



BRILL

“Schneepart” and *Schlachtbeschreibung*

*On the Resumption of the Debate on Montage in Alexander Kluge
and Paul Celan*

Chiara Caradonna | ORCID: 0000-0003-2623-7025

Senior Lecturer, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

chiara.caradonna@mail.huji.ac.il

Received 16 July 2024 | Accepted 7 May 2025 |

Published online 1 July 2025

Abstract

In 1968 Alexander Kluge published an abridged and edited version of his 1964 experimental historiographical ‘novel’ on the Battle of Stalingrad, *Schlachtbeschreibung*. Right after its publication, Paul Celan purchased the book and offered a response *sui generis* to it in the poem “Schneepart.” The encounter between these two very different approaches to confronting the destructive political violence of the past gives occasion for a new assessment on the legacy of the debate on montage that took place in the 1930s. The article shows how montage is at work both in Kluge and Celan, and how it can be made viable for hermeneutic practices as well.

Keywords

Paul Celan – Alexander Kluge – montage – Expressionism debate – historiography – poetics

1 The Debate around Montage/Collage in the 1930s

At the heart of the debate surrounding the legacy of German Expressionism that took place in the 1930s, mainly between Georg Lukács on the one hand and Ernst Bloch, Bertolt Brecht, and Walter Benjamin on the other, was the question of the aesthetic and political legitimacy of the use of fragmentation in

the form of collage and/or montage in artistic works. At that point in time, the heyday of the artistic movements that had been experimenting with these techniques was already over. However, the escalating political events, not least the stigmatization by Nazism of avant-garde art as “degenerated,” demanded that left-wing intellectuals return to reflecting on the relationship between form and content and between politics and art, thought and action.

Lukács agreed with Bloch on the centrality of montage in the avant-garde,¹ but he criticized it for its immediate superficiality in reproducing a chaotic and opaque reality, forgoing a holistic, interpretative representation, as in his opinion was the case in the realistic novel (1971: 324, 341). For Lukács, montage was questionable, among other things, because of the “monotonousness” and ambiguity it produces, which does not align with orthodox Marxist tenets and does not produce any thorough understanding of reality (1971: 328, 339).

Brecht, the reader hardly needs reminding, repeatedly took a theoretical and practical stance in favor of montage and in particular of mixing new and old artistic techniques, of theater and film, novel and reportage (Morel, 2008; Didi-Huberman, 2018; Möbius, 2000: 338–346). His theater became a prime example of montage, which tore the audience away from the comfort of emotional identification and challenged them, as Bloch observed in the 1930s (Bloch, 1985: 247, 253), to think critically.

In his reply to Lukács, once a close friend, Bloch pointed to the “*reale Zersetzungen des Oberflächenzusammenhangs*” (“*real decomposition of the superficial context*,” 1985: 270–271) that Expressionism, unlike the realist and classicist novel (Thomas Mann’s, for example),² was capable of bringing about. Lukács accused the proponents of montage of understanding history solely from the viewpoint of the “rifts, abysses and catastrophes” that interrupt it, instead of highlighting “the dialectical unity of continuity and discontinuity” (1971: 339). Bloch insisted that “reality itself is full of interruptions” exactly *because* of its “dialectical relations” (253). Montage, Bloch claimed, indeed “has all the negativity of emptiness, but it also has, indirectly, this as potential positivity: that it creates ruins in another space, against the usual context” (228).

1 However, Lukács also wished to redefine the notion of artistic avant-garde itself: “eine solche wirkliche Avantgarde [können] nur die bedeutenden Realisten bilden [...]” (“only the important realist writers can build such a real avant-garde”, 1971: 332). A comprehensive collection of the relevant documents pertaining to the debate can be found in Schmitt 1976. See also Morel 2007. Unless stated otherwise, all translations in the present article are mine.

2 Cf. Lukács’s argument in favor of Thomas Mann (1971: 320–321).

According to Bloch, Benjamin's "philosophical cross-drilling" (227) was also exemplary for this kind of montage.³ For Benjamin it was in turn decisive that this technique was "capable of turning readers or spectators into participants" ("aus Lesern oder aus Zuschauern Mitwirkende zu machen imstande," 1977: 696). Benjamin elevated montage to the fundamental principle of his radically reconceptualized historiography in the *Arcades Project*. In this way, he unknowingly helped this technique to a kind of rebirth when the *Arcades Project* was first published in 1982.

An unexpected line of reception of the debate on montage in the second half of the twentieth century brings together, rather surprisingly, the poet Paul Celan (1920–1970) and the writer and film director Alexander Kluge (b. 1932). In what follows, I briefly discuss both authors' stance regarding this quintessentially avant-gardist technique. I focus in particular on Kluge's early work *Schlachtbeschreibung*, in which he employs montage as a historiographical tool to narrate the 1942–1943 Battle of Stalingrad. Celan, as I show, not only read this book but also took heed of Kluge's narrative strategy. In the poem "Schneepart," which is of crucial importance for his late poetics, Celan responds to Kluge's *Schlachtbeschreibung* through a subtle montage *sui generis*, which I analyze in detail, shedding new light on Celan's quotation strategy as montage. The analysis is based on the available critical editions of Celan's work, which offer insight into his laboratory throughout various stages of writing. These editions, I argue, are themselves the result of montage, as is the hermeneutic approach that makes use of them. The reception of montage, and thus of the historical avant-garde, I suggest, can therefore be traced both in specific literary works and in an interpretational method that shares the theoretical underpinnings that advocated for the use of montage since its inception.

2 Alexander Kluge's Choice of Montage

In a 2016 interview given in English, Alexander Kluge explicitly refers to Benjamin's unfinished major work when he claims: "we want to renew the *Pas-sagenwerk* from the point of view of the 21st century looking back to the 20th; we imitate what he [Benjamin] did from the view of the 1930s looking back to the 19th century." In the 1930s, Benjamin presented a model that could be reproduced almost a century later with different content. In the interview, Kluge

3 Lukács acknowledges the correctness of Bloch's diagnosis regarding the use of montage in contemporary "bourgeois" philosophical writing (1971: 328). For an overview on the concept of montage and its development see Möbius, 2000: 15–30.

goes on to differentiate between collage and montage. He considers the former as unsuitable for the purpose of writing an alternative, non-linear historiography. In collage, Kluge argues, the focus lies too strongly on the will of the author, who arranges the material “for artistic reasons.” What is essential in montage—Kluge is referring here primarily to film—is what happens between two consecutive images, both in relation to each other and in relation to the viewer. According to Kluge, in the interval between the montaged images, the active viewer, in Brecht’s and Benjamin’s sense, creates a second, invisible film through his or her participation (see also Andrae, 2020: 131). So while collage already presents a unity that consists of parts but is self-contained and does not require the participation of the viewer, montage is characterized by the fact that the unity of meaning is created only through the participation of the viewer. Moreover, much like Bloch,⁴ Kluge considers montage as “a principle which serves to acknowledge the contradictions in the world, the diversity, the plurality in the world” (Kluge, 2017).⁵

2.1 *Kluge’s Schlachtbeschreibung*

In 1964, when Kluge’s *Schlachtbeschreibung* was first published, the writer and film director, who was still at the beginning of his career, could hardly have known anything about Benjamin’s *Passagenwerk* (if he did, then possibly it was through Theodor W. Adorno, whose student he was at the University of Frankfurt).⁶ Accordingly, in the note accompanying the publication of an excerpt of *Schlachtbeschreibung* titled *Die Höhere Führung vor St. (St.’s Higher Command)* in the journal *Merkur* of the same year, Kluge stated that Gottfried Benn’s 1949

4 In a 2001 conversation with Jochen Rack, Kluge explains his relation to Bloch as follows: “JR: With his book from the 1930s, *The Heritage of Our Times*, Ernst Bloch tried to return to buried and forgotten feelings in order to explain how those feelings, which once may have been orientated toward an original solidarity, made their way into fascism. Do you consider your own work in line with this project? AK: You can be sure of that. However, this lineage can be drawn in another way, one that accounts for the gap between Ernst Bloch and Theodor W. Adorno. I see myself more in accordance with Adorno’s line of thinking. He would never publish a book entitled *The Principle of Hope*. He would nevertheless admit that we cannot live without hope, even if we have to produce hope at the expense of truth” (2019: 45).

5 Although he does not distinguish sharply between collage and montage with respect to *Schlachtbeschreibung*, Winfried Siebers highlights the multiperspectivism in Kluge’s work (Siebers, 2000: 163).

6 On Kluge’s closeness to Adorno, see the speech “The Actuality of Adorno,” which he gave in 2009 upon receiving the Adorno prize (2019: 450–461). For Ulrike Bosse (1989: 60–61), Adorno’s influence on Kluge when writing *Schlachtbeschreibung* is made evident by the choice of topic, which had to become part, according to Adorno, of the German “Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit.”

Roman des Phänotyps had served as a model for his project. Both works were, as Benn stated in *Doppelleben* in 1950, "orange-shaped" in structure ("*orangenförmig*," emphasis in the original, 1961: 132). By choosing such an "Orangentechnik" ("technique of the orange," Kluge, 1964: 445), Kluge thus employs a (late) expressionist, avant-garde, and experimental aesthetic. Kluge's intention was to "depict in a kaleidoscope-like manner the battle of Stalingrad—in WWII—from the various perspectives of the people involved in the event with military or mental acts" (445). Accordingly, the various "orange pieces" that make up *Schlachtbeschreibung* are largely materials from the time of the events that Kluge collected in archives, but also images of various kinds (photographs, drawings), or interviews with witnesses. However, there are also fictional narrative parts that are similar to what one could find in a novel. The characters are based on real people (Hitler, for example). But this is not the only reason why in the afterword to the 1968 edition of *Schlachtbeschreibung* Kluge describes the book as "fiction." Rather, he is concerned with the epistemological insight that "a disaster that affects a machinery of 300,000 people" cannot be "grasped" in its *Allseitigkeit* ("all-roundness"), to use Lukács' Leninist terminology (1971: 318), by documents based on the testimony of two eyes. It can therefore only be presented as fiction (Kluge, 1968: 237; see Visch, 1983: 46; Carp, 1987: 108–110; Siebers, 2000: 158–159; Fischer, 2013: 205–206). Certainly also to emphasize this point, Kluge refrained from providing bibliographical details that would signal the origin of the sources and clearly distinguish fiction from historical document.

In *Schlachtbeschreibung*, quotations are, as Benjamin determined for his own historiography, "blown out" of their respective contexts and cannot be easily traced back to their original source.⁷ This outraged the influential lit-

7 "Das destruktive oder kritische Moment in der materialistischen Geschichtsschreibung kommt in der Aufspaltung der historischen Kontinuität zur Geltung [...]. Die materialistische Geschichtsschreibung wählt ihre Gegenstände nicht leichter Hand. Sie greift nicht, sondern sprengt sie aus dem Verlauf heraus" (Benjamin, 1982: 594). "The destructive or critical momentum in materialist historiography is registered in that blasting of historical continuity with which the historical object first constitutes itself. [...] Materialist historiography does not choose its objects arbitrarily. It does not fasten on them but rather springs them loose from the order of succession" (Benjamin, 2002: 475). Cf. Carp, 1987: 106–107; "Kluges Prinzip der Montage, das Vorstellung und Realität unkommentiert nebeneinanderstellt und miteinander konfrontiert, ermöglicht genau diese ironische Brechung und damit Erkenntnisgewinn für einen aktiven Leser." ("Kluge's principle of montage, which puts imagination and reality uncommented next to each other, makes this ironic rupture and hence an increase in understanding for the active reader possible," Bosse, 1989: 76.) Siebers suggests that "[d]ie literarische Demontierung der Quelle als glaubhaftes Zeugnis historischer Quellen ist ein Aspekt, der sich aus Kluges Geschichtsbegriff ergibt" ("the literary dismantling of the sources

erary critic Marcel Reich-Ranicki, who pilloried the volume when it was first published and criticized Kluge for “abusing the reader’s trust in the facts and [...] turning history into a puzzle” (Reich-Ranicki, 1967: 50). The book had neither “contemporary history” nor “literature” to offer, and “more or less skilfull montage” should not be “mistaken for modern literature” (50). Furthermore, Reich-Ranicki did not understand why literature should not be able describe the Battle of Stalingrad, as “it is an event that can be researched and surveyed, rationally grasped and no less rationally interpreted” (46).

The avant-garde debate about the aesthetic and epistemological content and function of montage in the context of historiography was reignited in postwar Germany by Kluge’s *Schlachtbeschreibung*.⁸ It also found supporters, such as the literary critic Joachim Kaiser, who stated that Kluge did better justice to his subject “than most war novels.” The blurb for the 1968 edition of *Schlachtbeschreibung* that reports Kaiser’s statement also notes that Kluge “actualizes the events by letting the documents speak.” In fact, Kluge took the principle of actualization literally, publishing *Schlachtbeschreibung* six times in the course of 40 years, in separate book form, with different publishers, different titles, and a different order of the collected material.⁹

Schlachtbeschreibung last appeared in 2000 in the first volume of *Chronik der Gefühle* (Chronicle of emotions). There, Kluge notes that “in 1964 [he] still perceived Stalingrad as an event of near contemporary history” (2000: 988). This had led to certain decisions regarding matters of representation. Instead, at the time of the “Berlin Republic,” that is, after German reunification, the book would need to resist the idea that the “realities that produce Stalingrad” (Kluge uses the present tense) “are” merely “evil fictions” (51). With a somewhat convoluted formulation and a double negation, Kluge claims “to insist on Stalingrad” for the “protest reason that lack of memory is unreal” (“hat den Protestgrund, daß Erinnerungslosigkeit irreal ist,” 51).

Kluge turns the relationship between fiction and reality, fiction and realism on its head, but at the same time he makes it clear that his sentence cannot be reduced to the positive content that memory is real or that the absence of

as a reliable testimony of historical sources is one aspect that results from Kluge’s notion of history,” 2000: 164).

8 For an overview of the first decades of the reception of *Schlachtbeschreibung*, see Siebers, 2000: 158–159 and 170–171.

9 The first edition came out in 1964 (Walter Otto Verlag); in 1968 the Fischer edition was published; in 1969 the book came out under the title *Der Untergang der 6. Armee (Schlachtbeschreibung)* with Piper; in 1978 as *Schlachtbeschreibung. Der organisatorische Aufbau eines Unglücks* with Wilhelm Goldman Verlag; in 1983 as *Schlachtbeschreibung*; and in 2000 as part of *Chronik der Gefühle* with Suhrkamp. See Carp, 1987: 114–115.

memory is fictitious. At the heart of every new edition of the book is a dialectical relationship between past and present, remembering and forgetting, which only comes to fruition in the act of a "completely impractical, inactual" reading (2000: 511). A thorough examination of Kluge's early project that defies conventional genre classifications requires, as Kai Lars Fischer has demonstrated (2013: 35, 144–145), the consideration of each individual edition as part of a large-scale montage. Such montage, the components of which are scattered over time, only reveals its meaning in the gaps between the individual parts and in relation to the time of their respective appearance. The versions published earlier or later cast different shadows on each other, forward into the future and back into the past, as "the model of a linear reading is disbanded" (Fischer, 2013: 146). The simultaneity of different time levels is the consequence of such a reading (see Fischer, 2013: 154–155).

3 *Schlachtbeschreibung* and "Schneepart"

3.1 *Celan Reads Schlachtbeschreibung*

The 1968 edition of *Schlachtbeschreibung*, published by Fischer as a paperback, differs significantly from the previous edition and contains no images (Fischer, 2013: 205). On the cover there is a collage by Kurt Wirth which, against the backdrop of Stalingrad going up in flames, decomposes the name of the city as if it had also been blown up. Celan probably acquired the volume at the beginning of 1968 in Bonn (13 January), where he had been invited to read his poetry. In the book, which is kept in Celan's private library at the German literary archive in Marbach, there are traces of Celan's reading in his own hand.¹⁰ Celan took linguistic material from various sections of Kluge's book. This material found its way in particular into the poem "Schneepart." This poetologically significant poem is dated 22 January 1968. The poem lends its name to Celan's last, posthumously published poetry collection, which he partly prepared for printing himself, and concludes its first cycle.

From a biographical standpoint, the events described in Kluge's book were not that distant from Celan's own personal experience. At the time of the Battle of Stalingrad in the winter of 1942–1943 Celan was 22 years old, was doing forced labor in his hometown Czernowitz under German occupation (Chalfen, 1983: 117–121), and had to mourn the death of his parents in German concentration

10 I thank Eric Celan and Bertrand Badiou for kindly granting me access to the book and the Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach for readily providing me with scans of the marked pages.

camps (Chalfen, 1983: 126–129). The events on the Eastern Front had a direct impact on his life. As a result of the Soviet victory over Nazi Germany in Eastern Europe, Celan further deepened his knowledge of Russian, which he had started learning when Czernowitz had become part of the Soviet Union in 1940 (Chalfen, 1983: 93, 139). This rough biographical framing is important, especially in view of the fact that Kluge's account deliberately reflects exclusively the German perspective on the events.¹¹ This other point of view is conveyed in Celan's poem by way of a conversation with the sources used by Kluge.

I will now turn to Celan's treatment of Kluge's *Schlachtbeschreibung*—an experimental historiography assembled from heterogeneous material—against the background of the debate about montage, especially in Benjamin's understanding of it as an instrument of historiography, and with respect to its implications for hermeneutic procedures. This will provide further insights both on Celan's later work and on ways of approaching it. Can montage be used conceptually in both a descriptive and a normative sense for interpretative procedures? How might this affect the ambiguity and openness of interpretation? How does it affect the avant-garde position of literary criticism today? Can something of the explosive power of the poem be preserved in the explosive power of interpretation?

3.2 *Quotation, Collage, and Montage in Celan*

All those involved in the debate on Expressionism that I mentioned at the beginning, critics and supporters alike, agreed that montage was the avant-garde technique par excellence. Kluge, who in the second postwar period unapologetically, explicitly, and unambiguously took up this tradition, is regarded as the contemporary heir and continuator of the avant-garde in literature and film. In contrast, Celan's relation to the avant-garde, and especially to Surrealism, has been the subject of controversial scholarly debate (Barnert, 2007: 45–46; Ryland, 2010: 21–27).

In her study on the topic, Charlotte Ryland concludes that “Celan shares with the surrealists the recognition of correspondences between apparently disparate elements,” though not in “a surrealist celebration of renewal,” but rather to expose their “permanent difference” (2010: 183).

11 Bernd Wegner (2003) offers an overview of the different stages in which the battle of Stalingrad, in contrast to other equally momentous military events of the Second World War, acquired mythological significance. Wegner also refers to literary texts on Stalingrad published in German after the war but does not mention Kluge's *Schlachtbeschreibung*, the objective of which is precisely to contrast such mythologization. Celan in turn points to the limits of this objective and offers a formerly ignored perspective.

In the present context, the much discussed issue of Celan's handling of quotations is decisive (see Barnert, 2007: 13). Barbara Wiedemann's extensive commentary to the collected edition of Celan's poems demonstrates with great evidence the extent to which Celan incorporated foreign word material into his poems, with or without quotation marks, verbatim or with alterations. Celan, like Benjamin, was constantly on the lookout for quotable material. Quotations form the framework of the *Meridian* speech and their importance has led Arno Barnert to speak of a "poetics of quotation" (2007: 47) in Celan's work.

At the award ceremony for the Büchner Prize in Darmstadt in 1960 Celan introduced Lucile as the only figure in Georg Büchner's play *Danton's Death* who had spoken her own, independent, creative word, thereby upsetting hierarchies and power relations, and performing a true revolutionary act in the midst of a revolution that had degenerated into violence. However, in reality Lucile speaks as the representative of many other women who are known to have shouted the same phrase that Lucile utters at the play's end: "Long live the king!" (see Caradonna, 2020: 78). While the whole play is made out of quotations (see Barnert, 2007: 93), Lucile's quotation stands out as the combination of a highly individual speech act with immediate consequences (she is arrested and likely sentenced to death), and a moment of collective resistance to the violent exertion of a power that polices both bodies and language.

Through Lucile Celan exposed the very heart of the problem of quotation for poetry, if poetry's core is about creating the space for individual speech that can still be shared with others by means of material that is always already foreign. For Celan, this moment is politically charged to the highest degree with the revolutionary force that was characteristic of avant-garde art for Bloch, Brecht, and Benjamin. So, again, should, and can, Celan's poems be considered collages or montages?

In his detailed book on Celan's poetics of quotation, Barnert discusses both montage and collage in relation to the work of Gottfried Benn (Barnert, 2007: 43), from which Celan explicitly distanced himself, and to Julia Kristeva's and Roland Barthes's notion of intertextuality (46). Both ways of conceiving collage and montage are, according to Barnert, at odds with Celan's handling of quotations, because they either stress the arbitrary character of the textual combination (Benn) or refute the possibility of any "individual speech act" (44), as they rest on always already inherited material (Kristeva and Barthes). Barnert thus denies both terms any immediate relevance in relation to Celan's work, and despite referring to Benjamin's use of quotation (37), he does not delve into the use of collage and montage in the avant-garde or in Kluge's early work.

However, Celan demonstrably experimented with these techniques, certainly in the notes for the *Meridian* speech and in a series of quotations and

aphorisms that he compiled in May 1968 and collected under the title “Rote Mappe” (Red folder, see Caradonna, 2021). The latter compilation of heterogeneous textual material constituted, as I have argued elsewhere, an attempt to respond to the occurring political events through a complex, multi-voiced reflection on testimony and historiography, action and contemplation. Celan, a keen reader of Benjamin’s work as far as it was available at the time,¹² could not take heed of the *Arcades Project*, which remained unpublished during his lifetime. But while the student protests were raging around him in the Quartier Latin in Paris, and possibly after having paged through Kluge’s *Schlachtbeschreibung*, he himself attempted to write an alternative historiography that consisted of a montage of heterogeneous material, which is still unpublished in its entirety.

To summarize, two main aspects of montage as they were developed during the debate in the 1930s seem of particular relevance for its revival in the second afterwar period. For Benjamin—and Kluge refers to this in the interview quoted previously—“literary montage” is the “method of [his] project.” Benjamin vows to “merely show. [...] purloin no valuables, appropriate no ingenious formulations” (1982: 574; 2002: 460). Only “the rags, the refuse” (1982: 574; 2002: 460) should be used. For Benjamin, quoting meant above all that “the respective historical object is torn from its context” (1982: 595). Moreover, Bloch repeatedly emphasizes the relation between montage and *Hohlraum* (Bloch, 1985: 215, 228, 249, 276), the empty space that came to be with the “collapse of bourgeois culture” (215). Montage occupies, represents, and turns this empty space into a fundamental aesthetic and epistemic device (228). On the side of reception, montage draws the reader’s attention to those empty spaces and demands an active engagement with them, not least so as to explore “freige-wordene Möglichkeiten” (“possibilities that have been released,” 247).

3.3 Poetic Montage in “Schneepart”

The insight that Celan’s poem “Schneepart” goes back to linguistic material from Kluge’s *Schlachtbeschreibung* is due to a montage *sui generis*, namely the presentation of the poem’s variants in the critical editions of the homonymous collection. If one reads the poem in the first, posthumous edition of 1971, there is little reason to turn to Kluge, something that indeed has not happened, neither in the existing editions nor in the few existing interpretations of the poem to date (Speier, 1987; Plass, 1999):

12 See Celan, 2004: 287. On Celan’s readings of Benjamin and the latter’s presence in Celan’s poetry, see Hamacher, 2000; Dogà, 2009.

SCHNEEPART, gebäumt, bis zuletzt, im Aufwind, vor den für immer entfensterten Hütten:	SNOWPART, arched, to the last, in the updraft, before the forever dewindowed huts:
Flachträume schirken übers geriffelte Eis;	flatdreams skip over the chamfered ice;
die Wortschatten heraushaun, sie klawtern rings um den Krampen im Kolk.	to carve out the wordshadows, to stack them around the cramp in the crater.
CELAN, 2018: 490	CELAN, 2014: 335

The mention of snow or a snowy landscape could point in many directions and is characteristic of several of Celan’s poems, both in general terms and in the context of the poems written in the winter of 1967–1968 specifically (see Amthor, 2006). Celan wrote to Gisèle Celan-Lestrange from Berlin on 23 December 1967 that he was experiencing for the first time in years “un hiver fait de neige et de neige” (“a winter made of snow and of snow,” Celan and Celan-Lestrange, 2001: 596).

Upon opening the Tübingen edition (TCA) at the double page where the development of “Schneepart” is showcased (2002: 28–29), five columns of word material are displayed.¹³ According to the editor’s intention the columns represent in print the various stages that led to the poem’s final version (the *Reinschrift*), printed in the fifth column on the right. In the case of “Schneepart,” the double page of the notebook *Arbeitsheft* 1,20 is “diplomatically printed” in the first and second column on the left-hand side (2002: xii). A footnote at the bottom provides information on the writing tools used for each notation: “ink on the left page at the top, soft pencil on the right side at the top, harder pencil at the bottom” (2002: 28). It can therefore be assumed that these notations were written at different points in time.

The sentence “die Hölzer werden—kreuzweis—/ überblattet” (“the pieces of wood are scarfed—crosswise,” 28), written at the bottom of the notebook’s left-hand page, appears to be the only direct quotation from the 1968 edition

13 The same material is displayed genetically in the Bonner Celan Ausgabe (Celan 1994: 84–87). There are slight differences between the two editions as far as the poem is concerned. In what follows, I refer mainly to the more recent Tübingen edition.

of *Schlachtbeschreibung*. It left an explicit trace up to the penultimate version of the poem's last stanza in the verses "Die überblatteten / Wortschatten drauf" ("the scarfed wordshadows on top," 29). It was then crossed through and disappeared from the final version. This formulation can be found in the section "Stellungsbau im Winter" (Emplacement building in winter) in the third chapter, "Richtlinien für den Winterkrieg" (Guidelines for winter warfare):

Auch aus Rund- und Kanthölzern läßt sich schnell eine aufgesetzte Deckung für 1 oder 2 Schützen der 1.MG bauen. Die Hölzer werden als offenes Viereck an den Enden kreuzweis überblattet und mit Bolzen oder Bauklammern untereinander verbunden. Durch Aussparungen in den beiden Hölzern der Stirnwand entsteht die Schießscharte oder der Sehschlitz [muß dicht über Schneeoberfläche liegen].

KLUGE, 1968: 48

Also with round and square timber a fitted cover for one or two shooters of the 1. MG can quickly be built. The pieces of timber are joined together crosswise at the endings as an open square and connected with each other with bolts and cramps. Through openings in both pieces of timber at the front wall a shooting embrasure or observation slit is formed [it must be located closely to the snow surface].

The passage describes one of the possible ways to quickly and effectively build cover for soldiers in extremely cold weather conditions. This chapter is built out of various excerpts from the Wehrmacht's *Taschenbuch für den Winterkrieg* (Pocket book for winter warfare, 1942). Contrary to Reich-Ranicki's complaint regarding the lack of clear bibliographic references in *Schlachtbeschreibung*, in this case the source's details are clearly noted, albeit with abbreviations, at the beginning of the section (Kluge, 1968: 43). The *Taschenbuch's* instructions are meant for immediate military use, as the reference to the "shooters" and the "shooting embrasure" makes clear. In this chapter, Kluge combines various, evidently partial excerpts from the *Taschenbuch*. For example, in the quoted section on "Stellungsbau im Winter" the list of possible building techniques begins at point 4, making the reader aware of the previous three points that are missing. This obvious incompleteness exposes the text's montaged structure and its empty spaces. As Barnert points out, Celan himself makes extensive use of similarly "interrupted, intermittent and omitted quotations" in his poetry ("[u]nterbrochene, intermittierende und ausgesparte Zitate," Barnert, 2007: 68). They are at work in "Schneepart" as well in its response to *Schlachtbeschreibung*.

The passage quoted previously also illustrates allegorically the procedure of building *Schlachtbeschreibung* itself. Separate blocks of foreign text are connected together and leave "Aussparungen," openings in between them. Celan's notation from this passage, and what remains of it until the second-to-last version of the poem, is a "quoted quotation" or "quotation to the second degree" (Barnert, 2007: 126), that is, an already mediated and manipulated textual fragment that relates to two different sources and demands a critical assessment of both, and in particular of the "Zwischenräume," the spaces that are left open between them (see Barnert, 2007: 85, 132).

The image of building blocks, of the ways in which they are joined together, and of the openings (*Aussparungen*) between them constitutes a first important poetological thread that ties together *Schlachtbeschreibung* and "Schneepart," and the understanding of montage they respectively convey. In two drafts of the third stanza of "Schneepart," which Celan later left out entirely, there is explicit mention of building blocks and their reception: "Blöcke heraushaun, sie / in den noch freien / Gehörgängen klawern" ("to quarry blocks / to cord them in the / still free auditory canal," 2002: 29).

During his reading of *Schlachtbeschreibung*, Celan underlined the words that caught his attention and added a small diagonal line on the side to mark their importance. Such markings can be found on only 15 of the book's 237 pages. It hardly appears to have been an intensive or particularly penetrating reading, and the recorded and to a small extent excerpted words do not find their way directly into "Schneepart." Yet the poem's overall setting shows traces of Kluge's documentary material. In particular, Celan refers and responds to the already mentioned chapter based on the *Taschenbuch für den Winterkrieg*.

Celan has the overall description in *Schlachtbeschreibung* interact with other material, as well as with the other poems from the collection's first cycle. In fact, the notations on the upper part of the *Arbeitsheft's* double page seem to refer to the poems "Du liegst" and "Lila Luft," both devoted to the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht on 15 January 1919 (see Szondi, 1972), almost exactly 49 years before Celan wrote "Schneepart."¹⁴ These notations are indeed a continuation of a series of notes on the topic in the same notebook, which starts at page 56^r and continues up to pages 63^v–64^r, where the excerpts from *Schlachtbeschreibung* can also be found. This suggests not only that the poems are interlocked, but also that together they constitute a reflection on (state) vio-

14 The formulation on the top part of the right-hand page is the most explicit in this respect: "und die verhenkterte Nelke / grüßt aus dem Kolk" ("and the executed carnation / greets from the colk"). The carnation is famously the flower associated with socialism, and Rosa Luxemburg's dead body was thrown into the Landwehrkanal's icy waters.

lence and its language in the German context from the aftermath of the First World War to the Second World War.

3.4 *Building Blocks: Snow, Wind, Huts*

The first stanza of “Schneepart” takes on various motifs contained in the aforementioned section of the *Taschenbuch* on how to prepare for winter warfare:

SCHNEEPART, gebäumt, bis zuletzt,
im Aufwind, vor
den für immer entfensterten
Hütten:

CELAN, 2018: 490

SNOWPART, arched, to the last,
in the updraft, before
the forever dewindowed
huts:

CELAN, 2014: 335

Among these motifs, wind and the construction of protective measures, “Schneebauten” (“snow buildings,” 44), are the most striking. At the beginning of the section from the *Taschenbuch* reported in *Schlachtbeschreibung* the “Russian winter” is described in detail, warning in particular that “[a]uch geringer Schneefall kann unter dem Einfluß des Windes durch Schneeverwehungen zu großen Verkehrsstörungen führen” (“even a light snowfall can cause severe disruptions to traffic due to the windblown dispersal of snow,” 43). In point 11.9, soldiers are encouraged to acquaint themselves with the surprisingly trusted ally that snow can be under such harsh weather conditions:

Der winterungewohnte und besonders im Winterkrieg in Rußland unerfahrene Soldat muß nicht nur über die Nachteile, sondern erst recht über die Vorteile, die der Schnee ihm bringt und die es auszunutzen gilt, Bescheid wissen! Schnee schützt, richtig ausgenutzt, gegen Kälte [siehe “Schneebauten”]. Schnee schützt gegen Wind [...].

KLUGE, 1968: 44

The soldier who is not used to winter and in particular lacks experience in winter warfare in Russia should know not only about the disadvantages, but most importantly about the advantages that snow brings him and that should be exploited! Snow, if used properly, protects against the cold [see “snow buildings”]. Snow protects against the wind.

Celan marked this passage. He does not quote directly from this passage or any of the other possibly relevant words from these pages, such as “Stellungsbau” (47), “Schneeloch” (47), “Deckungen” (47), or—also marked by Celan in the section “Tagesablauf Hitlers” (Hitler’s daily routine)—“Holzbaracken sowie

Betonkästen” (226). These constructions serve, as is constantly stressed in the guidelines themselves, military purposes. However, indirectly both the winter setting and the reference to a hut, a “covered place of shelter” (Grimm and Grimm, 1876: 1995), in the poem can be read in parallel to these sections in *Schlachtbeschreibung*. At significant junctures, the poem departs decidedly from *Schlachtbeschreibung*, thereby taking a strong stance with respect to its military jargon and to the purposes for which shelter is built. Already in 1971 Peter Szondi had noted the following regarding Celan’s poetic procedure:

Das Gedicht als Sprachgewebe [...] konkretisiert die Gedankenassoziation nicht so sehr diskursiv, im Nacheinander der Satzaussage, als vielmehr in dem vom Sprachmaterial bereitgestellten Ineinander, in Roman Jakobsons Terminologie: nicht metonymisch, sondern metaphorisch.

1972: 124

The poem as a tissue of words [...] gives concrete form to the association of thoughts, not discursively, in a fixed sequence of statements, but in the sum of interactions provided for by the linguistic material—or, in Roman Jakobson’s terminology, not metonymically, but metaphorically.

2003: 91–92

The substitution of constructions for coverage during a military campaign with humble windowless huts, meaning huts without openings for machine guns, operates according to Szondi’s application of Jakobson’s terminology to a reading of Celan’s poem “Du liegst”—metaphorically, on the grounds of similarity, though with a subversive, polemical intention. Significantly, in the essay that Szondi is referring to, Jakobson considers a development of filmic montage that also functions metaphorically rather than metonymically, as is usually the case:

[i]n such motion pictures as those of Charlie Chaplin and Eisenstein, these devices in turn were overlaid by a novel, metaphoric “montage” with its “lap dissolves”—the filmic similes.

JAKOBSON, 1956: 92

I suggest reading “Schneepart” as a montage that operates, with respect to *Schlachtbeschreibung*, in this way, through substitution rather than direct quotation and combination of foreign textual material as occurs in *Schlachtbeschreibung* itself. Instead of repeating Kluge’s operation, Celan engages with it by offering an alternative, a *Gegenwort*—akin to that of Lucile in the *Meridi-*

an—a counter-word to the language of warfare. Bringing the two texts together allows for the poem to emerge in all its evidence as a *Gegenwort*, as interpretation montages the different materials together.

By choosing “entfensterten Hütten,” Celan recalls, as Hans-Michael Speier (1987: 72) and Barbara Wiedemann (Celan, 2018: 1183) have noted, his own 1963 poem “Hüttenfenster,” which begins with the verses: “Das Aug, dunkel: / als Hüttenfenster” (2018: 161; “The eye, dark: / as hut window,” 2020: 337). It also echos the revolutionary cry from Georg Büchner’s *Hessischer Landbote*: “Friede den Hütten, Krieg den Palästen,” which Celan had in turn taken up in the shortened version “Friede den Hütten!” (2018: 157; “Peace to the huts!,” 2020: 327) at the end of the poem “In Eins” (2018: 157). This same poem also refers to another significant place in Celan’s Russian geography, Petersburg/Leningrad: “Petropolis, der / Unvergessenen Wanderstadt” (“Petropolis, the / wander-city of the unforgotten,” vv. 15–16, 2020: 325–326, translation modified; see Ivanović, 1996: 92–93). In December 1967, less than a month before writing “Schneepart,” Celan had translated and published one last poem by Osip Mandel’shtam, titled “In Petersburg” (see Ivanović, 1997: 80–81). Its first verse reads programmatically also for “Schneepart,” and for Celan’s montage technique as a whole: “Petersburg: es führt uns neu zusammen” (Celan, 2000: 15; “Petersburg: it brings us anew/in a new way together”). The first stanza of “Schneepart” includes a set of multilayered self-quotations (see Barnert, 2007: 61–68) that respond to the textual material presented by Kluge. “Hüttenfenster,” which ends with the verses “das Haus, wo der Tisch steht mit // dem Licht und dem Licht” (2018: 163; “the house, where the table stands with // the light and the light,” 2020: 341), evokes a famous Midrash on the Book of Numbers about the building of windows:

Know that when a person builds a house, he crafts windows that are narrow from without and wide from within. Solomon, who built the Temple, did not do so, but rather, he crafted windows that are narrow from within and wide from without, so that the light would emerge from the Temple and illuminate outside, as it is stated: “He made for the House recessed narrowing windows” (1 Kings 6:4). This is to inform you that He is all light and does not need their light. Why, then, did He command you? It is to accord you merit. That is why it is stated: “When you kindle the lamps.” That is, “The Lord is desirous of him because of his righteousness.” Moreover, [God said:] “If you are vigilant in kindling the lamps before Me, I will illuminate for you with a great light in the future.” That is why it is stated: “Arise, shine, for your light has come ... Nations will walk by your light and kings by the radiance of your shining” (Isaiah 60:1, 3).

Bemidbar Rabbah, 15,2; see *The Sefaria Midrash Rabbah*, 2022

In “Schneepart,” there are no windows through which the light may shine anymore, neither the divine light nor the earthly light of a candle lit by a human being. The windows have forcefully been removed, as the prefix “ent-” suggests.¹⁵ But the “dewindowing” of the huts can also be understood, in relation to the first verse of “Hüttenfenster” (“Das Aug: dunkel / als Hüttenfenster”), as the closing of the eye and the shifting of the attention to the ear. This is confirmed by the further course of the poem and especially by the last stanza, which in the penultimate draft still mentioned “Gehörgängen” (“auditory canals,” 2002: 29). The final version’s final word is “Kolk” (“crater,” but also hole or whirlpool), which is etymologically connected to the word *Kehle* (throat) but also recalls, with respect to both the shape it refers to and its sound, the ear’s cochlea. Rather than vision, speech—spoken as well as heard—is addressed here.

The poem openly rejects the construction of any window that may be used for combat purposes and expresses an attitude that resolutely opts for the “outside.” As Speier has noticed (1987: 71–72), with some sensitivity to paronomasia in the unusual past participle “entfenstert” resounds also the, in contrast, quite common word “entferntest” (farthest away), suggesting that the huts for shelter have become utterly unreachable. More common still would be to involve the French verb *défenestrer*, which means both to remove a window and to throw someone out of a window, and was most likely present to Celan’s francophone ear. In this case, the huts would be thrown out of the window altogether, in a curious and paradoxical reversal of inside and outside, the part and the whole.

The reversal with respect to *Schlachtbeschreibung* is at work also in the role of the wind. In the *Taschenbuch* it is described as a force from which one protects oneself with the help of snow (“Snow protects against wind”). Instead, in “Schneepart” it becomes an ally of the snow in the form of a positively connoted “Aufwind,” “updraft.” In fact, a previous version of the poem reveals that the perspective is inverted from the poem’s beginning. The first verse included a verb that made the action to be carried out in the first stanza explicit: “Den Schneepart spielen” (“to play the snowpart,” 2002: 28–29). No longer played out against each other for the purposes of military success (“Schnee schützt gegen Wind,” Kluge, 1968: 44), snow and wind are rather allies in opposing the *Taschenbuch*’s belligerent stance, both in deeds and in words.

Accordingly, the second stanza proposes a whole different pastime, one that indicates play and daydreaming, in stark contrast to war:

15 “ent drückt aus ab, davon, los, weg und wird ganz privativ, das gegentheil von be: entdecken, enthüllen ist aufdecken, entkleiden auskleiden, entgürten losgürten, entschuhhen ausschuhhen [...]” (Grimm and Grimm, 1859: 489).

Flachträume schirken
 übers
 geriffelte Eis;

CELAN, 2018: 490

to skip flatdreams
 over
 the chamfered ice;

CELAN, 2014: 335

The poem's first preserved draft (2002: 28) shows Celan's hesitation between the words "Weißträume" (white dreams), "Wachträume" (daydreams), and the final "Flachträume" (flatdreams), which incorporates the flat stones to be thrown onto the water's surface. In his interpretation of the poem, published before the manuscripts were made available, Speier suggested that throwing "flatdreams" over the rippled icy surface may produce a sound, much like the needle on a vinyl plate (73).

3.5 *Shadows in the Snow*

In the same essay, Speier also offered a reading of the poem's last stanza:

Die aus dem Eis geschlagenen Wortschatten werden wie Barren oder Kloben aufgehäuft, um mit ihnen zu bauen. Man richtet sich wohnlich ein im Unwirtlichen: in der aus spiralförmig ("rings um") geschichteten Eisblöcken errichteten Winterhütte halbnomadischer arktischer Völker, dem Iglu. In trotziger Abkehr von den ungastlichen menschlichen Behausungen, den entfensterten Hütten, soll ein Gehäuse entstehen: ganz aus Sprache. Es ist ein Gegen-Haus und deshalb auch eine Gegen-Sprache, die als Baumaterial dient—Sprachmaterial, das der Dichter aus dem Vereisten und Erstarrten gewöhnlicher Sprache gewinnt, indem er es aus ihr heraushaut, befreit.

SPEIER, 1987: 74

The wordshadows, shoveled out of the ice, are stacked as bars or blocks with the purpose of building something with them. A homelike arrangement in an unwelcoming setting: in the winter hut of half-nomadic arctic people—the igloo—, built with blocks of ice layered in spiral ("around"). Turning away defiantly from unwelcoming human dwellings, the dewindowed huts, housing is to be created: entirely made of language. It is a counter-house and therefore also a counter-language that serves as building material—linguistic material that the poet gathers from the frozen and solidified daily language by quarrying, freeing it.

The juxtaposition with the wartime sources provided by Kluge completes and adds a new dimension to Speier's interpretation. In fact, "igloo of the type built

by Eskimos” is mentioned in the *Taschenbuch*’s section on “snow buildings” (47). In particular, reference to the shadow in v. 8 (“Wortschatten”)—a recurring theme in Celan’s poetry (see Speier, 1987: 73; Caradonna, 2020)—acquires additional concreteness when read against the background of *Schlachtbeschreibung*.

die Wortschatten
heraushaun, sie klaffern
rings um den Krampen
im Kolk.

CELAN, 2018: 490

to carve out
the wordshadows, to stack them
around the cramp
in the crater.

CELAN, 2014: 335

In *Schlachtbeschreibung*, the shadow is mentioned in a section of the *Taschenbuch* entitled “Die verschiedenen Arten des Zurechtfindens” (“The different ways of finding your way,” 46), which features points 10–14 from the *Taschenbuch*. Point 13 states that “[t]he direction of one’s own shadow” can be considered an “aid to hold on to the direction.” The following point 14 reads:

Bei schattenloser Beleuchtung [diffuses Licht] ist es zweckmäßig, künstliche Schatten zu erzeugen. Beispiel: Verfolgen einer schwer sichtbaren Spur im Schnee. Ein Mann stellt sich [...] dicht neben die Spur und erzeugt dadurch einen auf der Spur liegenden Schatten. Dieser kann von einem 2 m dahinter stehenden zweiten Mann deutlich wahrgenommen werden.

KLUGE, 1968: 46

In the case of shadowless lighting [diffuse light], it is advisable to create artificial shadows. Example: Following a trace in the snow that is difficult to see. A man stands [...] close to the trace and thereby creates a shadow on the trace. This can be seen clearly by a second man standing 2 m behind him.

In the poem, the instructions for successful warfare in hostile weather conditions become a call to action that describes and requires a wholly different understanding of language and of our relationship to it. The words’ shadow, which is paradoxically as tangible as a block of ice, provides orientation in an only apparently desolate landscape. They are used to build a shelter that stands for the articulation of sound, for dialogue (speaking/listening), rather than an antagonistic, belligerent stance. In earlier drafts the poem’s final exhortation, “grüß sie” (“greet them”), further accentuates this orientation towards a welcoming encounter.

The poem indeed provides instructions for a “counter-house,” as Speier suggested, but this house is not meant to be solely the poet’s home (see Speier, 1987: 74). *Schlachtbeschreibung*’s second chapter presents various excerpts from the “pressemäßige Behandlung” (“treatment by the press”) of the events surrounding the Battle of Stalingrad. The indications provided by the *Reichspressechef* (the Reich’s press chief) towards the end of this battle—that Germany lost, and that caused an exorbitant loss in terms of human life—demanded its transformation into the “greatest heroic song in German history,” an “event, which outshines the greatest heroic military actions in world history” (37), “an epos of heroes,” “a myth that will give all the coming generations of our people strength and a sense of obligation” (38). “Words of sorrow” (38) should be avoided in favor of “an optimistic language” that would “express confidence in victory” (39).

Confronted with the material montaged in *Schlachtbeschreibung*, “Schneepart” reveals itself as a pocketbook of instructions of a whole different kind. It responds to two episodes of extreme political violence in the past, against individuals and against collectives. Such events cut off one’s breath and the ability to speak. The words “Gewürgt, gewü” (“choked, cho”), noted and struck through at the top of the poem’s first draft (2002: 28), testify to this. Such events are catastrophic not least for an orientation in language and the relation with others. Both have to be rebuilt and remain arduous to realize, as the accumulation of plosive and liquid sounds in the last stanza—almost a tongue-twister—suggests. As the *Taschenbuch*’s instructions were meant for soldiers in warfare, the instructions in “Schneepart” are meant for those who, as Lucile, wish to resist and oppose all that the *Taschenbuch* stands for.

4 Conclusion

The references to Kluge in Celan’s poem are not quotations in the strict sense and are no longer immediately recognizable as such. The passages Celan marked in his copy are not sufficient to trace reading behavior and reception. What is quoted and assembled are rather historical moments in their linguistic and thus ideological expression and in the way they are reproduced over time. The poem itself articulates a statement on all of this, in the very concrete sense of the “Stellungsbau im Winter” (“emplacement building in winter”), the heading of the section quoted earlier. The military jargon is transformed into a poetological, aesthetic, political, and ethical statement that relates to the jargon itself and to the way Kluge treats and presents it. Thus, when one of the announcements by the *Reichspressechef* in *Schlachtbeschreibung* states

that "[t]he German press [...] will use a confident language" ("[d]ie deutsche Presse [wird] eine zuversichtliche Sprache führen," 39) in the face of defeat, the poem performatively defies this linguistic attitude and places itself in a position of resistance against manipulative and mendacious speech. It searches for the wordshadows. "Schneepart" confirms Sandro Zanetti's consideration that Celan's poems are concerned with "ein vorwegnehmendes Zitieren, ein gegenwärtiges Herbeizitieren dessen [], war erst noch gesagt werden sollte" ("an anticipatory way of quoting, a quotation, at present, of what still has to be said," 2006: 60). The space for what is yet to be said is the *Hohlraum*, the empty space that unfolds in between different texts, as they are montaged together and fade into one another in a filmic lap dissolve.

The steps taken towards interpretation consist largely of combining together pieces of different origin, except that, in contrast to Benjamin's or Kluge's montage technique, the convention requires us to make our sources explicit. The "hermeneutics of excess," as I have called it elsewhere, does not strive for a final, exhaustive interpretation of a poem (Caradonna, 2020: 257) but intends to expose and make space for the *Hohlraum*. On the one hand, this approach wishes to mark the surplus that a poem brings with it and that cannot be logically reduced or resolved; on the other hand, it wishes to point towards possibilities of actualization in the respective, unrepeatable now of reading and understanding (Benjamin's *Jetzt der Erkennbarkeit*) by bringing together heterogeneous materials—including those that the author demonstrably did not know. As in the montage conceived by Brecht, Bloch, and Benjamin, the reader is called upon to actively participate in such a montage, in a process that does not see itself as complete or concluded. Ambiguities are to be guarded and even produced, in the conviction that the interpreter's task is to shed such light on each text that it can, in turn, cast a new shadow that will draw attention to previously unnoticed traces. Different interpretations can be assembled into a not always coherent, fragmented whole. There is, in short, also on the side of interpretation a legacy with respect to the 1930s debate on montage.

Finally, such a hermeneutic approach also takes into account coincidences, the contingency of which generate new constellations of meaning. In Kluge's short afterword to the 1968 edition of *Schlachtbeschreibung*, one reads the following sentence:

Das Buch, wie jede Fiktion (auch die aus dokumentarischem Material bestehende), enthält ein Gitter, an das sich die Phantasie des Lesers anklammern kann, wenn sie sich in Richtung Stalingrad bewegt.

KLUGE, 1968: 237

The book, like all fiction (including that consisting of documentary material), contains a grid to which the reader's imagination can cling as it moves towards Stalingrad.

Celan read this passage in 1968, but he underlined the sentence that precedes it instead: "Trübung der Wahrnehmungskräfte durch das Unglück selbst" ("blurring of perception due to the misfortune itself," 237). However, the sentence that Celan did not mark will, especially in the context of a discussion of Celan's work, bring to mind the title of Celan's earlier collection *Sprachgitter* (1959, *Speechgrille*). In reference to the speaking grids of cloistered monasteries, the word stands for the relationship between two speakers through the poem. In a conversation with Hugo Huppert, Celan described it as follows:

[...] immer greift er [mein Leser] nur die Gitterstäbe zwischen uns [...]. [D]ieser durchs Gitter "freigegebene Blick", dieses "entfernte Verstehen" ist schon versöhnlich, ist schon Gewinn, Trost, vielleicht Hoffnung. Keiner ist "wie" der andere; und darum soll er vielleicht den andern studieren, sei's auch durchs Gitter hindurch. Dieses Studium ist mein "spirituelles" Dichten, wenn Sie so wollen.

1973, 30–31

[...] he [my reader] only ever grasps the bars between us [...]. [T]his "view uncovered" through the bars, this "distant understanding" is already conciliatory, is already gain, consolation, perhaps hope. No one is "like" the other; and that is why he should perhaps study the other, even through the bars. This study is my "spiritual" poetry, if you like.

I do not assume that Kluge was referring to Celan with his use of the image of the grid. Rather, bringing these two quotations together reveals the distance that separates Kluge's and Celan's understanding of the text, and of its relationship with the reader. While Kluge refers to the relationship to an object to be recognized—albeit under unconventional epistemological conditions—Celan is concerned with the recognition of an Other in and through language. Both Kluge and Celan point to the support that the bars can provide, but Celan also points to the space that opens up between them and discloses the view to the other. This also measures the distance between the title words "Schneepart" and *Schlachtbeschreibung*: while Kluge imagines how to describe a catastrophic, disastrous battle and the belligerent rhetoric that surrounds it, Celan suggests acting and behaving like the snow and the wind that prevent it. Or, in Benjamin's words:

In jedem wahren Kunstwerk gibt es die Stelle, an der es den, der sich dareinversetzt, kühl wie der Wind einer kommenden Frühe anweht. [...] Fortschritt ist nicht in der Kontinuität des Zeitverlaufs sondern in seinen Interferenzen zu Hause: dort wo ein wahrhaft Neues zum ersten Mal mit der Nüchternheit der Frühe sich fühlbar macht.

1982: 593

In every true work of art there is a place where, for one who removes there, it blows cool like the wind of a coming dawn. From this it follows that art, which has often been considered refractory to every relation with progress, can provide its true definition. Progress has its seat not in the continuity of elapsing time but in its interferences—where the truly new makes itself felt for the first time, with the sobriety of dawn.

2002: 474

References

- Amthor, W. (2006). *Schneegespräche an gastlichen Tischen. Wechselseitiges Übersetzen bei Paul. Celan und André du Bouchet*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Andrae, S. (2020). “Und so kommen lauter Lebendigkeiten zusammen. Ein Interview mit Alexander Kluge über Realismus und Realität,” *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 65, pp. 128–135.
- Barnert, A. (2007). *Mit dem fremden Wort. Poetisches Zitieren bei Paul Celan*. Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld.
- Benjamin, W. (1977). “Der Autor als Produzent,” in Tiedemann, R. and Schweppenhäuser, H. (eds.) *Aufsätze, Essays, Vorträge. Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11.2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 683–701.
- Benjamin, W. (1982). *Das Passagen-Werk. Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. v.1. Edited by R. Tiedemann. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Benjamin, W. (2002). *The Arcades Project*. Translated by H. Eiland and K. McLaughlin. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Benn, G. (1961). *Autobiographische und vermischte Schriften. Gesammelte Werke in vier Bänden*, vol. 4. Edited by D. Wellershoff. Wiesbaden: Limes Verlag.
- Bloch, E. (1985). *Erbschaft dieser Zeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bosse, U. (1989). *Alexander Kluge—Formen literarischer Darstellung von Geschichte*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Caradonna, C. (2020). *Opak. Schatten der Erkenntnis in Paul Celans “Meridian” und im Gedicht “Schwanengefahr”*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag.
- Caradonna, C. (2021). “Beyond Poetry: Celan’s Red Folder, May 1968,” in Eskin, M.,

- Leeder, K.J., and Pajević, M. (eds.) *Paul Celan Today: A Companion*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 201–219.
- Carp, S. (1987). *Kriegsgeschichten. Zum Werk Alexander Kluges*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Celan, P. (1994). *Schneepart. Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe*, vol. x.2. Edited by R. Bücher, A. Gellhaus, and A. Lohr. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Celan, P. (2000). *Übertragungen II. Gesammelte Werke*, vol. v. Edited by B. Allemann and S. Reichert. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Celan, P. (2002). *Schneepart. Vorstufen—Textgenese—Reinschrift*, Tübinger Ausgabe. Edited by H. Schmull, in collaboration with M. Heilmann. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Celan, P. (2004). *La Bibliothèque philosophique. Catalogue raisonné des annotations*. Edited by A. Richter, P. Alac, and B. Badiou. Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm.
- Celan, P. (2014). *Breathturn into Timestead. The Collected Later Poetry*. Translated by P. Joris. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Celan, P. (2018). *Die Gedichte*. Edited and commented by B. Wiedemann. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Celan, P. (2020). *Memory Rose Into Threshold Speech. The Collected Earlier Poetry*. Translated by P. Joris. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Celan, P. and Celan-Lestranger, G. (2001). *Correspondance (1951–1970)*, vol. 1. Edited and commented by B. Badiou with the participation of E. Celan. Paris: Seuil.
- Chalfen, I. (1983). *Paul Celan. Eine Biographie seiner Jugend*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Didi-Huberman, G. (2018). *The Eye of History: When Images Take Positions*. Translated by S.B. Lillis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dogà, U. (2009). *“Port Bou—deutsch?” Paul Celan liest Walter Benjamin*. Aachen: Rimbaud Verlag.
- Fischer, K.L. (2013). *Geschichtsmontagen. Zum Zusammenhang von Geschichtskonzeption und Text-Modell bei Walter Benjamin und Alexander Kluge*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Grimm, J. and Grimm, W. (1854–1960). *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 16 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel Verlag. <https://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB>.
- Hamacher, W. (2000). “HÄM. Ein Gedicht Celans mit Motiven Benjamin,” in Matern, J., Motzkin, G., and Sandbank, S. (eds.) *Jüdisches Denken in einer Welt ohne Gott. Festschrift für Stéphane Mosès*. Berlin: Vorwerk 8 Verlag, pp. 173–197.
- Huppert, H. (1973). *Sinnen und Trachten. Anmerkungen zur Poetologie*. Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag.
- Jakobson, R. (1956). “Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances,” in Halle, M. (ed.) *Fundamentals of Language*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 69–96.
- Ivanović, C. (1996). *Das Gedicht im Geheimnis der Begegnung. Dichtung und Poetik*

- Paul Celans im Kontext seiner russischen Lektüren*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Ivanović, C. (1997). "‘Auch du hättest ein Recht auf Paris’. Die Stadt und der Ort des Gedichts bei Paul Celan," *Arcadia*, 32, pp. 65–96.
- Kluge, A. (1964). "Die Höhere Führung von St," *Merkur*, 195, pp. 445–463.
- Kluge, A. (1968). *Schlachtbeschreibung*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Kluge, A. (2000). *Chronik der Gefühle, Bd. 1.: Basisgeschichten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Kluge, A. (2017). "Alexander Kluge interviewed by Jonathan Thomas," *The Third Rail*, 10, <http://thirdrailquarterly.org/alexander-kluge/>.
- Kluge, A. (2019). *Difference and Orientation*. Edited by R. Langston. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lukács, G. (1971). "Es geht um den Realismus (1938)," in *Probleme des Realismus I. Essays über den Realismus* (Werke 4). Neuwied-Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, pp. 313–343.
- Möbius, H. (2000). *Montage und Collage in Literatur, bildende Künste, Film, Fotografie, Musik, Theater bis 1933*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Morel, J.-P. (2007). "La notion de montage dans le débat sur l'expressionnisme allemand," in Krzyzkowski, I. and Millot, C. (eds.) *Expressionnisme(s) et avant-garde*. Paris: L'Improviste, pp. 305–324.
- Morel, J.-P. (2008). "Brecht et la question du montage dans les années trente," *Études Germaniques*, 250, pp. 229–245.
- Plass, U. (1999). "Schlüssel? Zur historisch-kritischen Celan-Ausgabe," *MLN*, 114, pp. 594–621.
- Reich-Ranicki, M. (1967). "Alexander Kluge: 'Schlachtbeschreibung'," in *Literatur der kleinen Schritte. Deutsche Schriftsteller heute*. Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, pp. 45–51.
- Ryland, C. (2010). *Paul Celan's Encounters with Surrealism. Trauma, Translation and Shared Poetic Space*. New York: Legenda.
- Schmitt, H.-J. (ed.) (1976). *Die Expressionismusdebatte, Materialien zu einer marxistischen Realismuskonzeption*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Siebers, W. (2000). "Was zwei Augen nicht sehen können. Wahrnehmungsweisen, Möglichkeitessinn und dokumentarisches Schreiben in Alexander Kluges *Schlachtbeschreibung*," in Schulte, C. (ed.) *Die Schrift an der Wand—Alexander Kluge: Rohstoffe und Materialien*. Osnabrück: Universitätsverlag Rasch, pp. 155–174.
- Speier, H.-M. (1987). "Paul Celan, Dichter einer neuen Wirklichkeit: Studien zu 'Schneepart' (I)," *Celan-Jahrbuch*, 1, pp. 65–79.
- Szondi, P. (1972). "Eden," in *Celan-Studien*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 113–125.
- Szondi, P. (2003). "Eden," in Bernofsky, S. and Mendelsohn, H. (trans.) *Celan Studies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 83–92.
- The Sefaria Midrash Rabbah*, 2022, sefaria.org.

- Visch, M. (1983). "Zur Funktion von Dokumenten im historischen Roman. Eine exemplarische Untersuchung anhand von Alexander Kluges *Schlachtbeschreibung*," Böhm-Christl, T. (ed.) *Alexander Kluge*. Frankfurt am Main: Text+Kritik, pp. 26–49.
- Wegner, B. (2003). "Der Mythos 'Stalingrad' (19. November 1942–2. Februar 1943)," in Krumeich, G. and Brandt, S. (eds.) *Schlachtenmythen. Ereignis—Erzählung—Erinnerung*. Cologne: Böhlau, pp. 183–197.
- Zanetti, S. (2006). "zeitoffen". *Zur Chronographie Paul Celans*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.