

THE VALUE OF LITERATURE: THE DISCARD OF SOCIETY IN WILHELM  
RAABE'S *PFISTERS MÜHLE: EIN SOMMERFERIENHEFT*

MATTHEW CHILDS

[childsm@wfu.edu](mailto:childsm@wfu.edu)

Matthew Childs is a Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of German and Russian at Wake Forest University. He is a scholar of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German literature and intellectual history, the environmental humanities, and race and imperialism in the German context. His current projects include *Catastrophe and Critique: A Dialectic of German Modernity*, a book which focuses on the development of the catastrophe concept and its relationship to critique in intellectual and literary discourses from 1755 to Walter Benjamin's suicide; *Race and Germany*, co-authored with Prof. Jonathan Warren (University of Washington), that examines the history and contemporary discursive trends of race in Germany; and *Critical Catastrophe Studies*, a volume co-edited with Christoph Weber (University of North Texas) that brings together contributions from scholars around the world to discuss the intersection of catastrophe and critique and its implications for contemporary issues.

KEYWORDS

discard studies, capitalism, aesthetics, pollution, value

PUBLICATION DATE

Issue 17, October 31, 2024

HOW TO CITE

Matthew Childs. "The Value of Literature: The Discard of Society in Wilhelm Raabe's *Pfisters Mühle: Ein Sommerferienheft*." *On Culture: The Open Journal for the Study of Culture* 17 (2024). <<https://doi.org/10.22029/oc.2024.1442>>.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22029/oc.2024.1442>



## The Value of Literature: The Discard of Society in Wilhelm Raabe's *Pfisters Mühle: Ein Sommerferienheft*

### Abstract

This *Article* explores the way in which Wilhelm Raabe's 1884 novel *Pfisters Mühle: Ein Sommerferienheft* signals and depicts how society's transition into industrial capitalist conditions leads to discarding previously valued forms of social and economic arrangement. To demonstrate this process, this paper utilizes aspects of Michael Thompson's *rubbish theory* that find resonance in the novel's depiction, as the system of values that had symbolized a more rural manner of living gradually change from a durable to a rubbish state. In Raabe's novel, that process is depicted with a sugar factory, Krickeroode, polluting the waters upstream from Pfister's mill. This leads to the closure of the mill, Bertram Pfister's death, and the way of life they together represent. Evidence for the reconfiguration of societal values according to industrial capitalist priorities (i.e., commodification and capital accumulation) arises when, in reaction to the pollution and its devastating effects, characters shift attention to decision-making on the part of mill's proprietor, Bertram, using a nascent finance language. Why didn't he cofound (*mitgründen*) or purchase stocks (*Aktien*) in the sugar factory? Why not become a shareholder (*Aktionär*) and become a partner to progress, rather than, as it is implied, a victim? This paper concludes by examining how the narrator's account and its transformation into rubbish become its own repository of non-valued value that stands outside the trappings of any given system.

[Mein Vater] war immer gut, friedlich und vergnügt mit eben dieser Welt ausgekommen, sowohl als Müller wie als Schenkwirt, und hatte jetzt also sein ganzes freundliches, braves Wesen umzuwenden, ehe er seinerseits in den großen Kampf eintrat und im Wirbel des Übergangs der deutschen Nation aus einem Bauernvolk in einen Industriestaat seine Mülleraxt mit bitterm Grimm von der Wand herunterlangte.<sup>1</sup>

Wilhelm Raabe's 1884 novel *Pfisters Mühle: Ein Sommerferienheft* (Pfister's Mill: A Summer Vacation's Notebook) is a work that depicts a society in a state of exceptional and rapid change. The sentiment that Ebert Pfister, the story's narrator, expresses above captures what that precisely means within the context of the novel, namely the German nation's transition from being a *Bauernvolk* (agricultural people) into an *Industriestaat* (industrial state). As the positioning of Ebert's father, Bertram, makes clear, this is a process that can lead to fraught outcomes against which some may wish to resist. Indeed, the imagery here, of a miller/innkeeper who must take up

his axe and enter into battle (“in den großen Kampf eintrat”), recalls the idealistic image of the farmer of Ancient Rome who was willing to take up arms in defense of the city when invaded. Here, the call to arms is metaphorical: Bertram files a lawsuit alleging the Krickerode sugar factory’s complicity in the water pollution that has now irreparably damaged his livelihood and family legacy. As the aggressive imagery and the lawsuit make clear, the novel theorizes the relationship between the ideas of *Bauernvolk* and *Industriestaat* as predominantly oppositional. Considering that the novel concludes only a short while after Bertram’s death and the demolition of the mill, it also becomes evident that the two are, if not mutually exclusive, then certainly highly antagonistic.

This *Article* is interested in unpacking that mutual exclusion, even while observing certain factors that complicate its formulation as a strict binary opposition. What is it about this process of societal transition from *Bauernvolk* to *Industriestaat* that necessitates the destruction of the former? What, indeed, enables such a thing to occur? I claim that the system of the *Industriestaat*, which in Raabe’s novel is demonstrated through the rapidly emerging mode of political economy known as industrial capitalism, necessitates the destruction of the *Bauernvolk* through a realignment of social and economic values that prioritizes commodification and capital accumulation. With the help of Michael Thompson’s *rubbish theory*, I argue that the more traditional idea of society symbolized by the mill and Bertram Pfister undergoes a devaluation, with the ‘old way of life’ giving way to new social and economic arrangements centered on activity at the sugar factory. I claim that the novel signals that change through its use of a nascent language of finance, signified by narrative figures’ adoption of terms like *Aktien* (shares), *Aktionär* (shareholder) and *mitgründen* (cofounding) as a means to divert scrutiny from the conspicuous disposal of the mill and its owner. In so doing, this paper makes the case that Raabe’s text brings into focus the operative tendencies of industrial capitalism that act through shifts in social and economic attitudes, essentially modifying value paradigms to justify the devaluation and discarding of previous ways of being. The resulting ambiguities, reflected through the narrator’s memories and even captured in a brief depiction of literature, highlight the alienating effects of the new system and at the same time position literature outside the newly configured value system—in other words, they rubbish literature. This act of turning literature, and the way of life preserved in it, into rubbish, however, has the paradoxical

cal effect of reconstituting it as a repository of non-valued value beyond the trappings of industrial capitalism, which indicates the possibility of thinking about literature without any obligatory deference to capitalist conceptualizations of value.

### **1\_Rubbish Theory and the Discard of Society**

*Pfisters Mühle: Ein Sommerferienheft* is the tale of a family legacy destroyed by water pollution generated by the forces of industrial and economic progress. The novel is composed of a frame and inner narrative connected by a common narrator, Ebert Pfister. The frame narrative, which takes place in the late-nineteenth century, concerns the story's protagonist, Ebert, and his wife, Emmy, who are enjoying a summer holiday at Ebert's family mill before it is torn down to make way for industrial development. During their stay, the young couple explore the mill and the surrounding area, and Ebert reflects on his childhood and early adulthood at the mill, the people who lived there, recording his thoughts and memories on twenty-two loose *Blätter* (sheets of paper) that come to form the titular *Ferienheft*. These recollections, or reminiscences, as Roy Pascal rightly identifies them, make up the inner narrative, which centers on an environmental disaster, namely water pollution, and the subsequent closure of the family mill, marked definitively by the death of Ebert's father.<sup>2</sup> In these memories, the reader encounters the figures of Ebert's father, Bertram, Ebert's tutor and friend, Adam Asche, the local poet (and town drunk), Felix Lippoldes, and the poet's daughter, Albertine, as well as additional characters who fill in the background of life in a setting not dissimilar to Raabe's own domicile of Braunschweig. Most significantly, each figure represents a particular way of understanding the unfolding events, be it as an elderly father concerned about the preservation of a family legacy and the well-being of his child, an ambitious young scientist and tinkerer determined to make his fortune, or a drunken poet whose best and most reputed works are behind him. A key feature in these memories is the Pfister mill, in the family for generations, which acts as a meeting place for the entire town and an amenity for tourists. The novel's action takes place in the mill and its immediate surroundings. The central event of the narrative, the thing that changes everything, is the pollution of the stream whose malodorous and unsightly qualities drive away the mill's customers and community. An investigation by Adam Asche, who in addition to being a tutor is a scientist with industrial ambitions, reveals that a nearby sugar mill, Krickerde, is responsible for the

pollution that has led to a bacterial bloom that has killed the fish and filled the crystal waters of the stream with “[s]chleimige Faden” (slimy threads).<sup>3</sup> Bertram Pfister files and wins a lawsuit against the plant, which leads to monetary compensation and the eventual rehabilitation of the stream, but by the time these matters reach their conclusion his health along with his trust in the world have been destroyed, and he dies shortly thereafter. Collectively, the events of the novel and the varying reactions of its characters to them represent Raabe’s attempt to capture in literary form the otherwise invisible or indirect signs of a society’s transformation. The novel records a shift from an older and more traditional way of life characterized by non-commodified personal relations and certain aesthetic preoccupations with beauty as a form of poetic value (to name just two examples) to one in which economic growth, exchange, and private wealth accumulation are valued most highly.

Michael Thompson’s rubbish theory provides an apt model for reading the social dynamics at play in *Pfisters Mühle*. Thompson’s account of how value is created and destroyed in a society resonates with the process Raabe’s novel depicts, as the objects, places, and people that represent one way of life—a slower and more human-oriented ideal—are discarded for something else. That process, as the novel demonstrates, can be understood differently depending on the perception and prioritization of value. Thus, Bertram Pfister, the father of the narrator, Ebert, expresses his impression of society’s change in the following terms: “Die Welt will einmal in Stank und Undank verderben, und wir Pfister von Pfisters Mühle ändern nichts daran.”<sup>4</sup> His use of the words “verderben” (deterioration) and “Stank und Undank” (foulness and ingratitude) disclose his negative evaluation of the world that is coming into being, seeing it as a devolution into a miasmic cloud of corruption.

Bertram’s language along with formal elements of the novel, such as the prominent use of the olfactory sense, have inspired a number of different readings of the text. Sabine Wilke, for example, has made a strong argument for identifying *Pfisters Mühle* as the German-specific location where—to use Lawrence Buell’s concept<sup>5</sup>—“toxic discourse” begins to unfold.<sup>6</sup> In her article, “Pollution as Poetic Practice: Glimpses of Modernism in Wilhelm Raabe’s *Pfisters Mühle*,” Wilke asserts the centrality of pollution to the story as an all-encompassing and interpenetrative force whose aesthetics anticipate literary modernism. In so doing, she articulates what she describes as realism’s struggle to find “an adequate literary configuration for narrat-

ing pollution,” for which reason Raabe combines “different genres, discourses, and rhetorical figures.”<sup>7</sup>

Wilke’s claim is distinct from previous scholarship, namely that of Jeffrey Sammons, who reads these changes in Raabe’s novel as an indication of his move into naturalism. In Sammons’s view, Raabe’s literary development is an indication of his writing’s relevance for contemporaneous discussions of value.<sup>8</sup> What these and many other interpretations have in common is the observation that the novel represents an attempt to render legible the process of change. Where Wilke and Sammons read the result of Raabe’s undertaking as the anticipation or indication of shifts in his generic priorities, however, I propose to read it as the unfolding of a social dynamic: the creation and destruction of value. And for dealing with this topic and detecting its operation in *Pfisters Mühle*, I turn to Thompson’s rubbish theory.

Rubbish theory represents an attempt to account for the transformation of value in society, to explain the gain, loss, and inexplicable fluctuation of the value of objects. As Thompson writes, social science has claimed that there are “two cultural categories—the Transient and the Durable,” which are “‘socially imposed’ on the world of objects.”<sup>9</sup> The transient category relates to objects that have “decreasing value and finite expected lifespans,” while the durable category concerns items whose value increases over time and whose lifespans are expected to be infinite.<sup>10</sup> Within this model, objects that are transient lose their value until they reach zero, at which time they are discarded and destroyed. There are some additional occasions where a transient creation manages to become durable thanks to exceptional interventions in the social context, but they are rare. This account of transient and durable objects had long been established in the social sciences, most importantly in (neoclassical) economics, yet there was one issue that kept arising: the prevailing theories could not account for the process by which a transient object that had been discarded suddenly found itself transformed into an object of durable value. Among several examples, Thompson focuses on the Stevengraph to explore that process. Following a lengthy analysis of the Stevengraph, Thompson concludes that value is itself dependent on the stuff that is thrown away, the rubbish. Rubbish, his newly created third category of value next to transient and durable, is the term for objects that have no or unchanging value.<sup>11</sup> Thompson theorizes that rubbish, because it is not subject to the control mechanism that regulates the distribution and exchange of transient and durable goods, “provides

the channel between Transient and Durable.”<sup>12</sup> Rubbish, it turns out, is necessary as a covert third category of value in order to account for changes in the system of overt value constructed through the relation of transient and durable. Thus, rubbish theory can account not only for stability, but also change. It can explain the existence of value while demonstrating how that value fluctuates or is contingent.

At first blush, applying Thompson’s rubbish theory to Raabe’s *Pfisters Mühle* is something of an odd choice. I make that observation in consideration of the fact that Raabe scholarship frequently highlights his tendency towards ambiguity. “Raabe is at his best and richest where he propounds the situation in its unresolved problematic, in which both sides are affirmed with their drawbacks, in which the modern age is accepted because it is real, though with an ironical recognition of its failings.”<sup>13</sup> Ambiguity is present in Raabe’s novel, especially its ending in which Ebert describes the leisurely activities of a pleasant day (he even remarks on Asche who has fallen asleep while reading a work of literature). The characters are only able to enjoy their leisure because they are members of the petit bourgeoisie, whose economic fortunes are buttressed by industrial capitalist exploitation, commodification, and wealth accumulation. Indeed, the very existence of the summer notebook gestures at a life with plenty of leisure time, which members of the working class, such as those who work in Asche’s dry-cleaning factory on the river Spree near Berlin, will likely never have the chance to enjoy. Raabe’s depiction seems to be at odds with the distinctly “Heraclitean” nature of Thompson’s theory, which emphasizes the non-arbitrary nature of attributions of value according to social forces.<sup>14</sup> The ending of Raabe’s novel, with its tangible absence of “strife” and “conflict,” would seem to occlude the very social forces that Thompson’s theory attempts to bring into focus. How can Raabe’s apparently obscurant move function with rubbish theory’s call for clarity?

There are two key aspects of Thompson’s theory that buttress the case for using it to think with and through *Pfisters Mühle*’s representation of value change. First and foremost, rubbish theory is not restricted to a critique of capitalism, although it has much, as I argue, to contribute to that conversation.<sup>15</sup> Admitting as much would again seem odd considering the claim laid out above that Raabe’s text draws attention to the alienating effects of capitalism that Karl Marx theorizes first in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* and later in *The German Ideology* (1845/46), the *Grundrisse* (1857/58), and *Capital* (1867). Far from contradicting my claim, I would

point out that while industrial capitalism had become dominant and Marx had published all of the aforementioned volumes by the time Raabe was writing, Raabe's understanding of capitalism and its political implications was still developing and, what is more, there is no reason that a novel should necessarily be as systematic as Marx's economic and philosophical treatises—a novel theorizes in its own way.<sup>16</sup> That being said, Raabe at least indirectly engaged with Marx and Engels's ideas through the Social Democratic party that he perceived with considerable distaste.<sup>17</sup> Whether he was unconvinced or uncertain of the implications of their work, it would be a hasty generalization to equate that engagement with a fully expressed system of thought in relation to the social organization of industrial capitalism. It is partly for that reason, in fact, as well as a desire to reduce Raabe's novel to some kind of "use-value" that Jeffrey Sammons conveys reservations about reading the text as engaging with the theme of capitalism, preferring instead to characterize it as an encounter with industrialism.<sup>18</sup> However, Horst Denkler points out that, by 1870/71, the sugar industry in Braunschweig—where Raabe lived when writing the novel—had become inseparably linked with capitalist modes of production.<sup>19</sup> Considering that much of the novel is based on the actual situation of sugar production in Braunschweig and that much of the primary material comes from the findings in a court case that was underway, I think the case for reading Raabe's text as addressing industrialism *and* capitalism simultaneously is sound.<sup>20</sup> The two are inextricably linked, something that will become abundantly clear through the analysis of finance language below. In any case, Thompson's theory is focused more generally on value creation and destruction as broader social process, not just on that which takes place under capitalism. Thus, when I apply it here to help elucidate how Raabe's novel forms an image of life under industrial capitalism, I need not fear the discrepancies that may arise from Raabe's text as a result of an ambiguous reception of Marx. Indeed, Thompson's theory helps to produce a reading of *Pfisters Mühle* that can account for and not be limited by the representation of the industrial capitalist system, permitting a more productive interpretation of the depiction of the society's change in values.

The second aspect derives from its treatment of the loss of value. In Thompson's theory, when value depreciates due to changes in social relations, it does not immediately become 'rubbish.' Rather, as Reno again lays out, "[d]iscards do not become 'rubbish' until social processes and practices conspire to remove them from circula-



tion and consideration.”<sup>21</sup> The plot of Raabe’s novel traces the social processes and practices that lead to the Pfister’s mill’s removal from circulation and consideration. When the sugar factory, Krickeroode, pollutes the river on which the mill sits, by dumping its chemical byproducts into it, one is witnessing a kind of industrial capitalist social practice, one with an empirical referent in the work’s historical context no less.<sup>22</sup> The effects of the water pollution help to demonstrate how the discarding process works under industrial capitalism in the novel. As the pollution unfolds over the course of several years, the mill and its beer garden are steadily devalued until no one patronizes them. At the same time, Bertram’s health declines and the fish and wildlife that depend on the river ecosystem suffer.<sup>23</sup> Although they are able to win a lawsuit against the mill that provides monetary compensation, the business’s value along with Bertram’s has been depleted. Bertram dies, and the mill is sold and demolished to make way for new development. What one observes in Raabe’s text is the wholesale transfer of a once durable object (or person, in the case of Bertram) into rubbish. Rubbish theory not only makes that transition from durable to rubbish legible, but it also helps to make visible the system of values—with its ‘social processes and practices’—that enable the discard of the society as it had existed up until the events depicted in *Pfisters Mühle*. The system that enables the discard of the previous model of society is none other than industrial capitalism. It remains to be seen, however, exactly how that process is exhibited beyond the simple cause and effect of the plot. In the next section, I demonstrate how Raabe’s use of a nascent language of finance highlights the social practices that encourage the discard of Pfister’s mill and its proprietor.

## **2\_Finance and the Discard of Society**

In *Pfisters Mühle*, the finance discourse is restricted to the highly localized matter of the sugar mill, Krickeroode, though it also arises towards the end of the story when Ebert invests in Adam Asche’s dry-cleaning business. The reasons for this restraint are somewhat difficult to discern, though it might come down to the story’s realist fundamental of being based on an actual event, namely the court case of Müller and Lüderitz vs. the Refinery at Rautheim.<sup>24</sup> It may also be the case, though, that the subject matter was exceedingly difficult to grasp for what was a formative period of German financial markets, especially as it pertains to their relations with the wider econ-

omy and, in particular, industry.<sup>25</sup> Regardless of the inspiration for Raabe's use of terms like *Aktien* (stocks), *Aktionär* (stockholder), and *mitgründen* (cofound), their presence once again speaks to the period in which *Pfisters Mühle* is being written. Raabe is a member of a society in which concepts about capital flows, economic growth, and wealth accumulation have 'trickled down' into everyday language.<sup>26</sup> In today's environment, characterized by 24/7 financial news and the proliferation of apps that reduce such complex and risky decisions to taps on a screen, such a development may appear quaint. Yet, the nineteenth century witnessed significant innovations in corporate and government financial mechanisms that aimed to capitalize (literally and figuratively) on the expansion of empires and the advent of more integrated networks of economic relations that began to mature and cover the globe. From the standardization of coinage under the so-called Latin Monetary Union (LMU) of 1866 to the adoption of gold standards in countries like the United States (in 1879) and Russia (in 1897), as well as the export of capital from Europe to developing markets across the world, it all signaled a new age of commercial opportunity based on the movement of money within and across borders.<sup>27</sup> Capitalism—in Germany's case industrial capitalism—had come of age. Thus, the appearance of a sort of nascent literary representation of financial discourse in Raabe's text marks a greater shift in the structure of life in the time around 1884 and, more importantly, a change in the approximation of *value*.

But how does *Pfisters Mühle* conceptualize value? What is the meaning of that term within the context of the novel? The novel's working definition of value comes about through the opposition introduced through the opening quote of this essay, namely that of the *Bauernvolk* and the *Industriestaat*. The system of values enshrined in the former is symbolized by the way of life acted out by figures such as Bertram Pfister, whose mix of manual and service labor does not foreclose meaningful social interactions with others. Indeed, his relationship to his customers as well as his employees (prior to the water pollution) is what permits him to labor without being alienated from his work or his community. By contrast, the *Industriestaat*, represented by *Krickerode*, forgoes such connections. In fact, a figure representing the factory never appears in the novel; they are always at a distance from the events that their actions bring about, an abstraction captured in the language of finance, as discussed below. Based on those descriptions, *Pfisters Mühle* seems to juxtapose con-

cepts of value that emphasize labor (*Bauernvolk*) and exchange (*Industriestaat*). This is not to reduce Raabe's novel to an acting out of Marxist vs. capitalist theories of value. Rather, it is to say that certain elements of that opposition come about in the course of the novel's exploration of the value transition. This opposition can likewise be read into the depiction of green places in Raabe's fiction, as Alexander Phillips demonstrates through his analysis of *Pfisters Mühle* and *Die Akten des Vogelsangs* (1896). According to Phillips, Raabe's texts offer reflections "on the conditions of possibility for art and artistic representation in an era of ecological plunder" that generate an "implicit, self-reflective critique of nineteenth-century industrial-capitalism," by using industrial capitalist activity as a "destabilizing counterforce to the aestheticization of pre-industrial 'green' places."<sup>28</sup> This is not a simplistic juxtaposition, as Bayerl points out, since the choice to have the setting of the story be a mill actually highlights certain continuities of mechanization between the world of the *Bauernvolk* and the *Industriestaat*, which unsettles any attempt to place the two into a simple binary or make a claim of mutual exclusivity.<sup>29</sup> The result is that Raabe's novel generates a circumstance in which two competing sets of values come into conflict without the novel aligning with any set system. That one beats out the other is not an endorsement but an observation of what Raabe saw occurring in the real world and which he attempted to render through his text. Thus, in a very general sense, value is defined as that which receives the greatest priority by the society, that which maintains its value regardless of the system in place.

The characterization offered above by Bertram Pfister about the deterioration of the world highlights the emergence of the *Industriestaat*, which is made possible by the movement, investment, and accumulation of capital, processes that are rendered legible vis-à-vis the language of finance. It is the confrontation of that new system of value, which is focused most keenly on growth—in terms of personal wealth but also, on a larger scale, economic growth—and the old that brings into focus the discard of the form of society represented by the mill in Raabe's text. This is where Thompson's rubbish theory, with its ability to illuminate the transition from durable object to rubbish, comes into play. The mill and Bertram can be identified as the objects that are unable to maintain their value in the new system of industrial capitalism and are hence discarded. They are like Thompson's Stevengraphs. Absent the ability to adapt to societal changes they fall away or are actively disposed of to make room for more

important things, like the production of commodities (such as sugar) or providing services (like dry-cleaning).

Yet, Raabe is well-known for being an author who does not easily take sides, though he does sometimes dip into a sort of sentimentality. *Pfisters Mühle* is shot through with ambiguities and uncertainties that disturb any simple attribution of values or moral consideration to its author and, consequently, the story maintains a striking openness to the very destructive tendencies one witnesses within the system of industrial capitalism. It is for this reason that, in addition to showcasing the discard of society, Raabe's text can also be said to depict the ways in which that might not be the case. Rather, it shows how human actors, while necessarily operating within a web of relations beyond their capacity to control, can maintain the sort of outlook held by previous generations, like that of Bertram Pfister. This delicate balancing act is precisely what makes Raabe's *Pfisters Mühle* so valuable. In the remainder of this *Article*, I undertake three tasks: (1) to identify the moments where financial discourse arises in the novel, (2) to demonstrate how finance language signals the fundamental change of values in the transition to the industrial-capitalist system, and (3) to show how the novel resists the totalizing propensity of that shift and may signal the opportunity for a derivative of the way of life at the mill to find its way back into the form of a durable good. In so doing, I assert that Raabe's *Pfisters Mühle* produces unique insights into how a society and the literature produced in it adapts to highly disruptive and sustained change.

The first use of financial language comes at a pivotal moment in the novel, specifically in the fourteenth sheet simply titled "Krickerode."<sup>30</sup> In it, Ebert and Adam Asche are collecting samples from the stream in order for the latter to determine the cause behind the water pollution. Since the findings are actually revealed in chapter ten ("Krickerode!"<sup>31</sup>), the reader does not experience the search for the evidence until then. As they head out to collect their data, Ebert and Asche are accompanied by Felix Lippoldes, the local poet and, importantly for Asche, the father of Albertine, in whom Asche is romantically interested. As they reach the end of their task, the group comes to the factory that is ultimately responsible for their troubles, at which point Asche states:

"Der reine Zucker!" rief Asche. "Da schwatzen die Narren immerfort über die Bitterkeit der Welt. Da können sie sie niemals süß genug kriegen, und da—

stehen wir, das Leid der Erde wiederkäuend, vor dem neuen Tor. Sie sind nicht *Aktionär*, Lippoldes—Vater Pfister auch nicht, und von dir jungem Bengel ist es ebenfalls noch nicht anzunehmen.”<sup>32</sup>

Standing in the muck outside the factory, amid the stench of its byproduct,<sup>33</sup> Asche attempts to establish a kind of understanding between the other two members of his party and those who run the factory. While he refers to them as “Narren” (fools), he only does so because they are focused on producing sugar, which Asche considers something of a lowlier endeavor compared to his own, which is focused on textiles. Otherwise, Asche clearly holds a certain admiration for the “*Aktionär*” (stockholder) behind the activity at Krickeroode, such as when, in response to Ebert pointing out the fact that Asche himself is not an *Aktionär* in the factory, he says: “Ich wollte, ich wäre es schon.”<sup>34</sup> The manner in which Asche utters this is telling, denoting a clear desire for imitation—and one only imitates that which one perceives to hold value. Compare his reaction with that of Lippoldes, who a short while later in the same chapter warns Ebert ““Sieh es dir an, Knabe, und finde auch du dich mit ihm ab, wie [Asche] da—wissenschaftlich oder als *Aktionär*.”<sup>35</sup> He continues, admonishing Asche at the same time:

Uralte jüdische Weisheit und Prophezeiung, auf die ihrerzeit auch niemand geachtet hat! Rate dir ebenfalls zu der Lektüre, wenn dir einmal alle andere abgestanden, stinkend und voll fauler Fische vorkommen wird, wie deines Vaters Mühlwasser, Ebert Pfister! Zephania im ersten Kapitel Vers elf: “Heulet, die ihr in der Mühlen wohnt, denn das ganze Krämervolk ist dahin, und alle, die Geld sammeln, sind ausgerottet!”<sup>36</sup>

The tension of this scene turns on the use of the term *Aktionär*. For Asche, to be a shareholder is something to be admired, pursued, and imitated; for Lippoldes, however, it is something to be wary of, a brash and arrogant form of identity against which ancient Jewish wisdom and prophecy speak. In an important respect, this quote discloses a clash of identities. Lippoldes is a poet, a person dedicated to the creation of beautiful verses speaking eternal truths.<sup>37</sup> Yet the manner in which Asche describes the work of the *Aktionär*, described in greater detail below, mimics the language of creation. For Asche, there is no great distinction between writing poetry and discovering a new way to mass produce sugar or, in his case, to treat textiles. In Lippoldes’ eyes, however, the shareholder is not only a conman, but also the modern financial products through which he operates represents little more than a new version of an ancient sin—avarice.

As stated above, Asche sees things differently. He finds something ennobling about becoming a shareholder, about participating in economic activity. From his perspective, the person who knows to make the best with what his time and place offers is to be commended.<sup>38</sup> Through the tension of these two diametrically opposed viewpoints, centered as they are on the perceived value of being an *Aktionär*, Raabe is teasing out the details of two systems of value. Lippoldes, with his reference to ancient scripture, clearly represents the traditional system based on Judeo-Christian morality. In that system, one treats the pursuit of wealth with skepticism if not outright hostility (as evidenced by his reaction above). Asche, who obviously envisages himself becoming a shareholder of a major business one day, serves as the representative of the industrial capitalism that has come to dominate Germany in the latter-half of the nineteenth century. In that configuration, exchange value and speculative value come to hold sway over decision-making. Whereas the former is perhaps not so alien to previous generations, the latter signals something truly disruptive, allowing for the perception of value to generate value all on its own. That quasi-metaphysical construction of value has a limited connection to reality, and, in Lippoldes's view, that creates an opportunity for *Krämerfolk* (hucksters) to have their way. For him, there is no discerning between the huckster and the shareholder. Yet for Asche, such reactionary alarmism fails to account for the creative and productive capacity to which the new system has given rise. What becomes evident in Lippoldes and Asche's exchange is that the value system that Asche exemplifies is quickly replacing the old, and Lippoldes is clearly concerned as to what that portends. Asche's somewhat blunt rebuttal to Lippoldes's protestations only seem to confirm the latter's suspicions.<sup>39</sup>

The scene at Krickerode is not the only time when the use of financial terminology brings into frame society's changing value system based on industrial capitalism. The term *Aktie* (stock or share) is used only once in the novel, in this case in the outer narrative by Ebert's wife right at the beginning of the sixteenth chapter.

Ja, das wollte ich eigentlich auch schon längst einmal fragen, Herz—wirklich, weshalb hat denn dein armer Papa nicht mit auf die große Fabrik unterschrieben, da alles ihm doch so bequem lag, und hat keine Aktien genommen, sondern ist leider gestorben, obgleich die Herren Asche und Riechei ihm doch seinen Prozeß gewonnen haben?<sup>40</sup>

Emmy is inquiring as to the reason Ebert's father did not choose to sign on as a shareholder at Krickerode. If he had, her reasoning goes, he could have lived comfort-

ably rather than die following the successful lawsuit against the factory. The curiosity with which this question is asked shows definitively that capitalist values have settled into the common understanding of how society ought to function. Up to this point in the story, Emmy has listened (though she frequently nods off) to Ebert's recollections of his past, about Asche and Albertine, whom she knows. That she has heard so much up to this point about the character of Ebert's father, Bertram, and yet struggles to comprehend his decision not to become a *Mitbegründer* (cofounder) of the factory emphasizes the distance that has opened up between generations in a relatively short time. Ebert's response to Emmy's inquiry heightens that sentiment further: "Weil er nicht anders konnte, Lieb."<sup>41</sup> Bertram cannot act in the manner to which Emmy and her generation have become accustomed because he is unable to work with the new system of values. For him, the talk of investment and shareholding is a foreign and incomprehensible language. But for his daughter-in-law and son, the latter of whom it is said will invest his *Kapital* (capital) in Asche's business, it is practically the *lingua franca*.<sup>42</sup>

If Lippoldes's relation to the new system of values can be characterized as confrontational, in a manner not dissimilar to scripture, Bertram's can be described as resigned. While his persistence in pursuing legal action against Krickeroode displays a degree of tenacity, his decision early on to have Asche tutor Ebert in Greek and Latin, which successfully leads to his gainful employment in adulthood as a teacher in Berlin, betrays a distinct awareness of how life is already changing.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, at one point in the story it is made clear that Ebert sells the mill in part because he does not know how to run it. If Bertram had actually expected for the mill to continue, he would have taught his son how to run the mill and pub. Instead, he anticipates the end of the family legacy, albeit not in its particularities. Bertram understands that he, his profession, and the family legacy, symbolized by the mill, are losing value in society, that they have become transient and, ultimately, are doomed to be discarded by a society with new wants and desires. Pushing his son to find a life elsewhere, to do something different than that which the men in the family had done for generations signals the metaphorical tossing of the whole constellation onto the rubbish heap. And it is the language of finance that allows one to trace that whole process from start to finish.

### **3\_Rubbish and the Value of Literature**

*Pfisters Mühle* demonstrates the steady devaluation and discarding of the society and system of values of the *Bauernvolk*, represented by Bertram Pfister.<sup>44</sup> This comes about due to the changing values of a society in industrial capitalism: with its prioritizing economic growth and industrialization, new financial mechanisms and alienated forms of labor, ultimately resulting in things like environmental degradation. This industrial capitalist system is distinct from that taking place at Pfister's Mill. The difference between these two systems of value as well as the shift from one into the other are reflected in the emergence of a highly abstract language of finance, which contributes to tangible changes in the day-to-day lives of people while occluding their source. Raabe's novel not only shows how the values of the society change, but also how the entire paradigm through which value is to be perceived in the first place is transformed. Consequently, many of the operative tendencies of industrial capitalism become visible, even in their abstraction.

Yet as Thompson's theory clarifies, rubbish, while no longer bearing the value cherished in the predominant system, still has a role to play, namely in accounting for and regulating the stability and shifts that occur in the valuation of objects. It represents a third category of value. I return to this point because I perceive a resonance in Thompson's description of rubbish and the positionality of the way of life captured in the pages of Ebert's *Sommerferienheft* and, indeed, literature under capitalism.

Throughout Raabe's novel, Ebert repeats a question over and over with one of the last times coming at the opening of the twenty-first sheet: "Wo bleiben alle die Bilder?"<sup>45</sup> On this occasion, he makes clear that he is referring to his memories of life at the mill, his father and the love and affection he received there. Half asleep, staring out the windows of a fast-moving train on the way back to Berlin, enjoying the bountiful colors of the passing landscape, Ebert seeks within himself evidence of the mill's survival, at which point he states: "Wie unauslöschlich fest steht Pfisters Mühle gemalt in meiner Seele!"<sup>46</sup> The use of the term "unauslöschlich" (indissolubly) stands as a stark contradiction to the apparent discarding of the mill. While physically gone, the mill is nonetheless preserved in an aesthetic variant. "Hier halte ich das letzte des bunten Buches [das Sommerferienheft] fest."<sup>47</sup> That is not to say that the mill's metaphorical representation in the pages of the summer notebook constitute a return to durability, as sometimes occurs with discarded objects. Rather, the mill's "*unaus-*



*löslich*” quality echoes that which Thompson attributes to rubbish, specifically its unchanging value. The mill and its proprietor may have lost their value and been discarded under the new system of industrial capitalism, but their representation, captured in the memories of Ebert Pfister and committed to paper end up being preserved in a form of non-value. By virtue of being removed from circulation, the quasi-idyllic form of life becomes constitutive of the broader system of values—a system whose various objects of meaning would lose all worth were it not for the non-value of the rubbish it has cast away.

While towards the end of the novel Ebert places the assembled pages of the summer notebook in the “tiefsten Tiefen [s]eines Hausarchivs,”<sup>48</sup> its existence and its paradoxically valuable non-value continue. Rubbish has the effect of preserving what once was while providing the base upon which new value is (re)created. Whether he is conscious of it or not, Ebert’s life in Berlin is contingent upon the life he had at the mill; just as the industrial capitalist forms of value rely to some extent on their difference from what had preceded them. Wilhelm Raabe’s *Pfisters Mühle* tells the story of a society undergoing relentless and swift change in material circumstances as well as in values. The evidence of society’s transformation is recorded in the novel’s portrayal of discarded objects, the most prominent of which is the summer notebook itself. In so doing, Raabe’s novel may very well be said to theorize a new category of value for writing and literature. These products of culture are unable to maintain their value in industrial capitalism and, given his distrust of social democrats, there is little reason to believe Raabe would have thought it might be different in a more Marxist arrangement. Instead, the novel opens up the possibility of a value outside of value. In other words, by removing the story from the circulation of goods, it arrives at a positionality that preserves its independence from the practical purposes. If my interpretation is valid then Raabe’s text opens up a radical horizon where one can conceive of a realm of value beyond that in which we currently operate.

As Barbara Thum claims, Raabe’s narrative is characterized by a “Wissens- und Kulturpoetik des Restes und des Abfalls” that “betreibt eine literarische Archäologie, die am Umgang mit Abfällen, Resten und lebendigen Dingen die kulturellen Codes zur Bestimmung der Grenze zwischen Natur und Kultur, zwischen Tier und Mensch sowie zwischen Wert und Unwert des menschlichen Lebens abliest.”<sup>49</sup> The work I have completed here emphasizes primarily that final opposition through an analysis

of differing and shifting values communicated via a nascent language of finance and constituted by rubbish. Raabe's *Pfisters Mühle* not only depicts life in Germany at the end of the nineteenth century as industrial capitalist values become dominant in a way that is true to its realist credentials, but also, in this endeavor, ends up possibly theorizing literature as something simultaneously beyond that system and constitutive of it too. After all, to what end the productivity of industrial capitalism if not to provide leisure time for its beneficiaries to enjoy? Whether to write a summer notebook, visit art exhibitions or family homes, or even just fall asleep while reading a work of literature? The very things that are devalued, discarded, been made rubbish end up being precisely that which signals the success of people within the new system of values. Yet, far from being caught up within that system, that is to say, dependent on *its* circulation, literature becomes defined according to its independence from it.

To better understand literature's independence from industrial-capitalist values, one need only compare it to the sugar factory or Asche's textile factory. Both are valued for their ability to produce a commodity, which bears an exchange value. As finance discourse makes clear, the factories also accumulate value through speculation on the profit to be derived from the sale of sugar and textiles. The earnings of the factories provide the revenue to fund the dividends that Asche and Ebert enjoy, even if Ebert must still work as a teacher. The flow of capital illuminates explicitly and implicitly a broader system upon which the whole of its value depends, meaning that value is always to be found partly *elsewhere and outside of itself*.<sup>50</sup> By contrast, the novel theorizes literature, and the world it maintains, as something that no longer bears such dependencies precisely because the world it represents no longer exists. Its value is wrapped up within its own pages, either bound or as loose leaves. It is *unauslöslich*. It is a repository of non-valued value. It is *rubbish*.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> "Always well, peacefully, and pleurably did [my father] get along with this world, as miller and innkeeper all the same. He now had to change entirely his friendly and honest way of being before, on his part, he could enter into the great battle, taking up with bitter fierceness his miller's axe from its place on the wall amidst the whirl of the German nation's change from an agricultural people into an industrial state." Wilhelm Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke (Braunschweiger Ausgabe)* Vol. 16 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), 114. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

- <sup>2</sup> For a full discussion of Raabe’s “reminiscence technique,” see Roy Pascal, “The Reminiscence-Technique in Raabe,” *The Modern Language Review* 49, no. 3 (1954): 339–348. The distinction of this term from other forms of remembrance is vital for understanding the ways in which time, and not only place, come to be observed through Raabe’s narrative techniques.
- <sup>3</sup> Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 53.
- <sup>4</sup> “The world wants all at once to decay into foulness and ingratitude, and we Pfisters of Pfister’s mill do nothing about it.” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 62.
- <sup>5</sup> Lawrence Buell defines “toxic discourse” as “an interlocked set of topoi whose force derives partly from the exigencies of an anxiously industrializing culture.” The primary concern of that discourse is the emergence of a feared “poisoned world,” for which purpose it calls for new forms of reading, writing, and environmentalism that bring into question previous assumptions about the position of nature within the literary imagination. See Lawrence Buell, “Toxic Discourse,” *Critical Inquiry* 24, no. 3 (1998): 639–665, here: 639–640, <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1344085>>.
- <sup>6</sup> *Pfisters Mühle* is an excellent object of analysis for this claim because it has been identified as German literature’s very first ecological novel. See Heinrich Detering, “Ökologische Krise und ästhetische Innovation im Werk Wilhelm Raabes,” *Jahrbuch der Raabe-Gesellschaft* 33, no. 1 (1992): 1–27, here: 10; Dirk Götsche et al., *Raabe Handbuch: Leben – Werk – Wirkung* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzger Verlag, 2016), 201; Axel Goodbody, “From Raabe to Amery: German Literature in Ecocritical Perspective,” in *From Classical Shades to Vickers Victorious: Shifting Perspectives in British German Studies*, eds. Steve Giles and Peter Graves (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 77–96, here: 87. All that being said, it is worth noting two prior examples for which one might strike a dissenting claim, namely Ludwig Tieck’s *Der Alte vom Berge* (1828), which deals extensively with air pollution produced at a mining operation, and Karl Immermann’s *Die Epigonen* (1835–36), which likewise depicts air pollution resulting from industry. The fundamental difference, I would point out, is the successful legal case that the Pfisters make against the factory producing the pollution, which results in financial compensation, thereby establishing a rough mechanism for environmentalist action.
- <sup>7</sup> Sabine Wilke, “Pollution as Poetic Practice: Glimpses of Modernism in Wilhelm Raabe’s ‘Pfisters Mühle,’” *Colloquia Germanica* 44, no. 2 (2011): 195–214, here: 196, <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43551606>>.
- <sup>8</sup> Jeffrey L. Sammons, *Wilhelm Raabe: The Fiction of the Alternative Community* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 269–282.
- <sup>9</sup> See Michael Thompson, *Rubbish Theory: The Creation and Destruction of Value* (London: Pluto Press, 2017), 10.
- <sup>10</sup> Thompson, *Rubbish Theory*, 10.
- <sup>11</sup> Thompson, *Rubbish Theory*, 27.
- <sup>12</sup> Thompson, *Rubbish Theory*, 4.
- <sup>13</sup> See Pascal, “The Reminiscence-Technique,” 347.
- <sup>14</sup> Joshua Reno articulates his notion of the Heraclitean in his foreword to the second edition of Thompson’s work. For Reno’s characterization, see Thompson, *Rubbish Theory*, x; for Thompson’s own description, see page 111 in the same text.
- <sup>15</sup> As Reno notes in his foreword, capitalist exchange value offers a “useful way of representing rising and falling values, making legible dramatic categorical shifts.” See Thompson, *Rubbish Theory*, x.

- 16 One wonders what kind of influence volume three of *Das Kapital*, with its articulation of surplus values and how it transforms into profit might have had on the finance discourse in the novel.
- 17 Sammons, *Wilhelm Raabe*, 92.
- 18 Sammons, *Wilhelm Raabe*, 281.
- 19 See Horst Denkler, “Nachwort,” *Wilhelm Raabe. Pfisters Mühle: Ein Sommerferienheft* (Stuttgart: Reclam 2009), 225–251, here: 234.
- 20 For more on the court case on which Raabe based his novel, see Ludwig Popp, “‘Pfisters Mühle’: Schlüsselroman zu einem Abwasserprozess,” in *Städtehygiene* 10 (1959): 22–25. For an investigation into Raabe’s primary materials from which the novel developed, see Sammons, *Wilhelm Raabe*, 269–282. Sammons shows that Raabe was writing the novel at the same time as the trial was underway and, moreover, that he completed his novel before a verdict was reached in the court case, meaning Raabe required some improvisation in his work.
- 21 Thompson, *Rubbish Theory*, viii.
- 22 It was reported in 1875 that the Emscher river, in western Germany, had become terribly polluted as a result of industrial activity. Closer to home, 1887 witnessed over a hundred districts in Saxony, where Braunschweig is, filing formal complaints regarding the water pollution due to sugar production. By the end of the 1870s and into the 1880s, in other words, Raabe and his audience were well acquainted with the downsides of sugar production. See Günter Bayerl, “Herrn Pfisters und anderer Leute Mühlen: Das Verhältnis von Mensch, Technik und Umwelt im Spiegel eines literarischen Topos,” in *Technik in der Literatur: ein Forschungsüberblick und zwölf Aufsätze*, ed. Harro Segeberg (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1987), 51–101, here: 73–85; and Franz-Josef Brüggemeier and Thomas Rommelspacher, *Besiegte Natur: Geschichte der Umwelt im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (München: Beck, 1987), here: 44, 54.
- 23 Alexander Phillips makes the relevant point that the problem one witnesses in the life of the stream is one of “*too much life*” rather than death. This goes further to demonstrate shifting values, in this case through a clash between the aesthetic ideal that Phillips describes Raabe as trying to present and the biological (i.e., microbial) realities of life. The fish who raise their stomachs upwards in protest of their new living conditions might represent what had been valued by both human and non-human creatures in their shared environment, but now the microbes will have their say in line with their industrial comrades (Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 52). A new environment, one whose water is populated by microbes and curated by industrial actors, is coming into focus. See Alexander Phillips, “Environmental Depredation and Aesthetic Reflection in Wilhelm Raabe’s Late Fiction,” *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 24, no. 4 (2017): 653–679, here 658. Doi: [10.1093/isle/isx064](https://doi.org/10.1093/isle/isx064).
- 24 See footnote 20.
- 25 For more on the history of the German financial markets, see David Blackbourn, *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780–1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), here: 178, 186–187, and (for the 1880s) 323. When it comes to the 1880s, which is most relevant for the publication of *Pfisters Mühle*, Blackbourn notes that this was the period when finance and industry became increasingly tied together due to the high upfront costs of German industrial production. Yet, the actors in play tended to be titans of industry and large joint-stock exchange banks, all of which operated on a far larger scale than the sorts of transactions one witnesses in Raabe’s novel. Indeed, it was not until Max Weber published a series of essays on the stock exchange from 1894 to 1896, which would be published in 1896 as *Die Börse*, that its inner workings and its wider significance for the destruction and creation of social and cultural values would be widely understood. See Max Weber, “Die Börse,” in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und*

*Sozialpolitik* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr Verlag, 1924), 256–288. What one is witnessing in Raabe’s text is something of a simplified version that, due perhaps to its more restrained portrait of those highly complex processes, is able to reveal the fundamental shifts taking place in peoples’ value judgments.

<sup>26</sup> To be clear, I am not claiming that the etymology of these terms began in the latter-half of the nineteenth century. As even a cursory glance at the DWDS demonstrates, the term *Aktie* can be traced back as far as the fifteenth century. Rather, what I am claiming is that their usage by figures in the text—who are supposed to be the denizens of a rural town and not, as one might otherwise expect, bankers and financiers in Frankfurt whose occupations would necessitate their knowledge of the subject matter—signals the penetration of financial discourse into the cultural conscience and its ability to influence the cultural imagination.

<sup>27</sup> That is not to say that the discussion of finance in *Pfisters Mühle* is an insight into early globalization. As Jürgen Osterhammel has shown, the perception of the “world market is a rather abstract theoretical fiction [...] many markets grew so large that one might describe them as global. But none of these can be separated from its specific geography; none covered the earth in a geometrically even manner.” See Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 724. This is important to keep in mind in order to avoid overstating Raabe’s insight into this particular matter. Moreover, such a consideration could very well shift from what I claim is the primary function of the finance discourse in the novel.

<sup>28</sup> Phillips, “Environmental Depredation and Aesthetic Reflection,” 655.

<sup>29</sup> Bayerl, “Herrn Pfisters und anderer Leute Mühlen,” 51.

<sup>30</sup> One might be tempted to claim that the first financial matter comes in the second sheet (“Zu leeren Tischen und Bänken”), when Ebert mentions that he has sold the mill. “Ich hatte [die Mühle] nur verkauft—verkaufen müssen—, aber vier volle Sommerwochen war sie noch einmal mein Eigentum.” (“I had only sold [the mill]—had to sell it—but for four full summer weeks it was once again my property.” (Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 10). The term in question would be “*verkaufen*” (to sell), which does indeed qualify as a form of transaction with the commodity, ownership of the property (*Eigentum*), being handed over in exchange for cash. However, selling and buying of this kind existed well before the development of the more advanced form of industrial capitalism, here demonstrated by the purchase and sale of stocks, which exist at a certain remove from the object of value. In other words, there is a sort of metaphysical distinction between the sale of a commodity in exchange for money and the sale of a financial device (e.g., a stock in a company) whose value is based on the perceived value of the thing it produces.

<sup>31</sup> Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 65.

<sup>32</sup> ““Pure sugar!”” said Asche, “There the fools babble evermore over the bitterness of the world. There they can never have it sweet enough. And there we stand before the new gateway, ruminating about the sorrow of the earth. You are not a shareholder, Lippoldes—neither Father Pfister nor you, young rascal, are yet able to accept it.”” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 99 (emphasis added).

<sup>33</sup> Raabe’s use of smell in the novel has been remarked extensively in scholarship, especially insofar as it exemplifies an innovative moment in his literary realism and acts as an implicit critique of the industrial activity depicted in the novel. For more on the treatment of smell, see Hans Rindisbacher, “L’Odeur de Pfister: The Bittersweet Smell of Success in the German Realist Novel,” *The Germanic Review* 68, no. 1 (1993): 22–31.

<sup>34</sup> “I wish it were already me.” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 99.

- 35 ““Have a look at it, boy, and resign yourself to the situation, like [Asche] there—scientifically or as a shareholder.”” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 100.
- 36 ““Ancient Jewish wisdom and prophecy to which none of your time paid attention. Attend likewise to the lesson, when everything all at once appears to you insipid, stinking and full of decaying fish, like your father’s mill water, Ebert Pfister! Zephaniah in the first chapter verse eleven: Wail, all who inhabit the mills! For all the hucksters are no more, and those who weighed money coin are wiped out!”” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 101.
- 37 Once again Raabe demonstrates a resistance to simplistic oppositions. Lippoldes, as is noted throughout the novel, is a drunk, in part because his poetry is no longer popular, and his fame has waned significantly by the time the inner narrative takes place. This signals that the world depicted by the inner narrative is one already in transition.
- 38 “Was beiläufig mich angeht, Ebert Pfister, so meine ich, der beste Mann wird immer derjenige sein, welcher sich auch mit dem schofelsten Material dem gegenüber, was über der Zeit und dem Raume liegt, zurechtzufinden weiß.” (“What occurs to me, Ebert Pfister, what I think is that the best man will always be the one who knows to orient himself over and above the time and place with the most disgusting materials.”) Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 101.
- 39 Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 101–102.
- 40 “Yes, I’ve actually wanted to ask that for a long time, love—really, why didn’t your poor dad sign on to the big factory, since everything was so convenient for him, and didn’t take any shares, but unfortunately died, even though Mr Asche and Mr Riechei won him his case?,” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 118.
- 41 “Because he couldn’t do otherwise, love.” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 118.
- 42 Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 174.
- 43 While I focus on the character profiles here, Raabe signals a similar notion through the structure of the novel and the thematic of its setting. Raabe’s use of his reminiscence technique immediately sets the stage for a comparison between what is and what was in a way that articulates the concerns and preoccupations that a person living at that time may have had. For more, see Pascal above. There is also the issue of the setting, though. As Karin Kluger documents extensively in her book on Raabe’s idylls, Raabe’s use of that iconic *locus amoenus*, made so famous by contemporary English writers like George Eliot in novels like *The Mill on the Floss* (1860) but also touched on extensively by earlier figures like Friedrich Schiller in his *On Naive and Sentimental Poetry* (1795), would have already been strikingly different.
- “Während die Werke von Geßner und Voß noch als Idyllen im eigentlichen Sinn des Wortes konzipiert sind, kommt es im neunzehnten Jahrhundert zu einem formalen Bruch mit der überlieferten Idyllentradition, indem sich die Idylle von ihrer ursprünglichen Existenz als literarische Form mit festgesetzten Regeln entfernt und sich zu einem Themenkomplex erweitert, der charakteristische Gedankengänge, Szenen und Motive umschließt. Der Begriff ‚Idylle‘ bezeichnet demnach nicht mehr eine separate Gattung, sondern vielmehr einen in ein Romanwerk eingebetteten Ruhepunkt oder ein idyllisches Motiv, das thematisch ein literarisches Werk durchzieht.” (“While the works of Geßner and Voß are still conceived as idylls in the actual sense of the word, the nineteenth century saw a formal break with the idyll tradition, with the idyll moving away from its original existence as a literary form with fixed rules and expanding into a thematic complex, which encompasses characteristic trains of thought, scenes and motifs. After that, the term ‘Idyll’ signifies no longer a separate genre, but rather a point of tranquility embedded in a novel or an idyllic motif, which thematically pervades a literary work.”)

By the time of Raabe's writing, the idyl had come to occupy a more minor position as a literary motif that signals a quiet respite from, and here I am inserting my own two cents, industrial life. Considering that Ebert and Emmy can afford to have a summer vacation lasting several weeks goes a long way in showing that idyls and the sort of contemplative atmosphere they generate have already become a sort of leisure activity that can only be enjoyed by those with means. Thus, Raabe's use of it in *Pfisters Mühle*, far from signaling a return, actually places the story perfectly within the context of history. See Karin Kluger, *Der letzte Augenblick der hübschen Idylle: Die Problematisierung der Idylle bei Wilhelm Raabe* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 52.

44 Lippoldes could possibly be added to this category of value, too, as his poetry represents an outmoded means of creation that is steadily being replaced by the sort of figure represented by Asche—the shareholder or entrepreneur. I exclude mentioning this in the main text simply because I wish to emphasize the shift to capitalist values, which come across more readily in Bertram's example.

45 “Where do all the pictures remain?” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 156.

46 “How indissolubly firm stand Pfisters Mill in my soul!” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 157.

47 “Here I record the last of the colorful book [the summer notebook].” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 177.

48 “In the deepest depths of his personal archive.” Raabe, *Sämtliche Werke*, 150.

49 “A knowledge and cultural poetic of remnants and waste” that “pursues a literary archaeology that reads the cultural codes for determining the boundary between nature and culture, between animal and human, and between the value and valuelessness of human life by dealing with waste, remnants and living things.” Barbara Thums, “Vom Umgang mit Abfällen, Resten und Lebendigen Dingen in Erzählungen Raabes,” in *Jahrbuch Der Raabe-Gesellschaft* 48, no. 1 (2007): 66–84, here 83. Doi: [10.1515/9783484339217.1.66](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484339217.1.66).

50 This move is not just mimicking the language of deconstruction, but it is referring to the globalizing systems of trade that had continued to form during this period and were dependent upon imperialist and colonialist enterprises. For more on Raabe's attitudes towards German colonialism, see John Pizer, “Wilhelm Raabe and the German Colonial Experience,” in *A Companion to German Realism*, ed. Todd Kontje (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002): 159–181.