, an olive, a Roman spring.

There is no doubt whatsoever that all of these qualities are and were intended by Brecht as virtues, as good qualities. Puritans and ascetics of whatever religious or political conviction consequently will have difficulty in understanding the play; Galilei's sensuality is not a vice. Brecht was specific on this point, both in the Modellbuch and in his other commentaries on the play, for example:

"Vergiss nicht, er denkt der Wollust wegen!
Ist dies etwas Gutes oder etwas Schlechtes?
Ich rate dir, da du im ganzen Stück darüber
nichts der Gesellschaft nachteiliges finden
wirst, und besonders, da du doch selber, wie
ich hoffe, ein tapferes Kind des wissenschaft-
lichen Zeitalters bist, es als etwas Gutes dar-
zustellen."[135]

By uniting Wissensdurst and Weinderst, by creating a character of universal sensuality (polymorphous sensuality, if one prefers), Brecht has made it impossible to condemn Galilei's fleshly weakness without also condemning his scientific achievements. Or rather, the only standpoint from which this is possible is that of the medieval church; but Brecht was writing for the scientific era. Neither is it entirely possible to condemn Galilei for his belief in the gentle force of reason; at least Brecht's writings make it quite clear that gentleness and reason are the principles according to which all the social conduct of mankind ought to be based. Galilei is entirely, in other words, a good man.

But he also becomes a criminal, a traitor to society. Galilei's self-condemnation leaves no doubt of his sincerity, nor does Brecht leave any doubt of his own sincerity in portraying the recantation as treasonous and criminal.[136-138]

One encounters therefore a paradox which is central, in one form or another, to the great majority of Brecht's dramatic works as far back as the "Three-Penny Opera" with

its refrain, "Doch die Verhältnisse, sie sind nicht so," and perhaps farther back yet. A person is shown, embodying all the qualities (or at least intentions) which ought to be the general principles of all life in society, who collides with an actual society in which these qualities lead to the individual's ruin. In order to survive, the ideal or good person must compromise with evil or injustice and thereby enters into self-contradiction. Next the self-contradiction is re-projected outwardly in the recognition that it is the necessary reflection of a social organization in contradiction with its individuals, that the individual self-contradiction is a reflection of the social self-contradiction. Then, basically, the plays end with both contradictions unresolved; sometimes an ironic "happy end" is provided (as in the Three-Penny Opera), sometimes and in some forms the contradiction ends in death (Mannahme, Jasager), sometimes in purposeful absurdity (Mahagonny), sometimes in the depiction of outrageous stupidity (Anna-Anna). The purest form of this process is found in Der Gute Mensch von Sezuan, where the contradiction is treated lyrically and ends, very consequentially, in a cry for help.

Shen Te's recognition of the ethical ideal,

> Keinen verderben zu lassen, auch nicht sich selber
> Jeden mit Glück zu erfüllen, auch sich, das ist gut.[139]

could be rephrased in Galilei's vocabulary with equal applicability:

> "Keinen leiden zu lassen, auch nicht sich selber
> Jeden Genüsse bereiten, auch sich, das ist gut."

Shen-Te's consequent recognition that a world which requires the greatest suffering of its most virtuous people, the same as Mother Courage's realization that something is rotten in a land where great heroes abound, the same as that echoed throughout Brecht's Flüchtlingsgespräche, is also the recognition at which Galilei quietly arrives after his recantation:

> Unglücklich das Land, das Helden nötig hat. (138)

It is Galilei's answer to Andrea's "Unglücklich das Land, das keine Helden hat," it is the defendant's accusation of his jury, and a thoroughly "Brechtian" motif.

But the play cannot end with this recognition that the social order needs to be changed in order to permit a normal, unheroic life. There is a crucial difference between Shen Te's capitulation and compromise and that of Galilei: Shen Te had no choice, she had to capitulate in order to survive. But Galilei's recantation was entirely unnecessary for his survival. He was at no time in danger of physical harm. Nothing would have happened to him, had he not recanted. The social catastrophe was entirely evitable.

Thus for a brief moment in history the contradiction between Andrea's appeal for heroism and Galilei's appeal for a normal society had been suspended. At the moment when Galilei faces the inquisition, Italy needs no heroes, nor does Galilei need heroism; their exchange of bitter accusations is beside the point, based on ignorance of the true historical conditions in which they act. Galilei needed only the knowledge of his social strength in order to launch the new age of hope without any danger to himself. He only needed to know.

By structuring the crisis of the social conflict in this manner, Brecht went a long step farther than in the "classic" exposition-plays like Senzuan. Galilei does not only expose a contradiction in society, but also presents that contradiction as avitable. In this play, Brecht served notice to the present that all of the contradictions of the scientific era, especially the invention and use of the atomic bomb, were avoidable and need not have happened. In thus striking a fatal blow at the aura of inevitability and immutability which is made to surround historic developments and serves as a source for fatalism and impotent despair, Brecht exposed the artificiality of the contradictions of the present and achieved what in his last years he came to regard as the fundamental aim

of his theatre: to present man as subject of his history, and to present the world as changeable.[140]

In Galilei Brecht presented a historical review of the life of the founder of the scientific era, whose education came too late. Brecht's hope was that the children of the scientific era would in their turn learn from the education of Galilei, before—for the last time—it is too late.

***

NOTES

For brevity and convenience, often-used secondary works have been referred to by the name of their author only; works by Brecht by title only. For complete references, see items marked with an asterisk (*) in Bibliography.

PREFACE

1. Eric Bentley, "On Brecht's *In the Swamp*, *A Man's a Man*, and *Saint Joan of the Stockyards*," in Demetz, p. 52
2. *ibid.*, p. 56
3. Peter Demetz, "Introduction," in Demetz, p. 12
4. Mittenzwei, p. 330
5. Hannah Arendt, "The Poet Bertolt Brecht," in Demetz, p. 44
6. *ibid.*
7. Esslin, p. 65
8. *ibid.*
9. *ibid.*, p. 219
10. *ibid.*, p. 191
11. *ibid.*, p. 248

INTRODUCTION

12. Mittenzwei, p. 255
13. William L. Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, Fawcett paperback, p. 271

14. Mittenzwei, p. 134

15. Schumacher, p. 26

16. Grimm, p. 27

17. Sinn und Form II, pp. 214, 229

18. Schumacher, pl 122

19. Grimm, pl 8

20. in Schumacher, p. 126

21. Grimm, p. 11

22. Mittenzwei, pp. 49-71; cf. also Schumacher, pp. 345-380

23. Esslin, p. 51

24. Grimm, p. 18

25. Schumacher, p. 491

26. Mittenzwei, p. 367 fn.

27. Gedichte 4, p. 137

28. ibid., p. 145

29. Esslin, p. 61

30. Grimm, p. 28

31. ibid., p. 29; also Esslin, p. 62

32. Mittenzwei, p. 135

33. epigraph in Gedichte 4, p. 5

34. Gedichte 4, p. 139

35. Esslin, p. 67

36. Versuche 15 (Heft 15), p. 144

37. ibid.

38. in Gedichte 4, pp. 138-9

39. Not surprisingly, the play's central idea is at least as old as Plato. Cf. the Republic, ed. Cornford, p. 112. Cf. Also the discussion of "Scythian tactics" in Bertram Wolfe, Three Who Made a Revolution, paperbound, p. 12

40. Grimm, p. 80

41. Esslin, p. 166

42. Grimm, p. 81

43. Versuche 15, p. 141

44. Cf. Schriften zum Theater, p. 54

45. Esslin, p. 64

46. Stücke VI, p. 218

47. Esslin, p. 65

48. Cavillers at the play's perceptivity cf. Shirer, Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, esp. the chapters "The Farmer in the Third Reich," p. 354; "The Economy of the Third Reich," p. 357, esp. p. 362; "The Serfdom of Labor," p. 362, esp. p. 364 & 369; "The New Order," p. 1223.

49. Versuche 15, p. 144

50. Stücke VI, p. 319

51. ibid., p. 327

52. ibid., p. 330

53. ibid., p. 347

54. Cf. Shirer, p. 412

55. Gedichte 4, p. 16

56. Mittenzwei, pp. 144-6

57. Gedichte 4, p. 138

58. Cf. Shirer, pp. 556, 758

59. Gedichte 4, p. 145

60. ibid., p. 218

61. ibid., p. 145

CHAPTER ONE

62. Gedichte 4, p. 145

63. Flüchtlingsgespräche, p. 112

64. Stücke VIII, pp. 199-200

65. ibid., p. 201

66. Wohlwill, I, p. 41

67. ibid., p. 641

68. The critics who never tire of drawing the parallel Brecht-Galilei:Florence-East Germany, omit mention of these clearer parallels. Why?

69. Cf. Mother Courage, Chronik aus dem Dreissigjährigen Krieg.

70. Wohlwill, II, p. 185

71. ibid., p. 186

72. ibid., p. 188

73. Mittenzwei, pp. 269-270

74. ibid., p. 308

75. ibid., p. 309

76. ibid., p. 395, fn.

77. ibid.

78. ibid., p. 266

79. ibid., p. 273

80. ibid., p. 278

CHAPTER TWO

81. Versuche 14; Aufbau Einer Rolle: Galilei. The Suhrkamp single edition and the Stücke VIII text do not carry this note. Neither does the photostat of the Urschrift.

82. Versuche 14, p. 6

83. quoted in Mittenzwei, p. 284

84. Versuche 1-4, p. 22

85. ibid., p. 13

86. Schumacher, p. 141

87. Versuche 1-4, p. 118

88. ibid., p. 120

89. Cf. Schumacher, p. 313

90. Gedichte 3, p. 92

91. ibid., p. 82

92. Gedichte 4, p. 220

93. Versuche 1-4, pp. 355-356

94. Esslin 254; the same in Rohrmoser, "Das Leben des Galilei," in Das Deutsche Drama II, ed. von Wiese, p. 403; the same in Mayer, Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition, p. 87.

95. Esslin, p. 254

96. Brecht, in Rülicke, p. 294

97. in Mittenzwei, p. 278

98. Cf. Wohlwill, II, p. 184

99. Versuche 1-4, p. 25

100. ibid., p. 26

101. I am here only touching on a stream of thought which runs through a great many of Brecht's writings. Passivity, compliance, capitulation in one form or another are one of the central problems with which Brecht-criticism has yet to deal thoroughly and painstakingly. A simple identification of emotion with irrationality, as in Esslin, chapter 10, is precisely what Brecht was caricaturing in Die Sieben Todsuenden der Kleinbuerger. From the other side, cf. Schumacher pp. 107, 175, 176, 198, and elsewhere.

102. in Mittenzwei, p. 289

103. ibid., p. 282

104. At this exact point there is a large stain on Brecht's typescript!

105. Gedichte 4, p. 228

CHAPTER

106. Grimm, p. 38

107. Cf the list of American performances in Esslin, p. 340; also pp. 74-75

108. H. Agel, Les Grands Cinéastes, Paris 1960, p. 235

109. Esslin, p. 74

110. Joseph Losey (director of the US performances of Galilei), "L'Oeil du Maitre," and Louis Marcorelles, "D'un Art Moderne," in Cahiers du Cinéma XIX, 114, December 1960; pp. 26, 27; p. 52 respectively.

111. Esslin, p. 74

112. Brecht in Aufbau einer Rolle: Laughton, p. 8

113. Brecht, Stücke VIII, p. 201

114. ibid., p. 202

115. Aufbau: Laughton, p. 12

116. Stücke VIII, p. 201

117. ibid.

118. ibid., p. 205

119. ibid., p. 203

120. Aufbau: Laughton, pp. 14-15

121. ibid., p. 30

122. ibid., p. 46

123. ibid., p. 50

124. in Rülicke, p. 303-305

125. Galileo, in From the Modern Repertoire, Series Two, ed. E. Bentley, p. 478

126. Rülicke, p. 274

127. Cf also Mittenzwei's interpretation: "So tief auch Galilei gesunken war, den Gedanken an eine neue Zeit gab er nicht auf." (p. 298) In my opinion, Mittenzwei's interpretation is far too optimistic because groundless. He seems to be re-inserting the glosses after Brecht had carefully excised them.

128. Rülicke, p. 269

129. This difficulty again shows that Brecht had intended to show Galilei as defeated. But the defeat of an individual is usually not blameless unless his death ensues.

130. Aufbau: Laughton, p. 40

131. ibid., pp. 61-62

132. Galileo, in From the Modern Repertoire, Series Two, ed. E. Bentley, p. 469

CONCLUSION

133. Brecht in Rülicke, p. 318

134. Aufbau: Laughton, p. 50

135. Schriften zum Theater, p. 162

136. Brecht, quoted in Mittenzwei, p. 288

137. Aufbau: Laughton, pp. 43, 64

138. Stücke VIII, p. 204

139. Der Gute Mensch von Sezuan, Suhrkamp Einzelausgabe, p. 91

140. Schriften zum Theater, p. 8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(An asterisk indicates that that work was referred to in abbreviated form in the Notes.)

I. Galilei texts

Bertolt Brecht. Das Leben des Galilei, Bertolt-Brecht Archiv No 148, photostatic copy of Urschrift, typescript with handwritten corrections by BB, unpublished, 1938

_____. The Stargazer (sic), (Life of Galileo), translated by Desmond Vesey, unpublished (available at Kenyon College Library, Gambier Ohio), undated. (Translation and stage adaptation of 1938 version)

_____. Galileo, "translated by Charles Laughton," in From the Modern Repertoire, Series Two, ed. Eric Bentley, Indiana University Press, 1952.

_____. Leben des Galilei, Einzelausgabe, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1955.
Critical texts in:
Suhrkamp Hausbuch 1956
Versuche, Heft 14
Stücke VIII.

_____. Leben des Galilei, in Aufbau einer Rolle: Galilei, Henschelverlag Kunst und Gesellschaft, Berlin 1956. (contains minute and inconsequential alterations)

_____; and Eisler, Hanns. Zu 'Leben des Galilei' in Versuche 15. Music and part of final scene from 1938 version.

II. Commentary by Brecht to Leben des Galilei

Bertolt Brecht. "Anmerkungen zu Leben des Galilei" Elisabeth Hauptmann, ed., in Stücke VIII, p. 196

* _____. Aufbau einer Rolle: Laughtons Galilei, in Aufbau einer Rolle: Galilei, Henschelverlag Kunst und Gesellschaft, Berlin 1956, illus.

_____. Kleines Organon für das Theater, paragraph # 68, in Versuche 12 or in Schriften zum Theater.

III. Commentary to Galilei and interpretation

Hanns Eisler. Aufbau einer Rolle: Buschs Galilei, in Aufbau einer Rolle: Galilei, Henschelverlag Kunst und Gesellschaft, Berlin 1958

Günther Rohrmoser. "Das Leben des Galilei", in Das Deutsche Drama II, ed. von Wiese, Düsseldorf 1958. The same essay, abridged, in Demetz.

* Käthe Dallicke. "Leben des Galilei--Bemerkungen zur Inszenierung," in Sinn und Form, Zweites Sonderheft Bertolt Brecht, Berlin 1957

IV. General

Marcel. Les Grands Cinéastes, Presses Universitaires, Paris, 1960

Hannah Arendt. "The Poet Bertolt Brecht," in Demetz.

Eric Bentley. "On Brecht's In the Swamp, A Man's a Man, and Saint Joan of the Stockyards" in Demetz.

Bertolt Brecht, Casper Neher. Antigonemodell 1948, Berlin 1949

* Bertolt Brecht. Flüchtlingsgespräche, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1961

* _____. Gedichte 1-4, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1960-61

* _____. Schriften zum Theater, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1957.

* _____. Stücke I-IX, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1961

* _____. Versuche Hefte 1-15, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1959-60.

* Peter Demetz, ed. Brecht, A Collection of Critical Essays, Prentice-Hall paperbound, NJ, 1962

Friedrich Dessauer. Der Fall Galilei und Wir, Joseph Knecht, Frankfurt/M, 1961

* Martin Esslin. Brecht: The Man and his Work, Doubleday Anchor paperbound, 1961

* Reinhold Grimm. Bertolt Brecht, Stuttgart 1961

Joseph Losey. "L'Oeil du Maitre" in Cahiers du Cinéma XIX 114, Dec. 1960

Louis Marcorelles. "D'un Art moderne" in Cahiers du Cinéma XIX, 114, Dec. 1960

Hans Mayer. Bertolt Brecht und die Tradition, Neske Verlag, Stuttgart 1961

* Werner [illegible]. Bertolt Brecht: Von der 'Massnahme' bis zu 'Leben des Galilei', Aufbau Verlag, Berlin, 1962

* Ernst S[illegible]. Die Dramatischen Versuche Bertolt Brechts 1918-1933, Hütten & Loening, Berlin 1955

William L. Shirer. The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, [illegible]-Crest paperbound, 1959

* John Willett. The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht, Methuen, London 1959

* Emil Wohlwill. Galilei und sein Kampf um die Copernicanische Lehre, Band I, 1909; Band II, 1926; Verlag Voss, Leipzig

***

Titles not directly useful in this study have been omitted. Excellent bibliographies are to be found in Walter Nubel's article, Sinn und Form II, 1957; in Grimm's indispensable work listed above; in Walter Hinck, Die Dramaturgie des Späten Brecht, 1959.

Grimm, op.cit., indicates: "eine umfangreiche Monographie Schumachers (über Galilei) liegt im Manuscript vor." (p. 45) No other sources make mention of this surely valuable study or of its publication.

***

April, 1966. M.N.