



UWS Academic Portal

Max Reinhardt and his company

Simke, Ann-Christine

Published in:
Reinhardt, Jessner, Barker

Published: 02/12/2021

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Simke, A-C. (2021). Max Reinhardt and his company. In M. Patterson (Ed.), *Reinhardt, Jessner, Barker* (pp. 41-62). (Great Stage Directors; Vol. 4). Bloomsbury Publishing plc. <https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/great-european-stage-directors-volume-4-9781474253970/>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Max Reinhardt and his Company

Ann-Christine Simke

The career of Max Reinhardt shows us how the emergence of the star director can be as much a result of the organization as the art produced by that director. The investigation of this proposition will take us not only into the personnel of Reinhardt's company but also into the pages of the in-house journal produced by that company, not only, therefore, into the practical organization but also into the discourse that the organization produced about itself.

Reinhardt's Deutsches Theater in Context

The emergence of Reinhardt as a director on the Berlin theatre scene needs to be understood in the context of the theatre of his day. His directing style presented a fundamental contrast to the highly acclaimed aesthetic of Otto Brahm's Naturalist theatre that the Deutsches Theater had previously been known for.

Otto Brahm (1856-1912), author and critic, had already been heavily involved in the promotion of contemporary Naturalist playwriting in his function as the co-founder of the progressive, independent theatre society Freie Bühne [Free Stage]. On 1 September 1894 he opened his first season as the artistic director of the Deutsches Theater with a production of Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe* [Intrigue and Love]. This was followed two days later by the production of Henrik Ibsen's *Nora* [A Doll's House] and three weeks later by Gerhart Hauptmann's Naturalist play *Die Weber* [The Weavers]. These productions effectively announced the change in the Deutsches Theater's artistic direction. Under Brahm's directorship from 1894 until 1904, the Deutsches Theater developed into a platform for contemporary Naturalist writers, amongst whom Ibsen and

Hauptmann featured as the famous figureheads of their dramatic form. Brahm employed Cord Hachmann and Emil Lessing as his principal directors and ran his theatre by assuming the role of a versatile dramaturg.¹ His literary knowledge qualified him for this work, carefully choosing plays for his repertoire, while his analytical skills and interest in a realistic acting style enabled him to function as a pro-active production dramaturg. In his comprehensive and extensively illustrated publication on the history of the Deutsches Theater, Alexander Weigel describes this specific style which came to be known as the 'Brahm-Stil' as trying to achieve 'a complete illusion of reality: fragmented speech of everyday life, silent and detailed acting with realistic props, within interior spaces in front of muted, earthy colours, with rather dimmed lighting.'² The consequence of the focus on Naturalist drama and realistic acting and stage design led his audience to perceive him as a director who achieved a high degree of authenticity to real life as well as a strong faithfulness to the playtext.³ Brahm's directing style clearly foregrounded the dramatic text and consequently emphasized the literary bias of his theatre aesthetic.

Under the directorship of Brahm, Max Reinhardt, who had been part of Brahm's ensemble from the very beginning, soon developed into a celebrated and highly acclaimed actor who, despite his young age, came to be best known for his detailed and realistic representations of older characters and character parts. He was considered to be a cornerstone of Brahm's ensemble and when he left the Deutsches Theater in 1902 in order to pursue his 'artistic emancipation'⁴ and open up his own stage,⁵ he was not only fined with a contract penalty, but was also confronted by a collective outcry from the theatre press, which constructed Reinhardt's career development, from being Brahm's pupil to breaching the contract with his mentor, into a narrative of patricide. This narrative was solidified when Reinhardt took over the artistic directorship of the Deutsches

Theater in 1905 from Paul Lindau, whose one-season long intermezzo as the artistic director had been uneventful. Reinhardt, by contrast, who had presented several successful productions as director of the Neues Theater between 1903 and 1905, was perceived as Brahm's artistic replacement at the head of the Deutsches Theater and introduced a fundamentally new approach to staging performances.

The Development of the Reinhardt Style

Contributing to the successful narrative of Max Reinhardt's ascent to his status as one of Germany's and indeed Europe's most influential theatre directors are the numerous accounts by his colleagues about his work and his vision. One of these often-quoted accounts is given by Arthur Kahane, Reinhardt's long-term dramaturg, who, in his *Tagebuch eines Dramaturgen* [Diary of a Dramaturg], remembers his first professional meeting with Reinhardt in 1902 at the Café Monopol in Berlin. Kahane's diary was published in 1928, which means that he describes his meeting with Reinhardt and their discussion with the benefit of hindsight and the knowledge of how successfully Reinhardt's career developed. It is interesting how Kahane tries to present a consistent and coherent narrative of the intentionality of Reinhardt's artistic trajectory, which remained seemingly unchanged and uncorrupted over the course of nearly three decades. Everything Reinhardt had postulated in 1902 seemed to have been fully realized during his subsequent career.

Kahane presents Reinhardt's vision as diametrically opposed to the work produced under Brahm. Although Reinhardt acknowledged the qualities of the realistic acting style, he refused to focus on 'a specific literary programme, as little on Naturalism as on others.'¹⁶ He contrasted the dark and muted atmosphere of everyday life as depicted by Naturalist theatre with his bright and colourful

vision of a theatre that shows an enhanced version of life.⁷ The emphasis on visuals and sound ('I cannot tell you how much I long for music and colour'⁸) puts forward a sensual approach to theatre with a focus on the affective qualities of performance and not on its literary value. 'As a matter of fact, the theatre is more than an auxiliary art to other art forms. There is only one purpose of the theatre: *the theatre*, and I believe in a theatre that belongs to the actor.'⁹ As we shall see, a decade later there still seemed to be the need to communicate the principles of Reinhardt's artistic agenda by declaring them in the *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters* [The Journal of the Deutsches Theater]. This indicated the challenge that the process of familiarizing critics and audience with this new approach to theatre posed to Reinhardt's artistic team.

A look at the critical reception of Reinhardt's very first directorial work, the staging of Maurice Maeterlinck's Symbolist play *Pelléas and Mélisande* at the Neues Theater¹⁰ in March 1903, provides an impression of the paradigm shift that his aesthetic represented. Reinhardt had hired the Impressionist painter Lovis Corinth, who, together with the artist Leo Impekoven, created a striking set design. Interesting is the claim by some of the approving critics that Reinhardt had started 'a reform of the stage and costume design,'¹¹ followed by the wish that others would take his new approach as an example. Critics consistently pointed out how successfully his diverse settings affected the audience: from an enchanted birch forest to a scene at the seaside under steep rugged cliffs or a night-time setting in the park; each stage design created a new atmosphere which addressed the audience on an emotional and sensual level. In his review in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, critic Fritz Stahl approvingly stated: 'One does not need to know anything of the drama in order to enjoy this picture',¹² whereas Isidor Landau, a critic with a strong bias towards Naturalist theatre, bemoaned the fact that the dramatic text was no longer positioned at the heart of the production but

instead occupied an equal status to musical and visual elements.¹³ Others, like Alfred Klaar in the more conservative newspaper *Vossische Zeitung*, still focused on a lengthy discussion of the dramatic text in their review, trying to link their knowledge about dramaturgical structure, predominantly shaped by the Naturalist movement, to Maeterlinck's unconventional Symbolist dramaturgy.¹⁴ These different reactions show that Reinhardt had noticeably introduced his move away from the literary-centred naturalistic theatre to a more holistic and sensual aesthetic.

The lack of guidance by a text or adherence to a conventional dramaturgy together with the wider focus on diverse elements of performance challenged the audience's perception. In lieu of a naturalistic theatre that was characterized by a distinct predominance of drama and could be predominantly accessed on a textual and intellectual level, the audience was confronted with theatre experiences that spoke to them on a more phenomenological level, attacked their visceral senses as much as it challenged their intellectual understanding.

The fact that Reinhardt appeared here as a first-time director at a fairly new and less historically charged theatre gave him leeway to experiment without being scrutinized too much by the press. But in 1905, when he started his artistic directorship of the prestigious Deutsches Theater, Reinhardt had to win over a core audience that was used to Brahm's Naturalist theatre, a theatre aesthetic biased towards the literary text and easily readable to those who were used to the 'Brahm-Stil'. Reinhardt's emphasis on the theatre as a holistic and sensual art form presented a challenge to this audience's reading of the stage, and thus his artistic team continuously worked on the communication of his theatrical agenda.

Metropolis, Parvenupolis, Theatropolis¹⁵

However important the aesthetic context of the Deutsches Theater's and ultimately Reinhardt's work is, it is intricately linked to the geographical and demographical circumstances that were at play in the young metropolis of Berlin. Herbert Ihering's (1888-1977) account from 1907, the year he came to live and work in Berlin, provides the reader with a vivid impression of a culturally vibrant area, which today would be situated in the larger district called Berlin Mitte:

I was right in the middle of this young and fresh Berlin, in the vicinity of the Linden and the Friedrichstrasse, the Weidendammer Bridge and the Kupfergraben, the City Palace and the National Gallery. A few steps – and I was at the Deutsches Theater and at Hans Gregor's Komische Oper. A few steps further – and I reached the Lessing-Theater, the Kleines Theater and the Königliches Schauspielhaus.¹⁶

This later very successful theatre critic, director and dramaturg had rented a room in Krausnickstraße, just off Oranienburger Strasse, and in the above cited extract from his autobiography, Ihering poignantly merges important landmarks of the Prussian capital with the new attractions of the burgeoning metropolis. Indeed, Berlin in 1907 presented itself as a young and fresh city and this was the case for several reasons. Since the founding of the German Reich in 1871, Berlin's population, economy and, with it, its cultural assets had grown significantly. Over the course of half a century, 'between 1848 and 1905, the population of Berlin leaped from 400,000 to 2 million; huge suburbs ringing the city added another 1,5 million.'¹⁷ With this increase in status and population emerged a new metropolitan identity: 'Berlin began to be called the *parvenu* capital of Europe; loud, pushy and ostentatious.'¹⁸ In his monograph *Ein*

theatralisches Zeitalter [A Theatrical Age], theatre scholar Peter W. Marx argues that in the narrative of Berlin's rapid ascent to a metropolis of international recognition, the parvenu – the self-made man – is the emblematic figure of a city in which identities are quickly acquired and changed. Moreover, the figure of the parvenu serves as a fundamental driving force for Berlin's metropolitan theatre culture whose inherent motto 'to see and to be seen' served as an ideal platform for the parvenu's project of self-fashioning at the visual surface of society.¹⁹

Ihering mentions the heart of this parvenu culture, the famous Friedrichstrasse, a name iconic for Berlin's nightlife and entertainment district. During the day the nearby boulevard Unter den Linden, which had been the heart of the Prussian state's military self-staging, was now the meeting place for Berlin's upper and middle classes. In illustrious cafés and restaurants and on Sunday afternoon walks, the nouveau-riche citizens paraded the newest fashion and claimed their position at the top of Berlin's society just like the military parades had asserted – and continued to assert, yet not to the same degree – the presence of the Prussian state in the public sphere.

A further landmark mentioned in Ihering's description is the Weidendammer bridge, a bridge across the river Spree emblematic of Berlin's growth and expansion, connecting the district Dorotheenstadt (including the Friedrichstrasse and the boulevard Unter den Linden) and the Friedrich-Wilhelmstadt Theater (north of the river with the Lessing-Theater and the Deutsches Theater). Further along the river Spree is the Kupfergraben, a street leading up to the Museumsinsel [museum island] with, amongst other museums, the National Gallery and ultimately the Hohenzollern City Palace, the residence of the Prussian King and German Kaiser William II. Ihering's short description culminates in an enumeration of the most significant theatres in his vicinity amongst which the Deutsches Theater tried to claim its place at the top. For what

seemed like a city of endless cultural experiences to the nineteen-year-old city dweller Ihering, was, however, a very competitive environment for those who were trying successfully to run a theatre. Around 1910 the city of Berlin hosted about thirty theatre institutions, most of which were privately run as economic enterprises which had to be financially viable.²⁰ And still investors were looking for new theatre businesses to start up, as Max Epstein describes in *Theater als Geschäft* [Theatre as a Business], published in 1911. Concerned about his observation that 'in Berlin, there are at least 20 people milling about with nothing else in mind than the launching of a theatre enterprise,'²¹ he methodically explains step by step what a theatre entrepreneur has to consider when starting up a new theatre business in order to avoid financial ruin. Epstein covers a range of issues, from the building regulations to an efficient ticket sale system to the renting out of facilities or the best way of handling press relations. His book is as much a guidebook for his contemporaries as it is a cultural portrait of the contemporary theatre scene in Wilhelmine Berlin. His advice on the best theatre location is very helpful for learning more about the Deutsches Theater's theatrical neighbourhood. Although the area seems to be saturated with theatres, a true theatropolis, Epstein acknowledges the district around the Friedrichstrasse with its highly frequented train station and array of shops and locales to be an ideal area. It meets the criteria of accessibility and vibrancy, which he considers to be the key factors for drawing in large audiences. According to Herbert Ihering, the issue of the district's density of theatres does not pose an obstacle since every theatre has its own specific profile; he even goes so far as to attest that Berlin enjoys a healthy balance of different theatres.²² Concerning the demographics of the Deutsches Theater's audience, Siegfried Jacobsohn, Ihering's subsequent editor-in-chief at the theatre journal *Die Schaubühne*, differentiates between two kinds of audiences at the Deutsches Theater. He personally dislikes the loud and

ostentatious crowd which, according to him, attends any kind of sensational Berlin premiere 'which are insufferable due to the vapour of impropriety of a tarted up and clamorous cohort of show-offs.'²³ Instead, he recommends attending a performance during the week where he describes the audience as consisting of 'quiet, educated and tasteful people from all of Germany's social classes and regions.'²⁴ Jacobsohn identifies with this kind of audience and claims that they appreciate the Deutsches Theater 'because for thirty years now, it is full of memories of celebrations of art, because it is simple and intimate and graceful in a good way.'²⁵ As problematic as this glorifying description of the right audience for the Deutsches Theater is, Jacobsohn is not alone with his criticism. Influential theatre critics like Maximilian Harden (1861-1927) and Alfred Klaar (1848-1927) articulated similar concerns about the superficial attitude of some parts of Berlin's new audiences.²⁶ Regardless of whether one would want to join them in their critique or dismiss these accounts as heavily biased towards a glorification of the established *Bildungsbürgertum* [educated middle classes], what these accounts ultimately show is the change in the demographics the Deutsches Theater was trying to address.

Concerning its location and demographics, the Deutsches Theater therefore was both advantaged and challenged at the same time. Factors like the easy access to the Deutsches Theater owing to the train station nearby, the highly frequented area around Friedrichstrasse and a loyal core audience were certainly considered advantageous to Reinhardt's theatre business. At the same time, these factors can be interpreted differently: located in a highly frequented area of Berlin with entertainment competition right around the corner, Reinhardt had to satisfy the hunger for new and flashy entertainment which the audience of parvenupolis was developing, while at the same time trying to live up to the Deutsches Theater's artistic and historical importance. Successfully bridging the

gap between those seemingly contradictory demands meant to establish a continuity of artistic standard while at the same time drawing in audiences large enough to secure the theatre's profitability.

Dramaturgical Practices at the Deutsches Theater

Key to the efficient functioning of Reinhardt's company, and to the production of his artworks, was the role of dramaturg. In the British theatre the dramaturg, despite now becoming more common, is still hardly known. The position is perhaps better known as literary manager, a role that for instance Kenneth Tynan and John Russell Brown filled when Laurence Olivier and Peter Hall respectively were Directors of the British National Theatre. The dramaturg is a much better known figure in German theatres, dating back to Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's association with the short-lived attempt to create a national theatre in Germany at the end of the eighteenth century. The role of dramaturg has been described by Adam Versényi as follows:

A dramaturg is a person with knowledge of the history, theory, and practice of theatre who helps a director, designer, playwright, or actor realize their intentions in a production. The dramaturg . . . is an in-house artistic consultant cognizant of an institution's mission, a playwright's passion, or a director's vision, and who helps bring them all to life in a theatrically compelling manner. This goal can be

accomplished in myriad ways and the dramaturg's role often shifts according to context, and is always fluid.²⁷

As we shall see, Max Reinhardt, while undoubtedly controlling the artistic output of his theatres, was indebted to his two major dramaturgs, Felix Hollaender and Arthur Kahane.

Although in the nineteenth century theatres had already widely employed dramaturgs, the introduction of an institutionalized dramaturgical office, responsible for the literary management as well as the inner and, above all, outer communications of the theatre, was an important development under Reinhardt's directorship. It became a necessity and cornerstone of the administration of his growing theatre imperium. The dramaturgical practice at the Deutsches Theater was highly organized and although Reinhardt's work was advertised under the label of the ingenious director – also referred to as 'the professor' – his creative practice was fuelled by the artistic team with which he surrounded himself. The two heads of his dramaturgical department were Felix Hollaender and Arthur Kahane. Joined by changing assistant dramaturgs, Hollaender and Kahane consistently accompanied Reinhardt throughout his career at the Deutsches Theater.²⁸ In his diary, Kahane humorously describes a chaotic but typical *Regiesitzung* [directorial meeting] with Reinhardt and his artistic as well as technical staff. This description is very informative in regards to the distribution of tasks at the Deutsches Theater as well as to the way in which Kahane portrays his dramaturgical position:

Everyone is present. Even the busiest, the administrative director. . . Aside from him: both of the dramaturgs: one of

them the quasi minister of the theatre's foreign affairs, the other the literary office clerk working on text, concept, casting etc.: furthermore, he has to provide for some humour in those meetings. . . While [the technical team] is quickly gathering designs and models, the foreign minister, with a bold leap, is already at the director's left ear and whispers to him – mysteriously and in a low voice, but still loud enough so that everybody has to listen – the battle report from the ten theatres of war. The poor man has to fight with the authorities, with the press, with the competitors, with the most famous and most recalcitrant authors; the most prominent members bearing down on him. He has lawsuits, appointments, peace agreements and engagement deals behind him as well as ahead of him, and so, in the theatre world, as with everywhere else, the political tune is the nastiest.²⁹

In this almost allegorical description, Kahane compares the theatre with a state at war, in which both of the dramaturgs occupy central positions in the government – one of them responsible for foreign affairs, the other one assuming the role of home secretary. He effectively portrays them as being indispensable to the smooth running of the theatre and it almost seems like he is fiercely defending the importance of the dramaturgical advisors. This does not seem surprising when looking at the contemporary satirical discourse surrounding Reinhardt's 'army of dramaturgs'³⁰ who figured prominently in caricatures and satirical plays like Hermann Bahr's (1863-1934) *Die gelbe Nachtigall* [The Yellow Nightingale], which premiered in 1907 at the Lessingtheater, practically around the corner from the Deutsches Theater. The six dramaturgs in this satirical play

are reduced to redundant, inarticulate bystanders who are lurking in corners, unable to make a decision without the approval of their charismatic artistic director. In this context, it does not come as a surprise that Arthur Kahane defended his seminal position in the theatre institution by emphasizing his valuable contribution to the theatre's survival in the face of constant competition (not least from the Lessingtheater).

The two fundamentally important but very different dramaturgical job profiles were split between Hollaender and Kahane with the former fulfilling the task of the outward facing dramaturg and the latter focusing on the literary desk job inside the institution. The difference between the two dramaturgs with regards to their work but also to their personalities is a recurring theme in the account of actors and directors who worked with them. In his autobiography, actor Eduard von Winterstein (1871-1967) simply states: 'Hollaender was loud, Kahane was quiet, this characterizes the difference between those two men most aptly.'³¹ According to von Winterstein's description, Hollaender was an energetic and clamorous personality, who knew how to handle the press and the public relations of his theatre, giving his dramaturgical profile the distinct edge of an advertising man knowing how to sell his product ('market crier'³²). Kahane, by contrast, seems to have embodied the stereotype of the bookish and intellectual literary dramaturg. Von Winterstein admits his fondness for Kahane, with whom he had long, stimulating discussions in his office. However, he recalls that Kahane's popularity amongst the ensemble of the Deutsches Theater was adversely affected by Reinhardt's habit of delegating unpleasant tasks, like delivering bad news about the recasting of roles or the rejection of scripts.³³ With mordacity, Kahane himself describes this thankless aspect of his profession at the beginning of his diary and draws the conclusion that the dramaturg, despite

serving as the artistic conscience of the theatre, will always be its sole scapegoat.³⁴

Time and again, by contemporaries as well as theatre historians, Kahane has been described as no less and at the same time no more than Reinhardt's right-hand man.³⁵ This familiar trope can also be found in the most recent article on Kahane in 2007 in the *Journal for Studies of History and Culture of the Jews, Ashkenas*. Tracing the considerable influence of the many Jewish dramaturgs in Berlin's theatrical culture, the author, Anat Feinberg, explains Kahane's seminal position in the infrastructure of the Deutsches Theater. However, he also claims that Kahane almost vanished behind the overbearing name of the ingenious 'Professor Reinhardt'. In contrast to his dramaturgical colleague Heinz Herald (1890-1964), so Feinberg argues, who managed the experimental stage *Das Junge Deutschland* [Young Germany] at the Deutsches Theater, Kahane did not have a proper project of his own, thereby simply remaining 'Reinhardt's dramaturg'.³⁶

However, there was one area where the presence of the dramaturg with a strong voice in his own right becomes very noticeable, the publication of an in-house journal, *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*. The journal might not have been Kahane's own exclusive project but he was certainly the animating force in this endeavour.

Blätter des Deutschen Theaters

On the evening of Saturday, 26 August 1911, the Deutsches Theater Berlin opened its seventh season with a premiere of Friedrich Freksa's new play *Der fette Caesar* [The Fat Caesar]. That evening, most audience members would have noticed a change in the routine of their theatre visit. In addition to the playbill of the evening informing the audience about the artistic team behind the

production as well as the cast onstage, every audience member received the first issue of the new in-house theatre journal *Die Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*. Therefore, a look around the auditorium of the Deutsches Theater before the lights went down might have shown audience members thumbing through or even curiously studying this sixteen-pages-long, unfamiliar booklet with a drawing of the recognizable Deutsches Theater façade on its cover, probably wondering about the function and purpose of this publication. Flipping it open, the curious spectator would have been addressed by the head dramaturgs of the theatre, Arthur Kahane and Felix Hollaender. In a preface to this first issue and to the project of their theatre journal in general, they elaborated on its purpose and, on a larger scale, the purpose and aim of their theatre, the Deutsches Theater under the directorship of Max Reinhardt. The preface was followed by seven texts that differed in genres, ranging from explanatory statements by dramatists about their work to poems and short commentaries on events of the day. These contributions varied in form and content significantly, yet, all of them related in some way or other to the Deutsches Theater's artistic and dramaturgical agenda.

The title of the theatre journal can be roughly translated as *The Journal of the Deutsches Theater*, however a faithful translation of this title would have to respect the original term *Blätter* – the plural of the word *Blatt*, which translates into either a *sheet of paper*, or, in a *pars pro toto* meaning, is a colloquial term that designates a newspaper or journal. This twofold meaning already hints at the ambivalent nature of the *Blätter*. They can both be considered as a loose collection of ideas and statements with a distinct experimental stance, however, they can also be seen as seeking the status of a proper journal amongst other legitimate print media in Wilhelmine Berlin. These *Blätter* reveal something of the mostly hidden dramaturgical work of Kahane and Hollaender which played a seminal part in the process of the branding of the label Reinhardt. In a style that

was part education, part propaganda, the two leading dramaturgs described the artistic direction that the Deutsches Theater was taking:

This journal is concerned with what we think is the concern of the Deutsches Theater. . .

New routes and new objectives lie ahead of us. And since it is essential to protect a work that we deem to be good and just against everything that wants to disturb, to repudiate any misinterpretation and misconception – we open up the workshop. No new idea! It is naive and wrong to think that art speaks for itself to its contemporaries, especially if there is a neat distinction drawn between success and understanding.

No artist yet has conquered his time with his first attack. . .

Critical objection, however, which accrued from the matter itself, has never inhibited us. And yet we think that the essential idea of what we aimed for, and sometimes even achieved, was not always recognized. Therefore it seems useful to us to articulate the result of long-time experience if it is supposed to point to and have an effect on the future.

To us, the essence of this result is: the theatre belongs to the theatre. It has always been our effort to give it back to itself. Its fantastic colourfulness, the infinity of its possibilities and variabilities, the interweaving of sound, word, colour, line, rhythm create the soil from which grow its deepest impacts.

The theatre is neither a moral nor a literary institution.

All the attempts of theoretical heads to alienate it from its actual destiny, to turn it into a secondary aid, a mere servant

of poetry, have to ricochet off its resilient nature. Theatre and literature are separate terms. . .

This was executed more methodically than any spectator would have guessed – no matter if we, informed by contemporary sensibilities, tried to transform masterpieces from the past into a lively present or risked to apply our forces to an experiment; attempts which were not always successful. On a route prescribed to us, we sought to expand the frame of current theatre, to heighten its effects, to make the contact with the audience more intimate. Thus, it was not a coincidence that we moved from the small theatre to the arena. We will continue on this route. Perhaps not without cause, we are confident that new, clear views and perspectives will open up to those who follow us.

Felix Hollaender.

Arthur Kahane.³⁷

To a reader from the twenty-first century, this lengthy extract from the first issue's preface might first and foremost provoke criticism. Too boastful seems the tone in which the Deutsches Theater praises its project, too obvious is the clear and urgent need to regulate and control, maybe even police the audience's reception. It can be argued that this frank language ['naive and wrong', 'misconception'] is simply reflecting the strong-worded criticism of the contemporary theatre press³⁸ and that a contemporary reader would not have seen this as an unusual choice of words. However, the attempt almost to force the reader/spectator into a certain mode of perception remains a rather

problematic aspect of the *Blätter* and points to their uncomfortable position between propaganda and educational purpose. Simply taken at face value, the preface alludes to several issues that Kahane and Hollaender are trying to address in their function as head dramaturgs of the Deutsches Theater. They establish clearly that the work of the Deutsches Theater is concerned with innovation. According to them, their innovative approach is based on a holistic concept of theatre that promotes the equality of all the different elements in performance and discards the supremacy of the written word. In allusion to Schiller's famous speech *The Stage Considered as a Moral Institution*³⁹ in 1784 – which featured as a prominent motto in the bourgeois theatre of the previous century – and in reference to the strong literary bias in the Naturalistic theatre movement at the end of the nineteenth century, they problematize the instrumentalization of the theatre for moral or literary purposes. Instead, they put forward the autonomy of the art form theatre and thus implicitly strengthen the position of the director. Their main interest lies in the specific sensual and affective qualities of performance and in creating a special, more intimate relationship with their audience. According to Kahane and Hollaender, a significant aspect of their commitment to the audience is to create new theatre spaces, one of which is the arena stage, which can facilitate a renegotiation of the stage-auditorium divide.⁴⁰

However, it becomes clear throughout their manifesto-like text that there is an urgent concern to communicate the above-described agenda appropriately. The head dramaturgs of the Deutsches Theater are explicitly worried that their audience is largely oblivious or even hostile towards attempts for innovation in staging, set design or theatre architecture ('And yet we think that the essential idea of what we aimed for, and sometimes even achieved, was not always

recognised.')

The emphatic purpose of the *Blätter*, therefore, is to communicate the Deutsches Theater's artistic agenda. As a result of this educational project, Kahane and Hollaender are hoping to protect their work against attacks by un- or ill-informed theatre critics and audience members. Thus, the closing lines bear a twofold meaning: 'those who follow us' refers to the audience following the work of the Deutsches Theater by attending performances and, at the same time, to the readers/followers of their journal who Kahane and Hollaender promise to provide a deeper insight into and a more profound understanding of the Deutsches Theater's artistic work. Working towards the systematic dissemination of information about the artistic profile of the theatre seems to have been crucial in order to avoid losing a core audience owing to a lack of understanding and/or familiarity with Reinhardt's work. Apparently, the distribution of an in-house journal was considered to be an appropriate remedy for these potential problems. The journal was thus effectively introduced as a guide for the audience; an audience which in Berlin specifically was⁴¹ by now well enculturated in the habit of reading and thus familiar with the concept of being guided by the written word. As a guide for its audience the *Blätter* produced a discourse about theatre practice that was not bound up with performed plays, as was the discourse of theatre journalism. Before the journal's first publication, in a letter that he wrote to the author Rudolf Alexander Schröder in 1911 Kahane outlined the journal's purpose:

we want to campaign not only for the continuance of our theatres but also for new comprehensive plans, ... we wish to apply the spoken and written word as an effective instrument for the promotion of our ideas with the press and the audience ... It should be multifaceted, educational and amusing, it should – in a cheerful and romantic tone – provide stimulation

to the expert as well as the layperson ... If the theatre is the house of unlimited possibilities, then our weekly journal will allow as much space or factual consideration and clear and conscious measuring of realities as for visionary gazing into the future. Those who have a connection to this iridescent phantom that we call theatre are invited to our table.⁴²

What makes this letter interesting and very informative is Kahane's explicit wish to create a journal that addresses a wide and diverse audience with the aim to promote not simply his theatre, like any other means of advertising, but also 'new comprehensive plans'. Although in the letter itself, he does not go into detail about these plans, the content of the journal later showed that those plans comprise fundamentally new directions in writing, acting and, above all, stage design.

Moving away from a focus solely on the products of dramatists, the journal demonstrates that plans, the work of directors and dramaturgs, are as interesting and worthy of attention as plays. When the dramaturgical department of the Deutsches Theater quite consciously decided to start mediating the theatre experience through the written word, this decision allowed them not only to exploit a popular medium of its time – the journal – but also to bring the dramaturgical department to the forefront. In doing so the dramaturgical department and its journal may be said to have established a free-standing discourse of dramaturgy and directing, offered explicitly to audiences as a discourse of interest in its own right.

New Spaces

The first issue of the *Blätter* spoke of moving 'from the small theatre to the arena', thus addressing concrete artistic issues that the Deutsches Theater was trying to

introduce to its audience. A good example of Kahane's educational mission is his article in the second issue, entitled 'Glossen zum Theater der Fünftausend' [Apostilles about the Theatre of the Five Thousand], in which he introduces the idea of a theatre for the masses.⁴³ This article from September 1911 has to be read in close connection with Max Reinhardt's earlier staging of *König Ödipus* [King Oedipus] in the venue Zirkus Schumann in November 1910 and the upcoming production of the play *Jedermann* [Everyman], which would premiere in the same venue on the 1 December 1911. The Zirkus Schumann, a veritable circus arena, could accommodate over 5000 spectators, a noticeable difference to the auditorium of the Deutsches Theater with its capacity of around 600. Kahane explains the reasons behind Reinhardt's artistic decision to perform *König Ödipus* and *Jedermann* in another venue. Arguing that theatre as an art form has a strong sensitivity to its *Zeitgeist*, he relates the changes in society to those in the theatre and claims to have observed a newly found appreciation for the masses, the myth and the body. According to Kahane, the simplicity forced upon the production by the different spatial layout of the arena stage showcases best the actor's physicality. Only the human presence, the voice and lighting should be used to create an impact. Kahane's reference to the bare Elizabethan stage serves as an argument for the timeless value and appeal of simplicity in stage design. Furthermore, he asserts that the vast space and musical elements should facilitate a strong bond between the audience and the performers, with individual spectators becoming part of a whole and timeless theatre community. He states: 'Here, the audience stops being an audience and instead becomes a people who feels simply and primitively but greatly and powerfully, like the people of all times.'⁴⁴

In this instance, the *Blätter* may be said to have created a truly intertheatrical connection.⁴⁵ In doing so it helped to promote an image of Reinhardt as a

director who was not confined to a particular theatre. While the Deutsches Theater may have been identified by audiences with Reinhardt's work, the *Blätter* as the official journal of the Deutsches Theater, invited the audience to take an interest in how Reinhardt tackled aesthetic challenges posed by a different venue. Therefore Zirkus Schumann was positioned as an extension of the Deutsches Theater. And it was able to be thus positioned because both theatres were linked together by the common purpose of taking forward Reinhardt's theatrical innovations. In this way the aesthetic practice comes to be associated with the creative figure of the director as an autonomous individual rather than with particular theatres. The director as it were becomes bigger than the theatre. This discourse took hold through the penetration of the *Blätter's* ideas into journalists' writing. Issue 10 of the *Blätter*, distributed on 1 December 1911, the evening of the premiere of *Everyman* at the Zirkus Schumann, also contained an article on the theatre. This was clearly absorbed by the critic Julius Keller who, in his review in the *Berliner Lokalanzeiger*, pointed out the elucidating function and overall value of the articles dedicated to explaining the challenges of and reasons behind the arena stage.⁴⁵

This positive reaction can be read as an indicator of a general awareness of the existence of the *Blätter*. The critic has not only taken notice of the new in-house journal, but has even read it and decided to refer to it in his article, thereby directing his readership towards the journal. Keller describes the function of the journal as a legitimate source of information and acknowledges it as more than simple promotional material. This incident serves as an example of how the journal was starting to be taken seriously by the critics, which subsequently led to a dialogue between the theatre and the wider public via the theatre press. The reflection on productions was no longer a one-way street, initiated and dominated

by the theatre critics, but a discourse with participants on both sides of the production–reception divide. Of course the status of the director whose theatrical innovations were the topic of the articles and reviews was discursively strengthened within this process. But there was a further element that contributed to the production of the image and status of Reinhardt the director.

New Acting Styles

As announced by the advertisement for the *Blätter*, not only directors and dramaturgs, but playwrights and actors too, contributed to the journal. Gertrud Eysoldt (1870-1955), a regular member of the Deutsches Theater ensemble, known for her eccentric acting style, explains her approach to the role of Kleist's *Penthesilea* in Felix Hollaender's production of the play and thus actively contributes to a broader discourse around new acting styles that was being introduced after a period of dominant Naturalism. Her short essay 'Penthesilea' from the third issue in late September 1911, passionately describes her work on the role and even comes close to comparing it to physical torture. Eysoldt speaks of feeling the heartbeat of Penthesilea in her chest, of her own tense body, which is being painfully subjugated to Penthesilea's temper, and of her longing to be devoured by the force of a stranger's volition.⁴⁶ This emphatic, visceral description echoes the many reviews of Eysoldt's performances, which confess to be fascinated by her 'cat-like ingenuity', her 'excesses of imagination' and her ability to 'apply the colour of the perverse as thickly as possible.'⁴⁷ Especially in contrast to the production at the Königliches Schauspielhaus, directed by Paul Lindau shortly before Hollaender's production premiered at the Deutsches Theater, Eysoldt stands out as an expressionistic actor who almost pushes past the limits of propriety on stage.

The discussion surrounding Eysoldt and her extraordinary acting style began several years before her portrayal of the character Penthesilea. Eysoldt had become instantly known as a wildly physical and extreme performer with her embodiment of the role of Elektra in Hofmannsthal's rewriting of the ancient Greek myth in 1903. The correspondence between Eysoldt and Hofmannsthal, who were intimate friends and professional colleagues, bears witness to the intensity with which Eysoldt responded to the character Hofmannsthal had created. Similarly to her strong-worded commentary on *Penthesilea*, Eysoldt paints a visceral picture of her first reading of *Elektra*: 'I suffer – I cry out from this violence – I fear my own forces – this torture that is waiting for me. I will suffer terribly from this.'⁴⁸ Positioning Hofmannsthal's play and Eysoldt's performance in its theatrical context, Sally McMullen explicates:

Hofmannsthal's *Elektra* was played in 1903 by Gertrud Eysoldt. She helped to implement the changes introduced by Max Reinhardt by emphasizing the need for a fully physical kind of acting. The old static stylization gave way to a mode of representation characterized by great mobility. It was important that each new idea expressed verbally should also be expressed in a supremely visual manner, through movements capable of conveying the slightest nuance to the audience. Gertrud Eysoldt's genius lay in her ability to mime: her movements, whilst appearing spontaneous and fresh, represented a new mode of stylization, which rapidly became a hallmark of Reinhardt's theatre.⁴⁹

Eysoldt's acting was not only a hallmark of Reinhardt's practice in her appearances on stage; it may also be said to promote that practice by being described in the official in-house journal of Reinhardt's theatre. In the forty-fourth issue of the *Blätter* in March 1914, commenting on the character Juliane in Knut Hamsun's play *Vom Teufel geholt* (In the Grip of Life), Eysoldt describes a process of somehow ingesting or being ingested by a character. This sort of language suggests something more than simply carrying forward a programme for a new mode of acting. Going deeper than merely pursuing a conscious programme, Eysoldt allows herself to be taken over by the role. As a representative of Reinhardt's new mode of acting her statement may be taken to bear witness to the depth by which the director's project penetrates his performers. As such it contributes to the emergence of the image of a director whose control over others goes beyond organization and inhabits their being

Consolidating the Reinhardt discourse

We have looked at how both the *Blätter* and the members of the company promoted Reinhardt's innovation and indeed his potency as a director. But the *Blätter* also did a slightly more complex job of work.

At the beginning of the 1912/13 season and in the twentieth issue of the *Blätter*, Kahane and Hollaender reflected on the development of the in-house journal so far. They arrive at the preliminary conclusion that the *Blätter* project had been fairly successful. The dramaturgs claim that their journal had been read by a considerable part of the audience, which, owing to the strong attendance at the Deutsches Theater, amounts to a large readership. Very noticeable is the change

in tone in comparison to the preface in the first issue of the *Blätter* where they had generally talked about trying to react to misunderstandings and avoid misconceptions and misinterpretations. A year later, they quite openly use the terms 'friend and foe' and call the summer break between the seasons the time 'between battles'. This use of language shines a light on why Kahane, in looking back at the beginning of the *Blätter*, had called the journal a '*Kampfblatt*' [combat organ]. The dramaturgs, as the case of the battle for sovereignty over the interpretation or simply the participation in the debate of Sternheim's oeuvre had shown, considered the main function of the journal to retaliate to attacks by the press on the theatre. In their opinion, their highest achievement was that 'almost without polemics, all those legends about the theatre that were being disseminated, those buzzwords that were being spread, they had fallen silent since the existence of the *Blätter*.'⁵⁰

From outside the inner circle of the Deutsches Theater's artistic team, this was regarded somewhat more cynically. The avid theatregoer Max Epstein suggested that publications initiated by the Deutsches Theater merely promoted its own work: 'They contained essays by well-known men and commissioned pages by the employees of the theatre, which should somehow substantiate the importance of the Deutsches Theater, its repertoire and its ensemble,'⁵¹ For him, the articles in the journal do not possess any more analytical value than simple advertisement.

The tension between an educational project, rationalizing the innovative practices, and self-advertisement by an institution was articulated several years later by Herbert Ihering: 'The *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters* opened up a long line of far too many theatre journals; soon almost every municipal theatre had one. But the original still had interesting contributors and at times even a point of

view, although back then the advertisement, sometimes hidden behind Kahane's lyrical glance, already predominated.¹⁵² Here, Ihering speaks with the benefit of hindsight and admits that the journal in its origins provided the reader with informed and stimulating contributions without necessarily lapsing into self-praising mode. Interestingly, he explicitly mentions Kahane as the dramaturgical figure who packaged an advertising agenda into an intellectual artistic project.

The tension that is being articulated here had its origins in the material circumstances of the director's project. The Deutsches Theater was run by Reinhardt as a private enterprise based on making a profit. The profit was necessary not only to survive but also to be able to afford the technical and artistic innovations that the theatre, and its director, were known for. The official in-house journal had the role of negotiating the balance, or tension, between idealistic artistic endeavour and the quest for profit. The discourse generated by this negotiation can be said to be both symptomatic of and perhaps influential in perpetuating the role and image of the innovative director who seeks to work within the commercial sphere.

The company man

To an observer from outside the German theatre, with its particular traditions and values, the *Blätter* said one further crucial thing about Reinhardt the director. In 1914 the English art and theatre critic Huntly Carter (1861– 1942) published a book about Reinhardt. Carter was particularly interested in innovative practices in art, cinema and theatre, producing a series of books attempting to describe what he saw as the 'new spirit' in various arts. His book on Reinhardt was one of the first books about directing in the English-speaking world. In writing that book he

drew on the *Blätter*, thereby helping to disseminate the journal's discourses to a wider, and non- German, audience.

Writing about Reinhardt's innovatory attempt to develop a theatre for the masses, Carter quotes at length from Kahane's article *Das Theater der Fünftausend*. But quite apart from his interest in new artistic forms Carter was also interested in artistic institutions and their functioning. For him the *Blätter* represented a challenge to traditional ways of engaging in the arts. He attributes to the journal a 'value to those who desire to come into communication directly with the theatre, instead of through an outside medium'.⁵³ This statement is of interest for the reflection on dramaturgical practices at the Deutsches Theater insofar as it points to a quintessential function of any form of dramaturgical profession: the task of facilitating a discourse between the theatre and its audience, of providing enough contextual material or offering up interesting provocations in order to start a dialogue. Carter certainly perceives this attempt and values it for his own reflection on Reinhardt's theatre.

But to Carter the journal said something more. In its pages members of Reinhardt's company, whether dramaturg or actor, could be seen to be speaking for themselves, describing their own roles in a shared artistic project. The importance of this, for Carter, can be judged in the context of his views as to what was wrong with contemporary theatre: 'nothing it has done or can do in its present condition has brought it or brings it within measurable distance of producing the complete vision, the design of the poet filled in by answering minds, unified and vital in all respects.'⁵⁴ The pages of the *Blätter* seemed to show that Reinhardt the poet was surrounded by 'answering minds'. This provides the evidence which allowed Carter to discriminate between Reinhardt and other sorts of director. As Shepherd points out, Carter's book on Reinhardt

takes issue with the model of directing that had been promoted by Edward Gordon Craig:

In his book Carter celebrates the model of directing which he saw as being initiated by Reinhardt. It was a model which contrasted with the rather more public, and more polemically stated, position adopted by Edward Gordon Craig. Craig was highly critical of the number of departmental 'heads' that tended to operate in contemporary theatre processes. He suggested that these need to be replaced by a single role.⁵⁵

By contrast with Craig's absolutist and individualistic director Reinhardt was, for Carter, a director who worked by cooperation and collaboration:

All the talk about ruler-art and ruler-artist is drivel. If producers really desire to make an advance, let them study Reinhardt, not Nietzsche, and learn how to think in terms of a circle, not of a pyramid. Reinhardt's contribution to the problem of the theatre is co-directorship. Except to the theatre, co-directorship is not a new thing to this mighty booby world, but outside the theatre dull persons are expounding it in the form of co-management and guild-socialism as *the* idea of the century. The new and significant thing in the theatre is the expression of the Will of the Theatre by co-ordinated minds, each artist taking the keenest interest in presenting the artistic work of the theatre.⁵⁶

Carter goes on to elaborate on what he means by 'co-directorship' and why it is important. The contemporary theatre, he says, produces bad art because it is badly organized:

the great number of units engaged in the production of a play are not properly organised as a body to give that play the widest and most complete expression. They have not a vision in common, but they interpret each in his own way. As a rule they are a spineless and disjointed crew, without the faintest concept[s] of a possible unity.

By contrast there is 'co-directorship':

The system of Max Reinhardt reminds us that what is needed is a new harmonious and intelligent body of interpreters in whose hands all the processes of interpretation are complementary and complete. Such interpreters may be briefly divided into seven classes – the artist- author, director-producer, stage-manager, musician, actor, decorator, and mechanician.⁵⁷

The pages of the *Blätter* showed how various representatives of the different classes of interpreters were indeed working in harmony. In Carter's analysis Reinhardt's 'co-directorship' model worked to produce both good art and harmonious organization, negotiating the balance between commerce and innovation. 'Co-directorship' provided the unity that would prevent the organization being 'spineless' and thereby make it successful. And so indeed it was. Towards the end of the 1920s the *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters* became *Die Blätter der Reinhardt Bühnen* (The Journal of Reinhardt's Stages). During that decade the *Blätter* had diversified significantly. They now included not only an edition for the Grosses Schauspielhaus which, formerly known under the name of Zirkus Schumann, had re-opened after a thorough renovation in 1919, but also editions for Reinhardt's Komödie at the Kurfürstendamm and later the Kurfürstendammtheater.⁵⁸ With their diversification the *Blätter* also changed their

design, appearing now in a more colourful format and including not only texts but also photographs of popular actors. The company comes to inhabit the journal even more intensively, but now not so much as banner carriers for innovation as celebrity properties. And quite literally above them all of course sits the name of Reinhardt. As both impresario and artist the director's celebrity image itself is now so powerful as to bind together and give coherence to the whole multi-company project.

¹ Alexander Weigel, *Das deutsche Theater. Eine Geschichte in Bildern* (Berlin: Propyläen, 1999), 54-94.

² *Ibid.*, 64.

³ I am aware of the fact that the terms 'authenticity' and 'faithfulness' refer to problematic and profoundly discussed concepts in Theatre and Performance Studies and I only use them in this context within the historical confines of the contemporary setting. Brahm's style was perceived by his contemporaries to be particularly true to life and respectful of the literary original.

⁴ Peter W. Marx, *Max Reinhardt. Vom bürgerlichen Theater zur metropolitanen Kultur* (Tübingen: Francke, 2006), 34.

⁵ In 1901 with a few of his Deutsches Theater colleagues, Reinhardt started the political cabaret *Schall und Rauch*, which, from 1902 onwards, produced serious drama in direct competition to the Deutsches Theater under the name *Kleines Theater*. See Norbert Jaron et al. eds, *Berlin: Theater der Jahrhundertwende*.

(Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1986), 467-8.

⁶ Arthur Kahane, *Tagebuch eines Dramaturgen* (Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1928), 116.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 119.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 116.

¹⁰ This theatre building is known today as the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, which permanently hosts the Berliner Ensemble.

¹¹ Paul Legband, *Bühne und Welt*, 5.14 (1903), cit. Jaron, *Berlin*, 521.

¹² F. Stahl, *Berliner Tageblatt*, 4 April 1903, cit. Jaron, *Berlin*, 513.

¹³ I. Landau, cit. Jaron, *Berlin*, 512.

¹⁴ A. Klaar, *Vossische Zeitung*, 4 April 1903, cit. Jaron, *Berlin*, 517-20.

¹⁵ The terms 'Theatropolis' and 'Parvenupolis' are both taken from theatre scholar Peter W. Marx. He used the term Theatropolis in a paper he presented on Wilhelmine Berlin (in July 2013, unpublished). The term Parvenupolis is central to his monograph: Peter W. Marx, *Ein theatralisches Zeitalter: Bürgerliche Selbstinszenierungen um 1900* (Tübingen: Francke, 2007).

¹⁶ H. Ihering, *Begegnungen mit Zeit und Menschen* (Bremen: Carl Schünemann, 1965) 105.

¹⁷ Peter Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin 1900* (London: Harvard University Press, 1996), 7.

¹⁸ Alexandra Richie, *Faust's Metropolis. A History of Berlin* (London: Harper Collins, 1998), 20.

¹⁹ P. W. Marx, *Ein theatralisches Zeitalter*, 251-64.

²⁰ Six for opera and operetta, eighteen for legitimate drama and comedies, five for popular theatre forms and farces, six so-called 'Spezialitätentheater' (variety

shows and circus acrobats) and the Metropoltheater which specialized in the genre of 'Ausstattungsstück' (shows with a focus on decorations and astonishing stage machinery). In addition to these theatres, Berlin had to offer many more evening entertainments with its popular 'Singspielhallen' [music halls] and more than 300 pubs, restaurants, nightclubs and cabarets which had obtained the licence to entertain. See Annemarie Lange, *Das Wilhelminische Berlin. Zwischen Jahrhundertwende und Novemberrevolution* (Berlin: Dietz, 1984), 520-1.

²¹ M. Epstein, *Theater als Geschäft* (Berlin: Fannei und Walz, 1996) 13.

²² Ihering, *Begegnungen*, 22.

²³ Siegfried Jacobsohn, *Max Reinhardt* (Berlin: Erich Reiss, 1921) 21.

²⁴ Ibid., 21.

²⁵ Ibid., 21.

²⁶ P. W. Marx, *Ein theatralisches Zeitalter*, 263-4.

²⁷ *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of Theatre and Performance*, ed. Dennis Kennedy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), vol. 1, 387.

²⁸ One of the more constant members of the dramaturgical team was Heinz Herald. See Arthur Kahane, 'Die Jahre 1905-1924', *Max Reinhardt: 25 Jahre Deutsches Theater*, ed. Hans Rothe (Munich: R. Piper, 1930), 32.

²⁹ A. Kahane, *Tagebuch*, 71-3.

³⁰ Eduard von Winterstein, *Mein Leben und meine Zeit* (Berlin: Henschel, 1982), 254.

³¹ Ibid., 255.

³² Ibid., 254.

³³ Ibid. 254-6.

³⁴ A. Kahane, *Tagebuch*, 9-23.

³⁵ The titles of articles dedicated to Kahane's work mostly refer to Kahane in connection to the 'bigger name' Max Reinhardt. See Franz Horch, 'Reinhardts

Dramaturg. Zu Arthur Kahanes 60. Geburtstag', *Die Scene* 22.5 (1932), 98-9; Etta Cor, 'Max Reinhardts erster Dramaturg. Zur Position des Dramaturgen am bürgerlichen Theater', *Theater der Zeit*, 14.3 (1959), 30-8; Henry Kahane, 'Arthur Kahane, Reinhardt's Dramaturge', *Theatre Research International*, 4.1 (1978), 59-65.

³⁶ Anat Feinberg, 'Was Dramaturg? Noch nie gehört, was ist das?' *Aschkenas* 17.1 (2007): 225-71.

³⁷ F. Hollaender and A. Kahane, 'Vorwort', *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*, 1 (1911/12): 1-3.

³⁸ In his theatre journal *Die Schaubühne* in 1911, Siegfried Jacobsohn denounces the harsh critique of Reinhardt's work by the contemporary press whose 'unkind, disdainful and snide tone' might drive Reinhardt out of Berlin. See Siegfried Jacobsohn, 'Reinhardts Zukunft', *Die Schaubühne*, 40 (1911), 285-7.

³⁹ In his speech in Mannheim in 1784, Schiller points to the vital function of theatre for the improvement of a humanistic society: 'The jurisdiction of the stage begins where the tribunal of secular law ends. . . As surely as a visible representation has a more powerful effect than the dead letter and a cold narration, the stage as surely acts more profoundly and more lastingly than morality and the law.' Friedrich Schiller, 'The Stage Considered as a Moral Institution,' abbreviated version in *Theatre in Europe. A Documentary History: German and Dutch Theatre 1600-1848* ed. George W. Brandt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 217-221.

⁴⁰ The term 'arena' refers to the Zirkus Schumann, where Reinhardt staged his production of *König Ödipus* in 1910 and his production of *Jedermann* [Everyman] in 1911. In 1919, after a fundamental reconstruction and transformation, Reinhardt re-opened the Circus under the name Grosses Schauspielhaus. The

building had the capacity to accommodate up to 3200 spectators. While at first instance the size of the theatre sounds like an obstacle to the development of a special relationship between the audience and the stage, Reinhardt tried to mirror the masses of spectators in the auditorium with a large number of performers distributed all over the theatre. Thus, he tried to minimize the auditorium-stage divide and introduce the audience to a new spatially immersive experience.

⁴¹ Peter Fritzsche, *Reading Berlin 1900*.

⁴² Kahane in a letter to Rudolf Alexander Schröder 1911, Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, no shelf-mark given.

⁴³ A. Kahane, 'Glossen zum Theater der Fünftausend,' *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*, 2 (1911/12), 9-12.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁴⁵ J. Keller, *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, 2 December 1911, cit. Jaron, *Berlin*, 713.

⁴⁶ G. Eysoldt, 'Penthesilea', *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*, 3 (1911/12), 5.

⁴⁷ Alfred Klaar, *Vossische Zeitung*, 24 September 1911.

⁴⁸ Leonhard M. Fiedler, ed., *Der Sturm Elektra. Gertrud Eysoldt, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Briefe* (Salzburg: Residenz, 1996), 9.

⁴⁹ S. McMullen, 'From the Armchair to the Stage: Hofmannsthal's 'Elektra' in its Theatrical Context', *The Modern Language Review*, 80.3, July 1985, 646.

⁵⁰ A. Kahane and F. Hollaender, 'Der Blätter erstes Jahr', *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*, 20 (1912/13), 305.

⁵¹ Max Epstein, *Max Reinhardt* (Berlin: Winckelmann Söhne, 1918), 42-43.

⁵² H. Ihering, *Begegnungen*, 149.

⁵³ Huntly Carter, *The Theatre of Max Reinhardt* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1964) 119.

⁵⁴ Carter, *The Theatre of Max Reinhardt*, 21.

⁵⁵ Simon Shepherd, *Direction: Readings in Theatre Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 98.

⁵⁶ Carter, *The Theatre of Max Reinhardt*, 20.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵⁸ From 1925 onwards, Harry Kahn took over the editorship, followed by Hans Rothe in 1928 and Franz Horsch from 1930 to 1932. See Alexander Weigel, 'Das Junge Deutschland. Ein Überblick über die Blätter des Deutschen Theaters (II)' *Blätter des Deutschen Theaters*, 2 (1985/86) 36-44.