

2014

Publishers and Cultural Patronage in Germany, 1890-1933

Gary D. Stark
University of Texas at Arlington

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/hst_articles



Part of the [History Commons](#)

ScholarWorks Citation

Stark, Gary D., "Publishers and Cultural Patronage in Germany, 1890-1933" (2014). *Peer Reviewed Articles*. 20.

https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/hst_articles/20

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History Department at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peer Reviewed Articles by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Publishers and Cultural Patronage in Germany, 1890-1933

GARY D. STARK

University of Texas at Arlington

In a speech to his colleagues at the 1901 Congress of Publishers in Leipzig, one publisher proclaimed that

a Louis XIV, of the Medicis, of a Maecenas in short, all the famous figures whom history recognizes as protectors of literature. Discovering meritorious emerging talent, helping it along in its earliest stages, encouraging it, supporting it, often providing it with the means it needs for its self-development, strengthening it and if necessary protecting it against its adversaries, insuring in general a carefree existence for the muses—do we not do this every day?¹

In pointing out the resemblance of publishers to patrons, this bookman recognized a phenomenon of which contemporary writers, too, were becoming increasingly aware—although the writers viewed the situation rather differently. The obscure, disgruntled author Erich Eckertz, for example, complained in 1913 that

the dependent relationship of a writer to a patron, which was so common during the Renaissance and even in Goethe's day, appears today to be changing into a dependency of authors toward publishers. A publisher behaves toward his writers like the prince did in those days, and one can look forward with foreboding to an epic poem in which the hero is not one of the Medicis, but rather a modern publisher.²

1. Ferdinand Brunetière, as quoted in Gerhard Menz, *Der deutsche Buchhandel, Die deutsche Wirtschaft und ihre Führer*, Bd. 4, 2. Aufl. (Gotha, 1942), 28.

2. *Schriftsteller, Verleger und Publikum. Eine Rundfrage. Zehnjahreskatalog Georg Müller Verlag* (Munich, 1913), 26.

Whether it was seen as a beneficial or detrimental development, cultural patronage by German publishers was an intriguing aspect of Wilhelmian and Weimar intellectual life. By the late 19th and early 20th century—a time when small, highly personalized, and strongly programmatic houses comprised a larger portion of the German publishing industry than under today's large-scale business conditions—many publishers had assumed the functions previously performed by traditional patrons and were using their unique resources to patronize individual intellectuals or entire cultural movements.

The traditional courtly, aristocratic, or patrician patrons of the early modern era had a complex but mutually beneficial relationship toward the intellectuals whom they patronized. The most obvious service of the patron, of course, was to provide material assistance or total support to an artist, thereby allowing him to devote his full energies to intellectual work. By throwing the prestige and influence of his own name or his court behind an intellectual, an aristocratic patron was also able to confer greater respectability and influence to his protégé. Occasionally an influential patron helped secure some public office for his protégé, which also served to increase the intellectual's income, influence, or social standing. Patrons traditionally functioned as spokesmen and protectors for their artists, shielding them from attacks by authorities or by artistic rivals.

In return for the services rendered their protégés, patrons expected loyalty, endorsement, and acquiescence. They frequently obtained some control over the material their artist-protégés produced and sometimes used this material for their own larger ends. Indeed, many patrons sought out intellectuals because their talents could be useful in furthering the political or ideological affairs of the patron. A patron usually viewed his patronage as an investment in an intellectual; the patron would be repaid when a successful artist's work brought recognition, political advantage, or social prestige to the patron or his court. Patrons thus received as much from a patronage as did the protégé; few patrons acted out of pure altruism.

Traditional patronage benefitted not only individual artists, but intellectuals as a social group. In helping writers obtain money or office, patrons helped raise the general social standing of intellectuals. And in cases where aristocratic patrons brought protégés to their court and put them in contact with educated court circles or urban audiences, they helped writers gain new opportunities for self-expression and assisted in breaking down their social isolation.³

3. Arnold Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur* (Munich,

All these aspects of traditional cultural patronage can be detected in the activities of German publishers during the Wilhelmian and Weimar eras. To be sure, many bookmen in this period were merely calculating businessmen who entered publishing solely for material gain. There were, however, a number who in pursuing their profession served as patrons of cultural life. The publishers Eugen Diederichs and Julius F. Lehmann are two excellent examples of this latter type. Although their particular conservative ideological orientation perhaps made them atypical of other publisher-patrons, the activities of these two bookmen nevertheless illustrate how many Wilhelmian and Weimar publishers, whether intentionally or not, were frequently instrumental in evoking and nurturing new intellectual forces.

The Eugen Diederichs Verlag, founded in 1896 and centered in Jena, published literary, philosophical, historical, political, and general cultural books. Diederichs' own broad-ranging interests, the house's prestigious circle of authors (which included several Nobel prize winners), its pioneering work in the area of book graphics, and the firm's early involvement in nearly every avant garde cultural movement brought international recognition and acclaim to the Eugen Diederichs Verlag and helped make it a leading cultural force in pre-Nazi Germany. The J.F. Lehmanns Verlag, founded in Munich in 1890, became one of Germany's foremost publishers of medical books and journals. Lehmann's personal interest, however, was for political affairs and his firm soon began issuing more and more nationalist and *völkisch* literature. By the 1920's the house published approximately 30 new titles and some 16 journals annually, divided about equally between the medical and political fields.

Both Diederichs and Lehmann assumed an important aspect of the traditional patron's role when they tried to assist destitute authors associated with their houses. Sometimes the publishers accomplished this by using their influence to procure for their writers grants or stipends from outside sources. Diederichs, for example, helped found a Thuringian Cultural Emergency Fund during

1969); Francis Haskell, "Patronage," in *Encyclopedia of World Art* (N.Y., 1959-68), XI, 118-35; Diana Laurensen and Alan Swingewood, *The Sociology of Literature* (London, 1972), 91-140. A good treatment of patronage relations in England can be found in A.S. Collins, *Authorship in the Days of Johnson* (London, 1927) and *The Profession of Letters. A Study of the Relation of Author to Patron, Publisher and Public 1780-1832* (London, 1928).

the lean inflation years of the 1920's in order "to support suffering, creative forces." It collected over 6 million Marks in 1923 and distributed the funds to needy writers, artists, and academics.⁴ He also approached private institutions like the Zeiss Foundation, requesting they provide pensions for elderly indigent writers.⁵ Lehmann, who considered it his "moral duty to insure that writers receive, financially, whatever is necessary for intellectual creativity,"⁶ was no less solicitous toward his house's authors. When the liberal Prussian government withdrew a public research grant from Karl Ludwig Schemann in 1929 because of the author's controversial racial publications, Lehmann wrote to private organizations on Schemann's behalf seeking a replacement stipend which would enable Schemann to complete his work.⁷

If outside aid for their authors was not forthcoming, both publishers were willing to provide the material support themselves. Thus, when Lehmann failed to find another stipend for Schemann, he furnished the grant himself so the scholar could complete his three-volume *magnum opus* on racial thought. He wrote to Schemann:

Under these circumstances I consider it my pressing duty, despite the present economic crisis, to enable you to complete the third volume of your work. . . Proceed with peace of mind; I will make it possible for you to finish your study even without the help of the government grant.⁸

On another occasion, the Munich publisher discovered a young

4. Diederichs, "Die Lauensteiner Jubilatenwoche," *Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel*, 90 (1923): 705; "Aufruf der Kulturellen Notgemeinschaft" (1923), and Heinrich Driesmann to Diederichs, 14 May 1923, in the Eugen Diederichs Verlag Archive, Cologne; Diederichs to Kurt Sprengel, 15 February 1923, in Eugen Diederichs Mappe, Archiv der deutschen Jugendbewegung, Burg Ludwigstein.

5. Diederichs to Dr. Fischer, November 1922, Eugen Diederichs Archive.

6. Lehmann, "Vor dem Zusammenbruch," *Deutschlands Erneuerung*, 4 (1920): 457.

7. Schemann was at work on a 3-volume history of racial thought for the Lehmann house and was being funded through a grant from the semi-official Notgemeinschaft für die deutsche Wissenschaft. Appearance of the second volume in 1929 drew vehement protests from liberals and forced the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Carl Severing, to withdraw Schemann's grant. Lehmann wrote to the Akademie zur wissenschaftlichen Erforschung und zur Pflege des Deutschtums in an attempt to find Schemann a grant which would allow the scholar to complete the third volume of his study. Lehmann to Dr. Franz Thierfelder, 21 August 1929, in Karl Ludwig Schemann Nachlaß, Universitätsbibliothek, Freiburg im Breisgau.

8. Lehmann to Schemann, 16 December 1929, *ibid.*

author, Hans Günther, who seemed just the man to write the definitive racial handbook which Lehmann had long been planning. Lehmann persuaded him to resign from his teaching position in order to devote full time to the book; during the subsequent two years Günther spent at the task, Lehmann assumed his living expenses.⁹ When one of Diederichs' authors, Hermann Löns, fell on hard times and could not afford to purchase Christmas gifts for his family, the publisher sent him a sum of 200 Marks with no strings attached. Diederichs felt a deep personal responsibility toward Löns and his family, and after the author's death served as paternal benefactor to his widow and child.¹⁰

The two publishers acted as financial patrons in another important way: both were willing to incur financial losses for their houses in order to publish books which they knew in advance would not be commercially successful, but which they considered to be politically or culturally necessary. Lehmann, for example, calculated that over the years he had sacrificed one-fourth of his income in order to publish the kind of nationalistic and *völkisch* literature in which he so ardently believed.¹¹ Even though he expected the undertakings to incur large financial losses, his house proceeded with such projects as K.L. Schemann's multi-volume *Die Rasse in den Geisteswissenschaften* and the journal *Deutschlands Erneuerung*. The latter cost the Lehmann firm some 12,000 Marks per year, but Lehmann told his readers:

our journal was not created for profit, but rather solely to prepare for and assist in Germany's spiritual renewal. The weapon which our journal represents will be maintained, even if it can be preserved only by absorbing great losses over a long period of time.¹²

9. Hans-Jürgen Lützhöft, *Der nordische Gedanke in Deutschland 1920-1940*, Kieler Historische Studien, Bd. 14 (Stuttgart, 1971), 30-31; *Vierzig Jahre Dienst am Deutschtum 1890-1930* (Munich, 1930), 40; Verleger J.F. Lehmann. *Ein Leben im Kampf für Deutschland. Lebenslauf und Briefe*, ed. Melanie Lehmann (Munich, 1935), 60; *Fünfundzwanzig Jahre J.F. Lehmanns Verlag 1890-1940* (Munich, 1940), 99-104.

10. Diederichs to Löns, 20 September 1911, in Wilhelm Deimann Nachlaß' Stadt- und Landesbibliothek Dortmund. The collection of correspondence between Diederichs and Löns in this Nachlaß illustrates the close personal relationship which existed between the publisher and the Löns family.

11. Lehmann to Prince Alexander zu Hohenlohe, 4 February 1905, J.F. Lehmanns Verlag Archive, Munich.

12. *Deutschlands Erneuerung*, 7 (July 1920): 454; also 15 (December 1931): 754. For the 12,000 Mark figure, see Lehmann to Schemann, 17 July

Lehmann often declared his willingness to accept financial losses if in the process he could achieve his goal of educating the German nation in *völkisch* ideas.¹³ Similarly, the Diederichs house willingly absorbed substantial deficits with its eighteen-volume *Politische Bibliothek* series, with its journal *Die Tat* (which cost the firm 29,000 Marks annually by 1929), and with other works.¹⁴ "I decided on all manuscripts which were offered to me," Diederichs said,

according to whether or not they still appealed to me after I had read them. I never cared about public tastes nor did I calculate in advance the chances of a book's success. It was enough for me that I realized a book had been written from an inner necessity of the author's and that the experience of reading it kindled something within me. But to be sure about that, I had to have a close personal relationship with my authors; the feeling of being able to help them gave me the heightened sense of life I needed.¹⁵

Sacrifices of this kind were not at all uncommon in German publishing. Even the business manager of one of Germany's major publishing houses acknowledged that broader considerations than mere profitability must guide the astute publisher when making publication decisions.¹⁶ Financial sacrifices by publishers for their authors

1929, Schemann Nachlaß. Lehmann lost over 7000 Marks on the publication of Volume 1 of Schemann's work and expected to lose a total of 21,000 Marks on all three volumes. Lehmann to Akademie zur wissenschaftlichen Erforschung und zur Pflege des Deutschtums, 7 September 1929, Schemann Nachlaß.

13. *Fünfzig Jahre Lehmanns Verlag*, 9; Friedrich Lehmann, "J.F. Lehmann Mein Oheim," *Deutschlands Erneuerung*, 19 (1935): 270.

14. On the *Politische Bibliothek* project, see Diederichs' letter of 8 July 1911 and Diederichs to H. von Berger, 28 August 1911, in *Eugen Diederichs. Leben und Werke. Ausgewählte Briefe*, ed. Lulu von Strauß und Torney-Diederichs (Jena, 1936), 199, 200. *Die Tat* ran a deficit every year of its operation from 1912 to 1930. See Klaus Dietze, *Eugen Diederichs und seine Zeitschriften*, Schriftenreihe Führende Männer der Presse aus Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, Bd. 3 (Würzburg, 1940), 139, 142, 151.

15. "Aufzeichnung 1921," in *Eugen Diederichs. Selbstzeugnisse und Briefe von Zeitgenossen*, ed. Ulf Diederichs (Düsseldorf, 1967), 66-67.

16. L. Feuchtwanger, business manager of the Dunker & Humboldt Verlag, stated: "Der Verlag brachte in früherer Zeit oft große Opfer für Werke, von denen für ihn von vornherein feststand, daß die Herstellungskosten sich durch den Erlös aus dem absatz nicht bezahlt machten. Außerwirtschaftliche Gründe oder eine sublimierte Wirtschaftseinsicht des 'königlichen Kaufmannes' führten zu solchen Opfern: Langjährige, oft sehr fruchtbare Freundschaften zwischen Verleger und Gelehrten, oder der ideale Ehrgeiz, dem Ansehen des Verlages durch die uneigennützigste Publikation einer erwiesenermaßen unschätzbaren großartigen Gelehrtenleistung. . . besonders zu nützen, oder drittens wohl auch die vorausschauende Klugheit

often led, among other things, to a stronger sense of house loyalty among the authors. Thus, when another firm tried to lure the writer Hans F. Blunck away from the Eugen Diederichs house, Blunck replied that he felt compelled to remain with Diederichs "because he backed me at a time when the prospect of commercial success (for my books) was quite small."¹⁷

Just as traditional patrons provided their protégés with more intangible benefits such as social opportunities, Diederichs and Lehmann, too, furnished their authors with valuable forms of non-material support. Diederichs used his authority and prestige to procure public posts for some of his authors. He knew the director of the *Deutsches Museum für Buch und Schrift* in Leipzig, for example, and tried to get Hermann Hesse a job there which would allow the young author to devote more time to his writing.¹⁸ On another occasion, he instituted an intensive campaign to have one of his authors, Blunck, appointed to the Prussian Writers Academy and to have him awarded the Nobel Prize for literature; the publisher wrote to the Prussian Minister of Culture on behalf of his "Verlagssohn" (Diederichs' term) and sent complimentary copies of Blunck's work to Academy members and other key figures with the request they give Blunck's candidacy every consideration.¹⁹ While Lehmann never solicited so directly for his authors, it was largely because of Lehmann's publishing house that two of his young writers were able to gain public notoriety and later attain public office. Lehmann himself had conceived the plan for a definitive racial science hand-

und Hoffnung des Verlegers, von dem Verfasser, dem man auf diese Weise scheinbar unter geschäftlichen Einbuße diene, bei späteren Gelegenheit ein gangbares Lehrbuchoder eine sonstige, sich an ein größeres Publikum wendende Arbeit anvertraut zu erhalten." "Die Bezahlung des wissenschaftlichen Schriftstellers," in: *Die geistigen Arbeiter*. Teil I: *Freies Schriftstellertum und Literaturverlag*, ed. Ludwig Sinzheimer, Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik, Bd. 152 (Munich & Leipzig, 1922), 275.

17. Blunck to Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 12 January 1924, H.F.K. Blunck Nachlaß, Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesbibliothek, Kiel.

18. Diederichs to Hesse, 28 January 1902, Hermann Hesse Nachlaß, Schiller-Nationalmuseum und Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Marbach am Neckar. Hesse apparently expressed interest in the post, for Diederichs wrote him again on 8 February giving further information on the opening.

19. Diederichs to Blunck, 9 November 1926, undated letter of 1926, and 13 December 1928, Blunck Nachlaß. So active was Diederichs on Blunck's behalf that one Academy member wrote back to the publisher: "Ich weiß nicht recht, ob ich Sie oder Ihre Dicter um Ihre Strebsamkeit beneiden soll. Teilen kann ich sie nicht." H. Hesse to Diederichs, 17 December 1928, *ibid.*

book; when he discovered the obscure young teacher Hans Günther, the publisher plucked him out of his job and commissioned him to write the work. Through Lehmann's energetic promotion, *Die Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes* was a tremendous success and established overnight Günther's reputation as Germany's leading racial theorist. Because of that reputation, Günther was given the first university chair in racial science in 1930 when the Nazis gained control of the Thuringian Ministry of Culture.²⁰ Similarly, R. Walther Darré, after becoming Minister of Agriculture and "Reichsbauernführer" in the Third Reich, acknowledged his deep personal debt to the Lehmann house, which had published, supported, and propagandized his early "*Blut und Boden*" writings.²¹

Like traditional patrons, Diederichs and Lehmann also used their influence to protect their authors against rival writers. After one of Lehmann's authors, Schemann, wrote critical reviews of the works of another Lehmann house author, Günther, Lehmann reacted angrily. He used his financial power over Schemann (who at the time was receiving research support from Lehmann) to make him cease his attacks on Günther's work.²² When one of the new Diederichs house books received negative reviews, Diederichs contacted Blunck and other of his firm's prominent authors and elicited from them public statements in support of the book.²³ The publishers were even more energetic in mobilizing their influence to shield their authors from challenges by public authorities. Besides complaining to the Ministry of Culture, Lehmann orchestrated a protest campaign in the press when the Social Democratic Prussian state government withdrew a research grant in 1929 from Lehmann's controversial racial author, K.L. Schemann. Diederichs did the same for B.N. Haken, one of his authors who had written a book highly critical of the government's unemployment policies and programs. When Haken was suddenly dismissed from his own bureaucratic post in 1930, the Jena publisher immediately contacted the other authors of the

20. See Gary D. Stark, "Der Verleger als Kulturunternehmer: Der J.F. Lehmanns Verlag und Rassenkunde in der Weimarer Republik," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, 16 (1976): 291, 399-03.

21. See Darré's congratulations to Lehmann on the publisher's 70th birthday, reprinted in *Deutschland's Erneuerung*, 19 (1935): 45.

22. Lehmann to Schemann, 6 June 1929 and 9 October 1929; Schemann to Lehmann, 17 October 1929, Schemann Nachlaß.

23. Diederichs to Blunck, 1 September 1927, Blunck Nachlaß. Blunck complied with a very laudatory statement about the book in question (*Amerika und der Amerikanismus*) on 6 September; it is not clear whether Blunck had actually read the work or not.

Diederichs house and asked them to take up Haken's cause, express their support for him publicly, and do everything possible to aid him.²⁴ Diederichs also defended Friedrich Muck-Lamberty, an eccentric, Dionysiac young preacher from the German youth movement whose growing cult of wild enthusiasts alarmed Thuringian officials in 1920-21. Diederichs, who served as a kind of adoptive father and adult spokesman for the youth movement and whose firm was a leading publisher of *Wandervogel* and *Freideutsche Jugend* material, intervened on Muck-Lamberty's behalf. To fend off suppression by the police, Diederichs helped Muck-Lamberty procure a local castle where it was hoped the strange young clan would confine their activities. However, officials continued to be concerned over the uninhibited sexuality of the Muck-Lamberty cult and moved to expel them from Thuringia. Diederichs, through several press articles, urged toleration of the cult's antics. Finally, when suppression seemed imminent in February 1921, Diederichs, in his role as a recognized and respected authority on youth movement affairs, wrote to the state Minister of Culture to plead Muck-Lamberty's case and to give it his own personal sanction; to gain additional public sympathy and support for Muck-Lamberty, the publisher also sent copies of the letter to various newspapers and journals.²⁵

What the publishers did to aid and support individual writers, they did also for entire groups of authors, for cultural movements. By placing the considerable influence, prestige, and resources of their houses behind specific intellectual movements, they helped the causes gain a recognition, respectability, and influence they would otherwise probably not have achieved. For example, Diederichs more or less adopted the German youth movement and associated his house closely with it; he regarded himself as the movement's "sponsor" (*Pate*) and "solicitor" (*Anwalt*).²⁶ Recognized by both

24. Eugen Diederichs Verlag Rundschreiben, 22 October 1930; Niels Diederichs to Blunck, 23 October 1930, Blunck Nachlaß.

25. Diederichs to the Altenburgischen Kultusminister, 10 February 1921, Eugen Diederichs Verlag Archive; Diederichs to Kurt Sprengel, 1 March 1921, Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Dortmund. For background on Muck-Lamberty and his "Freie Schar" cult, see Fritz Borinski and Werner Milch, *Jugendbewegung. The Story of the German Youth Movement 1896-1933* (London, 1945), 21-22.

26. Diederichs said: "Ich stehe der Jugeudbewegung persönlich seit Ihrer Entstehung sehr nahe. Ich habe sozusagen mit Pate bei ihrer Begründung gestanden und habe sie schon manchmal als älterer Freund zu beeinflussen gesucht. . ." Diederichs to Altenburgischen Kultusminister, 10 February 1921, Eugen Diederichs Verlag Archiv. When the publisher sent out a circular on behalf of the Hohe Meissner Festival, he did it "sozusagen

youth and adult society as one of the movement's leading spokesmen and champions, he was frequently invited to exclusive gatherings of youth movement leaders or asked his opinion on the movement by scholars.²⁷ When the various German youth groups convened for their famous Hohe Meissner Festival in 1913, Diederichs acted as a kind of press agent, explaining its goals and principles to the public and using his extensive contacts to solicit statements of support for the Festival from various prominent cultural figures.²⁸ When his internationally respected firm placed its prestigious imprint on the movement by publishing the Hohe Meissner *Festschrift* as well as numerous other youth movement books, Diederichs bestowed respectability upon the youth movement. For his services to the cause, youth movement leaders said of Diederichs upon his death:

The youth movement is immeasurably indebted to him. He helped unloose all the powers of the movement, . . . everything was instigated and called forth with his help. . . . In any case, the history of the pre- and post-war youth movement is totally unthinkable without the influence of Eugen Diederichs.²⁹

The Eugen Diederichs Verlag also championed several other new movements in Germany such as Bergsonian *Lebensphilosophie*, Literary neoromanticism, and the "Conservative Revolution."³⁰

als *Anwalt der Bewegung*." Circular of 17 July 1913, Eugen Diederichs Mappe, Archiv der deutschen Jugendbewegung.

27. Walter Hammer to Diederichs, 25 April 1921, and Diederichs to T. Chappey, 5 October 1922, Eugen Diederichs Verlag Archive.

28. Diederichs played a key role in the planning of the Festival. See *Eugen Diederichs. Leben und Werke*, 220–225, and his "Bericht über die vorbereitende Besprechung einer Jahrhundertsfeier aller lebensreformerischen Verbände (abgehalten am 5. and 6. Juli 1913 in Jena)," in *Die Wandervogelzeit. Quellenschriften zur deutschen Jugendbewegung 1896–1919*, ed. Werner Kindt (Cologne, 1968), 484–87. It was Diederichs who composed the Festival's official *Aufruf* (reprinted in *Grundschriften der Jugendbewegung*, ed. Werner Kindt (Cologne, 1963), 93ff.) In an accompanying circular to the *Aufruf* which Diederichs sent to key people, he "speaks on behalf of the Festival" in asking recipients to compose short statements in favor of the Festival or to sign the *Aufruf* "so that the Festival will find the press coverage it deserves." Circular of 17 July 1913, Eugen Diederichs Mappe, Archiv der deutschen Jugendbewegung.

29. Wilhelm Flitner's eulogy in *In Memoriam Eugen Diederichs* (Jena, 1930), unpagged; Georg Schmidt, "Eugen Diederichs und die Jugendbewegung" *Der Jungdeutsche*, 28 October 1930, page v.

30. For the broad cultural activities of the Eugen Diederichs Verlag, see Gary D. Stark, "Entrepreneurs of Ideology: Neo-Conservative Publishers in Germany, 1890–1933" (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1974).

In a similar way, Lehmann almost single-handedly created the cause of "racial science" (*Rassenkunde*) in the Weimar Republic and placed the full resources of his house behind it. His firm gained a virtual monopoly on racial publications and became one of the movement's foremost advocates. As a publishing house already world-renowned for its high-quality medical publications, the Lehmann Verlag was able to confer to racial eugenics a pseudo-scientific legitimacy.³¹ The firm performed a similar service to other conservative and nationalistic movements such as the Pan-German movement and anti-Catholic "Los von Rom" campaign before the First World War.³²

Both publishers further aided the writers of various movements by creating for them new organs and new opportunities for self-expression. When Diederichs acquired the journal *Die Tat* in 1909, he transformed it into a central organ for the youth movement. A few years later his publishing house founded another journal, *Der Aufbruch*, specifically for Free German Youth writers, and in 1918 he created the journal *Nyland* for a small circle of writers who called themselves "Werkleute auf Haus Nyland." In addition, Diederichs was active in organizing youth group cells such as the Sera Circle, and youth congresses such as the Hohe Meissner and Hofgeismar meetings. Likewise, Lehmann's publishing house founded the *Volk und Rasse* and *Zeitschrift für Rassenphysiologie* journals for the racial movement and created the Society for German Volkdom to promote racial research. The Lehmann house journal *Deutschlands Erneuerung* came to be one of the Pan-German movement's foremost organs in the 1920's.

Diederichs also patronized the new artistic school of *Jugendstil* and provided it with a new outlet of expression. At the turn of the century the Diederichs house revolutionized the area of book graphics and book decorations, transforming German books from ugly, shabby objects into richly illustrated works of art. Diederichs offered many generous commissions to struggling young *Jugendstil* artists to design new type, title pages, book covers, illustrations, and house

31. See Stark, "Der Verleger als Kulturunternehmer."

32. Stark, "Entrepreneurs of Ideology."

insignia.³³ In doing so, his firm not only helped individual artists³⁴ (many of whom first gained public recognition through their graphics work for the Eugen Diederichs Verlag), but also helped popularize the new *Jugendstil* art movement as a whole.

Traditional patrons often commissioned their protégés to produce specific works which would aid the patron in his own social or political pursuits. This not only had the effect of drawing the protégés into the realm of political affairs, but it also meant that the patron was the real motivating force and directing influence behind the production of many cultural works. The publishers Diederichs and Lehmann, too, had broad cultural and ideological goals which they hoped to fulfill through their publishing house programs, and both were continually seeking out and commissioning authors to carry out specific projects. Diederichs believed it to be an inherent part of his calling as a publisher to invoke (*anregen*) writers to work on specific themes and to encourage authors to popularize certain ideas.³⁵ Lehmann claimed his mind was constantly full of new plans, but that he often had great difficulty in finding the proper people to write them for him: "Only when I am unable to find an author to do the work for me do I occasionally take up the pen myself; but I have always laid it down again when I found (a writer) who could do it better." According to Lehmann, most of the works published by his house were the direct result of his own personal inducement and for many others, he had determined at least part of the content.³⁶ Indeed, many of the best-known works to come out

33. On the Eugen Diederichs Verlag, the revolution in book design, and *Jugendstil*, see Otto Grautoff, *Die Entwicklung der modernen Buchkunst in Deutschland* (Leipzig, 1901), especially 127–41; Georg K. Schauer, *Deutsche Buchkunst 1890 bis 1940*, Bd. I (Hamburg, 1963), 57–8, 76–80; W.C. Oschilewski, "Eugen Diederichs und die deutsche Buchkunst," *Archiv für Buchgewerbe*, 73 (1936): 399–416, and "Eugen Diederichs. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neuen deutschen Buchkunst," *Imprimatur*, Bd. IX (Hamburg, 1940), 17–32.

34. Emil Rudolf Weiß, Melchoir Lechter, J. Cissarz, Pankok, F.H. Emcke, Heinrich Vogeler, and Fidus (Karl Höppner) all did graphics work for the Eugen Diederichs Verlag.

35. Diederichs, "Gegenwart und Zukunft," *Der Ochs von Lauenstein*, Heft 5 (1926): 30; *Diederichs. Selbstzeugnisse und Briefe*, 171, 38.

36. Lehmann to Anna Chamberlain, 25 June 1906, J.F. Lehmanns Verlag Archive; *Fünfzig Jahre Lehmanns Verlag*, 7; F. Lehmann, "J.F. Lehmann," 270.

of the Diederichs and Lehmann houses originated with the publisher's rather than the author's initiative.³⁷ Initiative by publishers has in fact played an extremely important role in 19th and 20th century German literature.³⁸

In carrying out their publishing activities, Eugen Diederichs and Julius F. Lehmann behaved in a way which closely resembled that of traditional patrons of culture. They attended to the material wellbeing of their authors; they accepted financial sacrifices in order to spread what they felt to be important cultural works; they helped their authors to achieve more secure social positions or influential posts; they protected their authors from their opponents; they bestowed their prestigious house name and image to particular cultural groups or causes; they created new organs and new forms of cultural expression for intellectuals; they instigated and directed the writing of particular books or the production of other cultural works and used these as part of a larger ideological or cultural program.

As indicated earlier, Diederichs and Lehmann were by no means isolated examples in the German publishing industry. Many of Germany's foremost publishers in the late 19th and 20th century have pictured themselves as patrons of cultural life—and acted as such. Samuel Fischer, for example, the leading literary publisher whose authors included all the giants from Theodor Fontane to Hermann Hesse and Thomas Mann, believed that:

Nurturing literary art. . . is one of the most personal duties of a publisher. In this area it is a matter of recognizing and promoting latent cultural forces. Fostering talent. . . requires the greatest personal activity on the part of a publisher and the marshalling of all his abilities. . . . The publisher, as a man who is enticed to place his money and his efforts behind immaterial values, longs to be a discoverer: he wants to help bring new values to light and, as an organizational entrepreneur, wants to create new values.³⁹

37. For numerous examples where both publishers commissioned, invoked, or otherwise shaped the writing of books published by their houses, see Stark, "Entrepreneurs of Ideology."

38. See Helmut Hiller, "Der Einfluß der Verlegerischen Initiative auf die deutsche Literatur," *Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel*, Neue Folge 9 (1953): 450, 454, 469, 481.

39. Fischer, "Der Verleger und der Büchermarkt," in *S. Fischer Verlag Almanach, Das 25. Jahr* (Berlin, 1911), 24.

What Diederichs and Lehmann did for their authors, Fischer did for the German naturalists, impressionists, and other writers.⁴⁰ Kurt Wolff, the famous expressionist publisher, tried as a publisher "to represent and promote not books, but authors;"⁴¹ he and the publisher Ernst Rowohlt functioned as true patrons of the German expressionist authors. Georg Bondi performed the same service for the Stefan George Circle; Wieland Herzfelde's Malik Verlag and Paul Steegmann's house did it for the dadists; the Erich Mathes Verlag, the Walther Hammer Verlag, the Adolf Saal Verlag, and Karl Dietze's Greifenverlag did the same for the German youth movement. Many additional examples, whether of left-wing, right-wing, or apolitical publishers, could be cited from 19th and 20th century German cultural history.

The cultural patronage performed by so many modern German publishers is a social phenomenon whose origins lie deeper than in simply the personalities of individual publishers. Under modern (i.e., post-18th century) conditions, a large reading public and comprehensive copyright laws have made it possible for writers to live solely from the proceeds of their writings. These developments freed writers from their traditional dependence on some conventional occupation or their reliance on wealthy patrons for a stable income, and permitted the emergence of the independent, professional writer. As writers passed from dependence on patrons to dependence on the impersonal book market, however, they at the same time became more dependent on publishers, whose function it is to mediate between the writer and the reading public by providing a commercial mechanism to exploit the market. In this sense, writers did exchange dependence upon patrons for a dependence upon publishers, at least temporarily. As writers became more self-conscious and organized their own interest groups to reform copyright laws, fight for higher honoraria and royalties, and generally to press their own interests *vis à vis*

40. See Peter de Mendelssohn, *S. Fischer und Sein Verlag* (Frankfurt, 1970).

41. Wolff to R. Schickele, 29 March 1921, in *Briefwechsel eines Verlegers 1911-1963*, ed. Bernhard Zeller and E. Otten (Frankfurt, 1966). On the literary patronage of the Kurt Wolff and the Ernst Rowohlt Verlag, see Wolfram Göbel's two studies: "Der Kurt Wolff Verlag 1913-1930. Expressionismus als verlegerische Aufgabe," and "Der Ernst Rowohlt Verlag 1910-1913. Seine Geschichte und seine Bedeutung für die Literatur seiner Zeit," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*; 15 (1975): 521-962 and 14 (1974): 465-608.

publishers, writers eventually gained greater social stature and more complete financial independence even from publishers.⁴²

In Germany, effective copyright laws protecting authors from literary piracy and a book market large enough to support a class of professional authors did not emerge until the mid-19th century.⁴³ A workable copyright law for the entire *Deutscher Bund* was not established until November 1837; only when the law was further extended and strengthened in April 1871 and January 1876 did it provide effective protection for German writers. The threat of literary piracy was not completely eliminated until the 1886 Universal Copyright Convention of Berne. Consequently, during the 19th century the process by which publishers supplanted patrons was still taking place, and forms of the traditional patronage relationship survived into the 20th century.

While some writers resented their publisher-patrons because of the continued financial dependence involved in the relationship, others recognized that publishers had also inherited many of the beneficial functions of traditional patrons. One author, for example, when asked for his opinion of publishers, commented that in the modern confusion and competition of new cultural movements and cliques, each struggling for recognition and success with the public, the publisher had now become one of the most powerful allies of the modern artist. For it is the publisher

who must know the difference between what has worth and what is worthless, otherwise they themselves will not survive. The living, changing, and mutually beneficial relation between the artist and manager (i.e., the publisher) is more healthy than the frozen, empty, and painful meeting of artists and traditional patrons. For it is only the commercial side of the practice of art, (handled by publishers, impressarios, and managers,) which makes it possible for the artist. . .to receive his means of support and his means of existence not as an allowance, but rather empowers him to earn those means himself, and in so doing, esta-

42. On the modern organization of writers, see Friedhelm Kron, *Schriftstellerberuf und Interessenpolitik 1842-1973* (Stuttgart, 1976).

43. On the development and growth of the reading public in Germany, see Ronald A. Fullerton, "The German Book Markets, 1815-1888" (Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1975). The most complete treatment of the struggle against *Nachdruck* (literary piracy) in Germany can be found in Johann Goldfriedrich, *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels*, Bd. III: 1740-1804 (Leipzig, 1909), and Bd. IV: 1805-1889 (Leipzig, 1913).

blishes a much closer connection between art and the social world.⁴⁴

This author struck upon a crucial aspect of the cultural patronage of publishers: namely, that publishers are merely transitional patrons. The ultimate goal of any publisher is the public success of his house's authors. The greater that success, with its corresponding higher royalty income for the author, the more financially and socially independent the author becomes and the less he must depend on patronage of any sort. The cultural patronage exercised by publishers in Germany was thus not so much an anachronistic relic as it was part of a transition toward the ultimate elimination of patronage.⁴⁵

44. Ludwig Havatny, "Der Kampf um Erfolg," in *Schriftsteller, Verleger und Publikum*, 72.

45. See Peter Meyer-Dohm, *Buchhandel als kulturwirtschaftliche Aufgabe*, Schriften zur Buchmarkt-Forschung, Bd. 11 (Gütersloh, 1967), especially 27.