



## THE GENEALOGY OF THE MODERN DRAMA AS THE END RESULT OF THE MODERN AGE

Endre Kiss

*Keywords: Young Lukács, Genealogy of the Modern Drama, Weltanschauung, the late bourgeois culture, art criticism, existence.*

Looking always further in the past, we can somewhat surely affirm, that there were two works of Georg Lukács, for which the destiny has been decisive, *not* to have been simultaneously translated (or published) in German. The first work existing exclusively in the Hungarian language practically until today was „*The Genealogy of the Modern Drama*” (“A modern dráma fejlődéstörténete”), while the second one (and the latest one) – „*The Ontology of the Social Being*” („A társadalmi lét ontológiája”) – has been published for a long time exclusively available in the Hungarian language. Despite a perfectly justified doubt about the epochal legitimacy of the new philosophical conception of the *Ontology*<sup>1</sup>, it seems to be already clear today, that their simultaneous publishing in German, i. e. on the international scene of the philosophy had been some chances to be able to make themselves remarkable in the worldwide debate led about the declining neo-marxism. It will be necessarily still more complex due to the fact that, besides and outside of the assumed stimulating effect of a Lukács’ *Ontology* published just in time in German, we would have had to take into account the consequences, according to which the philosophical substance of the work would have exercised a rather negative influence on the general criticism of his philosophical Oeuvres.

It has been and is much different with the *Genealogy of the Modern Drama*. An opportune, i.e. contemporary translation in German of this work could have in principle had an absolutely *decisive* influence on the life of the young aesthete, in the German-speaking philosophical life as well as on the international scene in general. We think first to the possibility that, on the way of an opportune and complete divulgation of this work, the *complete works* of the young Lukács could have, in their comprehensive logic and consequences, also been opened to many interests. *The Soul and the Forms* or *The Theory of the Novel* could have provided, in their deep and multiple links with the *Genealogy of the Modern Drama*, with an absolutely affirmed probability, an image of this work, not only unanimous but also very clear. The fact that an opportune version in German of the *Genealogy of the Modern Drama* was missing, informs however also about another field no less sensitive for the young Lukács. Without that we wanted to reduce only to this ground both unsuccessful habilitation attempts of the young Lukács, it must not be questionable whether a Heidelberg habilitation with a *Genealogy of the Modern Drama* generally discussed in German could have had then better chances, even if still also many other positive and negative grounds have also here totally played their role. Our hypothesis is not only based on the high quality of the *Genealogy of the Modern Drama*, we also think of this side of the habilitation processus, that besides the non-academical character of the





submitted work has been vigorously emphasized, what should have revealed largely unfounded in the case of this work.

The methodical dimensions, in the stricter sense of the term, of the *Genealogy of the Modern Drama*, reveal practically all the characteristic problems of the work of the young Lukács. This methodology is, on the one side, *coherent*, on the other side, *eclectic*. It comes from the extreme and chaotic wealth of the *philosophical-methodical* culture and of the simultaneous exceptional extent of the positive (and even positivist) knowledge of the young scholar. The duality of this extremely large *methodical* arsenal and also of the extremely large *positive* knowledge of European dimensions, allows the author to develop in his methodology a *creative eclectism* (and in fact constantly coherent).

To this *creative eclectism*, belong the strong *historical-genealogical* visions, the mobilization of the most important semantic acquisitions of the *classical aesthetics* (mainly Kant, but also Hegel and others), the capacity borrowed from the *phenomenology* to explain<sup>2</sup>, in a free and creative way, new and not yet categorized phenomena, an obvious *interdisciplinarity*, which borders upon the capacities of a polyhistor, a strong *sociological* participation, in which not only questionings would be to subsume, the first corresponding sociological traditional signs, but also such individual subsystems, in the sense of the *philosophy of systematization* of Béla Zalai (as ethics, aesthetics, sociology, etc.) constantly in relation with each other and already integrating several times these operations in their analyses<sup>3</sup>.

At the same time, and in the course of the same diversity of interests, the aspects of *the immanence of the work* are however either not neglected. We think also on the concrete *immanent* analytical aspects, also constantly *synthetical-immanent*, whilst the „style” of the work, and a category is questioned, what afterwards – typically with the young Lukács – comes again from the immanent questioning and is again confronted, philosophically-historically or theoretically-culturally, with *no more immanent* new sub-systems or value systems<sup>4</sup>.

An instrument of the methodology of the young Lukács, also highly qualified, is the *ideal*, frequent and masterful shaping of *types*<sup>5</sup>. To the whole arsenal of the masterly intertwined methods belongs the permanent, *existential*, and at no moment, sinking method, as well the profound personal *desperation* and *rebellion* as also the one of whole groups, generations, intellectuals. The multiple *objectivistic-methodological* dimension is transmitted with the *existential rebellion* through the semantic of the *Weltanschauung*, specifically carried out by the young Lukács, in which the spiritual history of that time plays also a role as relevant orientation change in the literature theory of the II Internationale, especially critic of *Die Neue Zeit*<sup>6</sup>.

For the sake of the integrity, we must still mention, that Béla Zalai's systematization idea can easily reach an isomorphic relation with Kant's art theory (relation ethics-aesthetics, religion-aesthetics). To the leading characteristics of this virtuos methodology of the young Lukács, belongs also, that in his elocution, the results of a methodological sector as a carousel effect integrate immediately into another sector, sociology and existentiality, immanence of the work and theory of the tragic, description of functional relations and poetic particularities succeed with astronomical velocity and





perfection. This last structure can even often mistaken the superficial reader, somewhat in the form, that the young Lukács appears as *most platonical*, when he reaches the end of his *positive* analyses and appears as problematical *positivist*, when he makes a digression in *platonical* fields<sup>7</sup>.

This wealth of perspectives can at any moment embarrass the reader and the main part of the circle of the Hungarian readers of that time. Facing the horizon of real discussions, it can suddenly become clear that, with his exceptional style, the young Lukács has already definitely solved this problem, which the schools of interpretation of the work and rivalizing with each other in the second half of the last century, have suffered. He realized a perfect mode of the *synthetic* interpretation<sup>8</sup>.

The appearance of a problematic strange encounter somewhat between positivism and platonism is most intensive at the level of the *form problem*. However, to demonstrate the *carrousel effect* in this example, Lukács pursues, in most cases, taking possession of the reproduced form, positively obtained totally platonical, to put these forms somewhat *sociologically, ideologically or philosophically* in a further correlation and reach new results from other typologies of other correlations. To the further structure of this version and treatment of the problem of forms, belongs however also, that with Lukács (i.e. not as we could eventually expect it) it is not about the opportunity of the *reader* or of the cultural consumer, but rather more one of the *poet* himself (as we shall still debate about it largely).

In order to expose now another example for a *possible* other misunderstanding, we must remember, that Lukács has probably a clear *ideological* reason to have chosen as starting point of his description of the dramatical genre „the religious drama”. This assumption might be supported, on the one hand, by the fact that the *Weltanschauung* (also in the clear form of the religion) plays in the whole work a considerable role. On the other hand, facing this reason, we might come to this idea, that it can be a particular ground why the Modern Age produces a clear *secular* dramatical art. The choice had however a clear objective and functional, if we want, *immanent* reason. It was, in fact, the dramatic genre religiously embedded, that from the beginning corresponded most perfectly with the declared starting point of the Lukács of that time, it was namely the only in the situation to unite the *theater* and the *theatrical Weltanschauung*.

The work is a unique enterprise, which the young Lukács, with his *social extremely singular* behaviour, should not have been particularly conscious of<sup>9</sup>.

Through the perspective of the *modern drama*, the *modern art*, the *Modern Age*, all that we can today rightly name the *late bourgeois culture* is put on the balance and namely (and so we evoke the wealth of the methodology and of the heuristical ideology) facing a clearly carried out historical-philosophical approach. In this context, our concrete questions can be formulated as follows:

- 1) *Does this work provide an appropriate and authentical analysis of the late bourgeois society?*
- 2) *What does his analysis prove?*
- 3) *Is it possible to draw consequences from this analysis for Georg Lukács' late development?*<sup>10</sup>





First of all, it can be no doubt, that the work delivers a profound and really original analysis of the *bourgeois/late bourgeois* society. This analysis is in each subsystem carefully built, it will be referred to it in each individual subsystem. It always appears somewhat in the center of the form-material-problematic, in which according to the consequence of the analysis, *the time or the bourgeois society is the material*. It is the era that provides the artist with the material. It goes without saying (and totally corresponds to what has been said precedently), that the epoch interpreted as material becomes subject of independent social, sociological, even political analyses. The „external” and „internal” life of the era is then the material for the drama, what explains that in the work an analytical description of the late bourgeois society becomes initially one of the description of the possible dramaturgic material. It is unquestionable, that the starting point comes initially from the *extra-literary* realities. It however means, that the whole investigation, from the beginning, presents an *ontological* dimension. This information does not only awake for us the interest of the late Lukács for the social ontology, it makes us realize *how much an inter-relation of internal- and extraliterary analyses has disappeared from our present debates and which deficit it means particularly for the whole genre of the work interpretation*.

This clear ontologizing inclination leads us to answer the *second* question.

The young Lukács gives a clear and complete analysis of the bourgeois society. He considers it essentially as a secluded historical period, which a global image of can already be given. The first relevant précis is expressed as follows: „the essence of the problem consists in the despair of the consciousness, which also comes at first from some unsuccessfulness of the movements issued from a program. The fact is that, even if its negative character is admitted, it is able to put up some resistance.”<sup>11</sup>

From the potentiality of the modern drama, he observes the bourgeois world, which behaviour is capable of changement and self-changement. His point of view is similar to the one of the young Hegel, who watches the true reality of the modern bourgeois world in the simultaneity of the „*freedom of the subject*” and of the „*necessity of the object*”, whilst the effective freedom of a world of the „*necessities*” of the object faces it<sup>12</sup>. In this sense, Lukács’ analysis of the modern bourgeois totally harmonizes with the one of the classical writers.

That the analysis of the *extra-cultural reality* determines so deeply from the beginning the dispositions of the art, comes again from the relevant ontological dimensions of this approach. The power of the existence and of the existant is also *ontologically* described. In this debate, the history itself appears in an unusual lighting. For him, the history does not prove only the capacity toward a changement in ideas, it demonstrates rather more the incompetence of simply wanted and imposed forces, theoretical, purely ideological, rationalist, projected from inside and of their reality<sup>13</sup>.

This experience appears then as being the one that made the man understand what the history is<sup>14</sup>. This idea is supported as follows: „...Any thing, that enters the life, has a life which becomes independent. It exists because it exists and has also consequences... It is about the category of the existence and about the one of the simple being...”<sup>15</sup> From this fundamental vision, a global analogy





emerges with the young Lukács, which originality, in the true sense of the word, can be clearly considered only as the last result of a whole philosophical monography. The relation „*subject*”-„*object*”, „*individual*”-„*society*” metamorphoses on the basis of this fundamental vision into a rivaling structure of two similar *abstract* entities. On the one side, the young thinker finds the *abstract thought*, which will modify the reality, on the other side, the *abstract processes*, which prevent the concrete efforts of the individuals<sup>16</sup>. The model of freedom of the subject (as the first abstract) and the necessity of the object (as second abstract) is compelling.

What concerns the power of the existence, or the existant, apostrophized by Lukács, is on the one hand retrospective and on the other hand precursor of the fact that this power is spread out in the whole work, is no anticipation of eternal force relations, no metaphysics of the power of the existant, *but a synthesis of the really modern tendencies of the modern society*. To anticipate briefly, at this place, it is about the maturity of the modern bourgeois structural society, which led to this power of the existant<sup>17</sup>.

From this absolutely not purely immanent analysis, *the highest problem of style* of the new drama develops by the young Lukács (through which again an excellent and largely evident example is given to us for the growing together of immanent and superficial moments of the work). It is further a very important sign, if the young Lukács searches to make clear with a quotation of Dilthey the so interpreted problem of *style*. On the one side, he indicates with this information, that his *methodological perfection* coincides in this respect with Dilthey, that he wishes to constitute with it also a complete inventory of the literary work interpretation as Dilthey always intended to do it in front of a large professional public. This means also, that Dilthey, behind this unique conception, has absolutely a role of model. On the other side, this quotation throws also a characteristic lighting on Dilthey : „...the tragedy emerges here (with Lessing – EK) from the similar heterogeneity of the moral affect toward the surrounding world and in the so occurring impossibility for a moral heroism to survive against it<sup>18</sup>.

Only at this point of the analysis, it becomes unquestionable, that the drama, due to *this* ontological consistence, cannot reach its profound objective, it cannot present its protagonists, *in no sense of the word*, as *heroic*. The forms of life, the bases of the social being, which we already know about, that they are supported *social-ontologically*, do no longer allow this attitude. *The existence defeats the abstract will of the protagonist, the background defeats the heros acting on the scene*.

In the interdisciplinarity of the methods' carrousel of this work, the classical terms of the dramatical aesthetics win their new significance through their comparison with the new *realities social-ontologically* qualified. This analytical perfect and irreproachable sense awards Lukács' notion of the background a constant significance, although he stipulates generously this insight, in many places of the milieu-conception of other theater authors. Obviously, the impossibility (always decisive for the drama) of the existential heroism doesn't reveal at all with Lukács as cool fact of the aesthetic analysis. As well for him, young intellectual with intentions of worldwide changements, as for a high number of other protagonists, this result of the analysis applies as *existential shock*. There is no doubt,





that this result is already integrated in the important contents of the answer to our third question („Does this analysis have any consequences on the further development of the young thinker?“).

Lukács' specific contrast of the *background* and of the *foreground* builds a huge difference in this general and not particularly qualified conception, so as the Modern Age, particularly the modern art is permanently a range of innovations, putting up a constant resistance against the bourgeois society constituted of Philistines, with the same tenacity and persistence<sup>19</sup>. In this conception, not particularly profound but all the more widespread, the *foreground* is always lighted up, while the *background* (also in the sense understood by Lukács) was immersed in the insignificance. It was the same also with the protagonists, since – again in perfect opposition with Lukács' analysis – the protagonists of the Modern Age (also the artistical Modern Age) have been absolutely considered and celebrated as heroes. In this context, it is sufficiently revealed under which concrete forms the disadvantages witnessed, that Lukács had to stand in reason of the non-existence of his important youth work in the German language. This element of the existentiality, of the own desperation due to the impossibility of the heroic, intellectual protagonisms, appears with a certain necessity somewhat in the *The Soul and the Forms*, as a detailed emanation of non explicit motivations of the *philosophy of life*, while we can certainly not guess, only through the knowledge of this last work, the multiple analyses of this social-ontology of the Modern Age.

To be also able to comprehend the real possibilities of the personal development of the intellectual protagonists, the young thinker must investigate through the overall epoch in its social-ontological profoundness. *Aesthetics, art criticism, existentiality, sociology and philosophy of the history are hardly no longer separable from each other in these analyses*. This one of his approaches also leads to the fact, that he doesn't define the Modern Age from the middle of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, but returns to the profoundness of the former bourgeois times with the exigence or the identification.

In his specific amalgamation of sociologic, social-ontologic and existential dimensions, Lukács reveals himself also as a thinker who, in the great debate of his time, can acquire a singular personal position. This conception mode reminds us the further transformations, in which *the thematization of the existential as a general rule without any sociology, and the one of the sociologic also as a general rule without any existentiality, take place*<sup>20</sup>. It can also be seen here, how in any other individual questioning, Lukács' method of the complete, historical, social and sociological analysis is productive for, in the most strict sense of the term, the aesthetic and theoretico-cultural reflexions. Since, he does not build an historical interpretation, to be able to situate historically the art of the drama. He delivers, in direct and first intention, an *historical interpretation*, to be able to apply its results on the possibilities of the art of the drama. It is not surprising, if these results have a suggestive and sometimes fascinating effect.

In this presentation, step for step, the thesis crystallizes, according to which the Modern Age is no problem-free innovation, rather more – *finally* – a *product of the developing problematic of the relation between artist and public*<sup>21</sup> whilst the continual innovation accompanies with a permanent struggle, in order to make acceptable to him the new forms of cultural perception and production. This analysis





anticipates a lot the phenomenon of the mass culture, reveals the immanent dialectic, to produce continually new appeals and takes the sociology of the separation of the *Comical* and the *Tragical* of Erich Auerbach according to the height of the sociological position of the presented protagonists.

Lukács must take advantage of the fact that, just in the biggest metropolis (Paris, London), the separation of the „energical” theater and of the „high” poetry is going forward at the highest speed. It is not the first situation, in which the young thinker must turn up again in the frame of an elaborated paradox.

*The Lukács entirely engaged for the Modern Age reaches through his analysis a critical position vis-à-vis the Modern Age.* His social-ontology of the Modern Age is being revealing profound and not voluntarist tendencies, which are not favorable to the art. This analysis is further also very singular and extraordinary, because its tenor is neither aesthetic, nor critico-cultural, nor existential, rather more social-ontological and/or sociological. Formerly, we have already spoken about the particular suggestion and plausibility of this approach. Lukács’ sociological approach differentiates however beneficially from the dominant plurality of later sociological-cultural attempts, while just on the way of an integration and a synchronization – still today admiration worthy – of the related individual disciplines and methods, this investigation, finally sociological (social-ontological), stands in front of us in an interdisciplinary perfection.

Only at this place, a further characteristic of his methodological project also appears. Since he does not only describe a social reality first independent from the art of the drama, to confront then the basic challenges of the dramatic genre with this description. He involves however also in his analysis former descriptions of the Modern Age *rather more critical and cultural* (kulturkritisch) *as sociological*. We have already mentioned once the name of *Simmel* (without wanting even to reach a perfection in this context). He integrates still frequently in his analysis of the Modern Age *Nietzsche’s* cultural criticism (Kulturkritik), what should be everything but surprising, since Friedrich Nietzsche’s criticism of the modern society and the potentialities of the art were profoundly linked from the beginning.

Even Lukács’ recapitulative socio-ontological vision of the Modern Age sounds as a paraphrase of Nietzsche’s description of the Modern Age: „it seems that the anarchical orientations of the modern life (which infiltrate however under their most pure form in the large town) destroying, wasting the opinion atoms, would not endure such a complicated synthesis, as it is the case of the theater linked with the drama. The town has all the less or all the more the character of the metropolis, that this theater can put up no resistance against the eliminating forces.”<sup>22</sup> This situation is, in this respect, not produced by the large town, that it could have been made responsible for it, this development makes only worse the relation of the drama with its public<sup>23</sup>.

Still *another* important element of the philosophy of the art of the young Lukács becomes transparent through the recourse of the reconstitution of socio-ontological dimensions. It is about this element, through which the young Lukács thematizes permanently the availability or the non-availability of *mythologies* in the context of legitimation of the Modern Age. Without the social-ontological





communication, this idea could at the most be considered as an attempt, to achieve a more or less *structural isomorphy* between mythology (religion) and (modern) art. Only the realization of the socio-ontological analysis and the resulting effect of communication explain the true roots of this idea. Since the missing mythology(ies) is first of all exclusively a discovery of the socio-ontological analyses and is, *like all other results*, projected only further in the field of the art (of the theater)<sup>24</sup>.

Now, we come back to our *third* starting question, which object is to know if we can effectively draw consequences out of his former analysis of the Modern Age and the late bourgeois society for Lukács' later development.

First, we must emphasize, that *The Genealogy of the Modern Drama* delivers fundamentally a concrete and objective analysis, which essence constitutes the elaboration of the socio-ontological dimension. This analysis established a kind of End of the History, whilst it affirms the power of the background on the foreground as somewhat exhibited, what could hardly no longer be modified<sup>25</sup>.

This analysis shows however moments, which as obviously call upon a criticism. It is about a world view (*Weltanschauung*) of its center, round the power of the existence and the existant, as well as the superiority of the interdependence of the relations upon the heroic personal development of the protagonists. If we observe more deeply these elements, then emerges a large range of paradoxes turning to the tragic.

One of the global paradoxes is the center deficiency and the atomization of a world, in which the existence and the existant are dominating. Another paradox<sup>26</sup>, explicitly formulated by Lukács, is the simultaneity of a *democratically* minded cultural communication and its *aristocratic* character. To that, joins the paradox of the socio-ontological modified original poetic intentions of self-development, furthermore the most strict paradox of the dramatic genre itself, whatever this genre becomes abstract and esoteric, which wanted to appeal to most of the people, from the beginning, in the concentration of the biggest groups. The huge quantity of isolated-alone people in the large modern metropolis must not be forgotten.

A tragic paradox and a paradoxal tragic is then in the result, that the Modern Age, wanting to concretize as clearly as possible the values of the human genre under a modern form, is on the way of a concrete and original, not even aesthetically centralized analysis, appears as an orientation, which can appeal to the very few. This is identical with the failure of the project of the Modern Age. Lukács' approach grants however the final result a specific *aura*.

This failure of the Modern Age present on all doubts is effectively here, it is however neither essential nor determinant, because the values and fundamental hypotheses of the Modern Age have suffered no defeat, „only” the interconnections of the functions, the „background” has (have) through its (their) victory got the Modern Age off course. The catastrophic endresult is not totally tragic. Its bases concerning the values are not mainly catastrophic. Here again a paradox: the real relations of the background can still be considered *positively*, if it exposes a kind of improvement of the reproduction of the bourgeois society.





The consequences of the analysis of the *Genealogy* are absolutely relevant for the young Lukács. They do not directly bear in the young thinker the will to overcome in any sense his late bourgeois society. They however deliver a so completely and sophisticatedly elaborated, complex image of this society, that the young Lukács could rightly expect the few, who can say that they overlook this society in its entirety. And this is an element to consider very seriously in Georg Lukács's *pre-marxian* development.



**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> See from the author (1990) :Georg Lukács' Ontologie als misslungener, nichtsdestoweniger aber lehrreicher Erneuerungsversuch des Neomarxismus - oder über den Hegelianismus als Paradigma. in: *Diskursüberschneidungen*. Georg Lukács und andere. Bern - Berlin - Frankfurt am Main - New York - Paris - Wien. (Peter Lang), 1990. 127 - 136.

<sup>2</sup> We integrate, in the philosophical practice itself, two parallel current aspects of the philosophical phenomenology. On the one hand, it is about an independent thinking mode, in which, first, its problematic of legitimation is predominant. On the other hand, „another” phenomenology expresses (not rare with the same authors), in which new phenomena are described, the „scientific” thematization of which was not always possible from these grounds.

<sup>3</sup> *The reflection on the „systematization”* of Béla Zalai has been an attempt to mention absolutely successfully, to „systematize” and „synchronize” the numerous new philosophical orientations in their representational spheres. He anticipated a lot of the characteristics of the structuralist thought, while he had recourse to the former structural systematization (somewhat with Kant). His attempts provided also the young Lukács and his circle with a serious and constant help, essentially in his synoptic applications. A rarely successful attempt of this systematization thinking was, as Zalai did it with the help of his systematization thinking, to answer the question whether the new values are possible or not, as Nietzsche pretended it. See on this thema the Chapter of Zalai in: Endre Kiss, *A világnézet kora*. (Friedrich Nietzsche abszolútumokat relativizáló hatása a századelőn.) Budapest, 1982 (Akadémiai Kiadó)

<sup>4</sup> This is the decisive *dynamic* moment in the work of the young Lukács, to which he is grateful for his permanent results. Simultaneously, it is also the way on which the *immanent and apparent moments of the work* can always be compared to each other, namely never in a miserable way imitating the real causality and the dependency relation.

<sup>5</sup> Besides, we must also be able, in the case of the young Lukács, to separate absolutely the theoretical-scientific state of an *ideal-typical* enunciation from the one of a *normal-descriptive* enunciation. The enunciation appearing at the end of a long chain of analyses of the function of the big town and modern urbanization in general in relation with cultural observations must in no case be confounded with a descriptive, or even valuating enunciation (as the Lukács of the Stalinist period will do it with Nietzsche).

<sup>6</sup> The fact already earns some attention, since the most important theoretical concepts of the 2nd International with Lukács (as by the way also with a large part of the most interested intellectuals) have been carefully pursued. S. about it E. Kiss, *Történelem és világnézet. A II. Internacionálé irodalomfelfogása Németországban*. in: *A marxista irodalomelmélet története*. Budapest, 1981. (Kossuth Kiadó), 91-121. A shortened German version: *Geschichte und Weltanschauung.. Literaturtheorie bei Franz Mehring* . in: *Annales Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae*. Sectio Philosophica et Sociologica. Tomus XVII. Budapest, 1983. 231-245.

<sup>7</sup> Any expert in Lukács' philosophy can provide numerous examples, in which this extreme proximity appears, even this capacity of confounding *Platonism* and *Positivism* (also in other philosophical forms).

<sup>8</sup> The *synthetic* interpretation, taken in the most true sense of the term, delivered here by Lukács, is an important and very positive alternative to this fight of the various schools of the literary interpretation which, since the *Socialist Realism*, strive for an exclusivity, even why not a monopoly position through the giving of the sense of the literary works can be legitimated

<sup>9</sup> See Endre Kiss, Wittgenstein, Rathenau, Lukács about the decisive sociological singularity of Lukács. (Attempt of a sociological interpretation). In : *Wittgenstein. A New Evaluation*. Amsterdam, 1990. (Kluwer) 298-300.



<sup>10</sup> We of course also think of his turn toward the communism, however not in the too often simplifying sense.

<sup>11</sup> Lukács György, *A modern dráma fejlődésének története*. Budapest, 1911. Tom. I. (Akadémiai) 75.

<sup>12</sup> S. about it E. Kiss, Presentation of Fichte by Hegel „Differenzschrift“. In : *Fichte and the Romantism*. Published by Wolfgang H. Schrader. Amsterdam-Atlanta, 1997. (Rodopi) 247-257.

<sup>13</sup> *A modern dráma fejlődésének története*, 100

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>16</sup> Exposed in details in the quoted work, P. 101-102

<sup>17</sup> As it will still be thematical in some places, it is not in the power of the existant by Lukács about the milieu taken in the normal sense, but also not about metaphysics of social power relations, it is here about an already objectivated imbrication of social relations.

<sup>18</sup> Ebenda, 102. The quotation pursues as follows : „The conflict is abstract, because the fight is led for the abstract and toward the abstract... and the background is concrete, because it is just in the concrete of the facts, that the heterogeneity testifies straight away of the hopeless, tragic consistence of the abstract aspiration“ (102-103)

<sup>19</sup> As it has still to be mentioned, the only other similarly established general presentation of the modern art is Hermann Broch's great *Hofmannsthal*-Essay. Although we cannot accept, also in the case of Hermann Broch emigrated in the USA, that he knows this work existing only in the Hungarian language, we have to keep in mind further with a big attention other parallels and similarities between Lukács and Broch.

<sup>20</sup> For us, it is of a clear theory-historical significance, that Lukács thematizes the fight of the historical (and historicist) and of the presentist rationality also explicitly : „Historism and Individualism, both have grown out of the soil of the same civilization, and even if, in many respects, it seems as they were not in most keen and irreconcilable opposition with each other, the doubt remains, as how antagonistic this opposition is“ (Ibidem, 142-143.). – Regarding the decisive struggle of both types of rationality, s. Endre Kiss, *About the reconstitution of the presentist rationality in Central Europe* . Cuxhaven-Dartford, 1999. (Junghans Verlag)– It is farther everything but a coincidence, that the reconciliation of both types of rationality be possible only on a social-ontological basis. It must also be known, that an explicite analysis of the „rationalization“, reminding essentially of Simmel, is carried out as organical element of the Modern Age in this work of the young Lukács (87-88).

<sup>21</sup> See On this subject in detail *Hofmannsthal and his Time* of Hermann Broch.

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, 82. – This link is itself in the context of Nietzsche's interpretation is not unproblematic. On the one side, we know nothing of the analysis, on the other side, it is sometimes excessively overvalued and is widespread as proof of Nietzsche's fundamental antimodernist conception. Our option would be, that we consider seriously this conception as a brilliant generalization of the young Nietzsche, it is however confronted with the very complex and important positions of the second period and wins a definitive position only from this confrontation. In the context of Lukács' interpretation, we can also absolutely not undervalue the importance of the reference to Nietzsche's cultural criticism for well-known reasons.

<sup>23</sup> It can immediately be evident, how superficial is a global cultural-critical condemnation of the large town, while here the communication and the detainer of new objective behaviours is considered as last causal explanation.



<sup>24</sup> „The new life has no mythology and this means, that it must keep artificially a distance between the tragedy themes and the life. Since the mythology has a double aesthetic relevance. One consists in the fact that it projects life feelings of the people upon their most profound problems in concrete symbols of concrete stories. And these feelings hardened themselves so little, that the transfer of the feelings in those could not be excluded... Furthermore, and this is maybe still more important, the mythology keeps a strong and natural distance between the public and the tragic case it has developed. It is also kept in a more or less important distance from the life, according to the eternally paradoxal manner of the poetry...” (Ibidem, 182-183).

<sup>25</sup> We wanted somewhat to underexpose this dimension, in order that the *impression of an illegitimate actualization of the work* cannot occur. This does absolutely not mean, that this aspect cannot be used as basis of a new analysis.

<sup>26</sup> Ibidem, 89-90.

## Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor (1958): *Wiesengrund, Noten zur Literatur I-III*. Frankfurt am Main
- Arendt, Hannah (1955): *Der Dichter wider Willen*. in: *Hermann Broch (Gesammelte Werke)*, Band 1. Rhein-Verlag, Zürich (eredetileg Men in Dark Times, New York, 1968)
- Bachtin, Michail (1989): *Formen der Zeit im Roman. Untersuchungen zur historischen Poetik*. Frankfurt am Main
- Blei, Franz (1987): *„A.P. Gütersloh“*, in *Portraits*. Hrsg. von Anne Gabritsch. Wien - Köln - Graz
- Curtius, Ernst Robert (1961): *Marcel Proust*. Berlin - Frankfurt am Main
- Dilthey, Wilhelm (1961): *Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*. Stuttgart, (3., unveränderte Auflage).
- Friedrich, Hugo (1956): *Die Strukturen der modernen Lyrik. Von Baudelaire bis zur Gegenwart*. Hamburg
- Goldmann, Lucien, (1966): *„Georg Lukács: Der Essayist“*, in: *Dialektische Untersuchungen*. Neuwied und Berlin 173-187.
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von (1955): *Prosa. Gesammelte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. 1-15 Bde. Herausgegeben von Herbert Steiner. Stockholm (später Frankfurt am Main)
- Husserl, Edmund (1976): *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie*. Haag
- Johnston, William M. (1974): *Österreichische Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte. Gesellschaft und Ideen im Donaauraum 1848 bis 1938*. Wien - Köln - Graz
- Kahler, Erich von (1970): *Untergang und Übergang. Essays*. München
- Kassner, Rudolf (1938): *Buch der Erinnerung*. Leipzig
- Kayser, Wolfgang (1959): *Die Wahrheit der Dichter*. Reinbek
- Kiss, Endre (1982): *A világnézet kora. Friedrich Nietzsche abszolútumokat relativizáló hatása a századelőn*. Budapest
- Kiss, Endre (1999): *A negatív univerzalizmus filozófiája és irodalma. Intellektuális monográfia Hermann Brochról*. Veszprém
- Köhnke, Klaus Christian, (1986): *Entstehung und Aufstieg des Neukantianismus. Die deutsche Universitätsphilosophie zwischen Idealismus und Positivismus*. Frankfurt am Main
- Liebert, August (1923): *Die geistige Krisis der Gegenwart*. Berlin
- Lukács, György (1911): *A modern dráma fejlődésének története*. Budapest





- Lukács, Georg (1984): *Die Theorie des Romans. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch Über die Formen der grossen Epik.* Darmstadt - Neuwied
- Mannheim, Karl (1978): *Ideologie und Utopie. Sechste, unveränderte Auflage.* Frankfurt am Main
- Nautz, Jürgen und Vahrenkamp, Richard (Hrsg.) (1993): *Die Wiener Jahrhundertwende. Einflüsse, Umwelt, Wirkungen.* Wien - Köln - Graz, 1993.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1913): *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung. Eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften.* Tübingen, (2. Auflage)
- Riegl, Alois (1894): *Volkskunst, Hausfleiss und Hausindustrie.* Berlin
- Scheler, Max (1955): *Vom Umsturz der Werte. Abhandlungen und Aufsätze. Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage.* Herausgegeben von Maria Scheler. Bern
- Weininger, Otto (1902): *Geschlecht und Charakter.* Wien-Leipzig
- Windelband, Wilhelm (1910): *Die Philosophie im deutschen Geistesleben des 19. Jahrhunderts.* Tübingen

