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Handke's «Kafkaesque» Novel: Semiotic Processes in Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter

Abstract

Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter is characterized by qualities which have come to be known as «Kafkaesque.» The behavior of the protagonist is unexplained, the prevailing atmosphere is one of anxiety, and a fuzzy suggestiveness informs the novel's fictive world. Yet, as with Kafka's work, mimetic or allegorical interpretations seem to impoverish rather than to enrich the text. It may well be that the primary concern of both authors is to illumine not the character of the world, but the character of meaning itself. In Handke's novel, Josef Bloch, eluding capture by the Austrian police following his murder of a movie clerk, engages in a search for «semiotic sanity». Bloch's exceptionally aware rethinking of relationship among the phenomenal world, self, and language yields considerable insight into the ontology of meaning, revealing the Kafkaesque qualities of the novel to be the product of normal semiotic processes of life.
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When *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter* appeared in German in 1970 and in English translation as *The Goalie’s Anxiety at the Penalty Kick* in 1972(1), reviewers quickly dubbed it “Kafkaesque.” Some invoked the name of Kafka without pointing to specific parallels--other than to note the Kafka-sounding name of the protagonist, Josef Bloch--but simply as a short cut to accounting for what could not be understood; others pointed to the unexplained behavior of the protagonist, the anxiety-inducing events, and the sustained quality of fuzzy suggestiveness which inform both writers’ fictive worlds.(2) Just as the reader of Kafka’s *Der Prozess*, for example, is left with speculative, unverifiable explanations for K’s guilt, so also is the reader of Handke’s *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter* left with the feeling that he never knows why Bloch is fired from his job as a construction worker (if indeed he is), why he strangles the woman with whom he has spent the night, nor why he acts as he does in the days following these events. In both novels, a guilty, isolated hero attempts to understand the nature of his relationships, K through probing into his sins of commission and omission and Bloch through analyzing the terms of reality. And though the prose in both is distinguished by its clarity, both Kafka’s and Handke’s narratives create a surrealistic atmosphere seemingly resistant to interpretation.

But despite their long critical history as unsolvable metaphysical inquiries, the questions in Kafka may be at their core no more (and no less) than questions of language. Anthony Thorlby, defending such a thesis in his fine essay, “Anti-Mimesis: Kafka and Wittgenstein,” suggests that with Kafka, “the more intelligently we think about the situation, the less we experience its essential reality. Criticism becomes a way of missing the point.”
(3) With Susan Sontag, he would agree that to interpret Kafka’s work mimetically or allegorically is to impoverish the text, (4) wherein Kafka’s significance lies. As Thorlby notes, Kafka’s purpose “could have been to illumine the character of meaning rather than to illumine the character of the world.” (5) The application of this central premise to Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter yields considerable insight into the enigmatic texture of Handke’s novel and the strange behavior of Josef Bloch.

Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter sketches a series of events in the life of a former soccer goalkeeper, beginning in Vienna, where he leaves his job and murders a woman he barely knows, and following the occurrences of his daily life thereafter as he seeks refuge in a small southern border town. Though much of what constitutes Bloch’s daily experience following the murder is patently unnoteworthy, the reader is left with the feeling that he wants to understand what Bloch does and says in even the seemingly insignificant moments of his life, and he is never relieved from the sustained perplexity of experience the novel creates. As in a Kafka novel, the question of meaning in Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter is pervasive, but in the Handke novel there is less of a temptation to impute mimetic or allegorical significance, for here there if no doubt that the inscrutable actions of Josef Bloch are inextricably related to Handke’s own investigation into the nature of language and his hero’s obvious preoccupation with words.

In this respect, Bloch is strongly reminiscent of Roquentin, the hero of Sartre’s La Nausée (1938), a man who is driven to nausea by the presence of things and who comes to confront the insubstantiality of a reality of which his very body is a part. Realizing the fragile nature of the phenomenal world in the climactic scene beneath a chestnut tree, Roquentin discovers:

I couldn’t remember it was a root any more. The words had vanished and with them the significance of things, their methods of use, and the feeble points of reference which men have traced on their surface. (6)

The recognition that reality must be actualized through language becomes even more maddening for Roquentin when he considers that there is no innate correspondence between words and the objects they denote, rendering phenomenal reality—and existence
itself—logically unintelligible.

One passage in Handke’s *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter* particularly recalls the experience of Sartre’s hero; it is a point at which Bloch himself experiences nausea over his unbearable alienation from the objects surrounding him and his incessant need to name:

In his room at the inn he woke up just before dawn. All at once, everything around him was unbearable... A fierce nausea gripped him. He immediately vomited into the sink. He vomited for a while, with no relief. He lay back down on the bed. He was not dizzy; on the contrary, he saw everything with excruciating stability... Inside the room he noticed the two water pipes along the wall; they ran parallel to each other, cut off above by the ceiling and below by the floor. Everything he saw was cut off in the most unbearable way. The nausea did not so much elate him as depress him even more. It seemed as though a crowbar had pried him away from what he saw—or, rather, as though the things around him had all been pulled away from him. The wardrobe, the sink, the suitcase, the door: only now did he realize that he, as if compelled, was thinking of the word for each thing. Each glimpse of a thing was immediately followed by its word. The chair, the clothes hangers, the key...(7)

Like Roquentin, Bloch is experiencing the basic existential problem of the disconnection between one’s own consciousness and the external world and the painful awareness that the only link between them is language.

But Handke is only a limited disciple of Sartre. In an interview with Artur Joseph, Handke sees Roquentin’s nausea as a healthy alternative to the numbed consciousness which neither considers nor is disturbed by the “idiocy of language.” (8) But in “Die Literatur ist romantisch,”(9) he takes issue with Sartre’s ideas about a literature of engagement, suggesting that the one truly “engaged” literature is that which is concerned only with itself, that is, only with language. While Sartre the novelist defines the existential-linguistic problem with which Handke too is concerned, Sartre the philosopher finds a solution for Roquentin’s alienation in a Hegelian rationalism, a solution which Handke cannot concede.

*Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter* may have kinships with
both Kafka and Sartre, but, more strongly than either, the novel suggests the influence of French structuralism and, more specifically, of semiotics. In a 1970 article in *Der Spiegel*,(10) Handke is quoted as having acknowledged the importance of French structuralism for his writing, and in the interview I had with Handke in Berlin,(11) he said that the work of Roland Barthes had been very important in a world where formalized language offered the only permanence. While any work of literature may be analyzed from a semiotic perspective—and, indeed, the 1970's have given this critical approach currency—*Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter* is replete with textual support for Handke’s own exploration into the science of signs.(12) For it is Bloch’s extreme awareness of the semiotic processes of everyday life which gives the novel its Kafkaesque quality and accounts for the strange isolation of its hero. If the horror of consciousness is suggested in Handke’s play *Der Ritt über den Bodensee* (1970) through Bergner’s schizophrenic response to her own image, through the wailing doll, and through the metaphor of the horseman riding across thin ice, it is lived in *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter* in the character of Bloch, who is aware that it is only arbitrary interpretation which creates the tenuous bond between man and the world.

The metaphor of the soccer goalkeeper anticipating the ball’s coming into the cage he protects reflects the instability of this relationship. Shifting his weight from one foot to the other, the goalie is aware that his interpretation of the penalty kicker’s movements can determine whether the kicker scores, but he is also aware that while he is assessing the kicker, the kicker is assessing him, and even the slightest hint of movement on either of their parts becomes critical. That Bloch was formerly a goalie himself gives the title a practical relevance as well, for as a man whose job it once was to interpret gesture, Bloch is now hypersensitive to the signs of human life.

Bloch leaves his job as a construction worker because he interprets a gesture—no one but the foreman looked up at him as he reported to work—to mean he is fired. On the street a taxi stops for him because the driver interprets Bloch’s raising of his arm as a signal for a cab. A movie cashier hands Bloch a ticket when he wordlessly lays his money on the turntable before her. A hotel clerk refuses Bloch a room because he has only a briefcase with him. The first several pages of the novel create the terms of the
world through which Bloch moves, a world which must constantly be interpreted but which, with each successive decoding, seems more and more a dishonest joke.

But it is only after Bloch murders the young movie clerk that his awareness of semiotic processes and the role which language plays in them becomes excruciatingly intense. Handke, explaining the principle behind the novel, specifically singles out that event, which occurs very early in the novel, as the point at which Bloch begins to realize that perceptions cannot be received except in verbal terms, a recognition which leads Bloch to see everything as an insinuation or command. Writing in a letter published in part in Text und Kritik, Handke explains:

The principle was to show how the objects which someone perceives are transformed into language [versprachlichen] more and more following an event (a murder) and how, as the images are given linguistic form, they also become commands and prohibitions. An example from a treatise on Beginning Schizophrenia: a “schizophrenic” sees a piece of cheese lying under a cheesebell (an image) and out of this cheese appear drops (an image): henceforth, instead of seeing only the image, the schizophrenic sees not the images alone, but also immediately notes their translation into language: “the cheese is sweating!”; i.e., he who is looking at it should sweat; this is what is suggested to him (model), i.e., he should strain himself more, concentrate more, work more. The schizophrenic perceives objects as correspondences to himself, as “word games,” metaphorically. That is the principle of the narrative.... (13)

Transformed into narrative, Bloch’s view of objects as regulations containing the imperative of a programmed response appears in a passage such as this:

The dish rag hanging over the faucet told him to do something. Even the cap of the bottle left on the table, which by now had been cleared, summoned him to do something. Everything fell into place: everywhere he saw a summons: to do one thing, not to do another. Everything was spelled out for him, the shelf where the spice boxes were, a shelf with jars of freshly made jam... (pp. 116-117)
And his insistence on finding symbolic meaning in every object is reflected in these questions:

Does this ink pad mean anything to you? What do you think of when you see this filled-out check? What do you associate with that drawer’s being open? (p. 96) And why were the cookies on the wooden plate fish-shaped? What did they suggest? Should he be “mute as a fish”? Was he not permitted to talk? Was that what the cookies on the wooden plate were trying to tell him?(p.116)

As Bloch’s idiosyncrasies reveal themselves, it becomes increasingly clear that although his world is made up of everyday objects and events, Bloch is no ordinary participant in the quotidian world of man. Yet Handke contends that Bloch is “normal.” In the letter describing the principle behind the narrative, he writes that although he used the schizophrenic state of mind as the model for the behavior of his protagonist, he nonetheless created Bloch as a “normal” hero:

That is the principle of the narrative, only because this behavior is not applied to a schizophrenic (to the extent that there are in general schizophrenics), but to a “normal” hero...(14)

Though it is difficult to see the seemingly unmotivated murder which Bloch commits as the act of a “normal” man, when one reads the novel as the working out of the principle Handke describes, it becomes clear that the strange behavior of the protagonist following that act is simply the ongoing consequence of one man’s re-thinking of the relationships of reality. It is Bloch’s exceptional consciousness of himself and the world and his urgent questioning of correspondences following the deed which dictate his every move, precluding our judgment of him in traditional terms. For with one who is trying as hard as Bloch to understand existence itself, psychological and moral concerns would seem to belong to an order of criticism which can only be considered once the primary level is clear.

Bloch is exceedingly aware of the fact that if man is to come to any understanding of his relationship to the phenomenal and experiential world, he must do this through the one system which informs his every contact with it, and that is language. As Roland
Barthes suggests in his introduction to *Eléments de Sémiologie* (1964), it is doubtful whether any extensive system of signs can exist independent of language:

It is true that objects, images, and patterns of behaviour can signify, and do so on a large scale, but never autonomously; every semiological system has linguistic admixture. ...it appears increasingly more difficult to conceive a system of images and objects whose *signifieds* can exist independently of language: to perceive what a substance signifies is inevitably to fall on the individuation of a language. There is no meaning which is not designated, and the world of signifieds is none other than of language. (15)

Barthes suggests here what Bloch obviously senses: that without language (in the ordinary sense of the term), reality would have no meaning. Indeed, the governing principle of semiotics is that significance lies in neither the plane of content (the signified, the object) nor the plane of expression (the signifier, the word) but in the relation of the two planes. It is clear that this novel is the recording of one man’s attempt to undertake what Barthes designates as the future task of semiotics: “to rediscover the articulations which men impose on reality.” (16)

But Bloch’s awareness of the role language plays in creating reality is not equivalent to his coming to terms with this fact, and Bloch spends the days following his murder of Gerda T. thinking of nothing but the way in which language as part of a system of signification works. At one point he finds it impossible to visualize anything with his eyes closed and attempts to restore his sense of reality through first naming objects and then creating sentences about them. Failing, he opens his eyes and is immediately aware of the pressure of objects, which, though great, is not so intense for him as the pressure of words for those objects. In a general store he notices that the clerk seems uncomprehending when he speaks to her in sentences, but reacts immediately to the naming of items: a handkerchief, a tie, a wool sweater. When viewing a gatekeeper’s butterfly collection, he notices that the insects have deteriorated to the point of being indistinguishable as individual specimens, but that each is recognizable by the description attached to it. At times Bloch feels as though every word is a joke or requires an explanation, or that the names of
objects are call-letters for those objects, which are advertisements for themselves. Aware that it is only through language that he can order his world, Bloch seeks security in reconstructing events of the recent past through sentences and retracing how one sentence leads to the next. When successful, the sense of artificiality fades and all goes well for him, yet the process itself still strikes Bloch as artificial: “When he put on an act, one word still nicely yielded the next” (p. 82)

Bloch simply is incapable of sustaining participation in the systems of significance to which others respond without thought. When he is unable to comprehend why a policeman would tell him a story about a goat which soils the walls of the swimming pool area, he decides that the story did not say what he thought but was simply a series of mispronounced words. Dissatisfied with the way in which names designate people, he thinks of calling the waitress with the pierced ear “a hole through the ear lobe” and the woman with a purse, “You Purse.” Aware that the sign yielded by the relationship of the signified and the signifier itself becomes a signified through connotation, Bloch’s probing mind follows the complicated process of interpretation further, seeing a gatekeeper with a key as though he should be seeing him for something else. In other words, he is not concerned simply with the identification of the fish-shaped cookies but with their symbolic value as well, and much of Bloch’s experience of the world hinges on his awareness of this secondary order of significance. Overwhelmed by the feeling that everything is suggestive and insinuating, Bloch cannot maintain the pretense and instead falls prey to moments of intense irritation.

In fact, it may well be Bloch’s developing consciousness of the persistence of language which provokes his murder of Gerda T. in the first place, for while Handke offers nothing by way of explanation for Bloch’s motive, he vividly describes the scene preceding the murder, which consists simply of an ostensibly “normal” conversation. Bloch, however, only occasionally feels natural about talking; more often he notices the peculiarities of his conversation with Gerda T. He, for example, is unable to speak of her experiences or friends in familiar terms, always referring to them by quoting her or preceding new names with “this” or “that” in order to distance them. Yet she freely speaks of Bloch’s acquaintances as if she knew them personally. Gradually, Bloch finds himself unable to complete his sentences, feeling that the
woman already knows what he is going to say. Bloch is mystified by these phenomena, and the unexpected strangling seems clearly to be the necessary act of release for a feeling of intense irritation which finally overwhelms him.

Bloch responds in a similar fashion in another situation when his irritation reaches a level of intolerability, this time because a tavern patron cautions him against leaving a folded bill on the table in payment for drinks, for another might be tucked inside. "So what?" responds Bloch, and begins a punching session which he continues despite repeated defeats. Finally too weak even to lift a beer bottle, Bloch stops, and for several moments experiences a relationship with reality which makes it seem like "peacetime":

...he saw and heard everything with total immediacy, without first having to translate it into words, as before, or comprehending it only in terms of words or word games. He was in a state where everything seemed natural to him.(p. 111)

It is only when Bloch feels he has escaped the tyranny of words that he is comfortable with existence. Bloch is constantly struggling to achieve this state of feeling natural, for conscious as he is of the necessity of "languagizing" everything, Bloch is obsessed with the awareness and wants desperately to lose it. At one point he sits in his room naming objects; then, moments before he falls asleep, the words on the novel's printed page give way to outlines of the objects Bloch perceives, indicating that he has once again reached a state of "total immediacy." But both such experiences, and one or two others, take place when Bloch is in a state of physical and mental exhaustion, suggesting not the possibility of perception without language but simply that Bloch has lost consciousness of semiotic processes to the extent that he momentarily believes it is possible.

That Bloch is intensely aware of the way in which objects become language, and is simultaneously in need of escaping this awareness, is a paradox which can be explained not only in terms of the unsettling quality of such heightened perceptivity but in terms of the murder mystery as well. For Bloch is throughout the novel the object of a country-wide manhunt which will eventually culminate in his capture. Despite appearances to the contrary, he is responding to the chase in a very "normal" fa-
shion. Though psychology is never explicitly suggested in *Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfimer*, Bloch is constantly influenced by the mounting anxiety he experiences as the search for the murderer of Gerda T. intensifies. But it is an anxiety which rests not in the search per se but in Bloch’s knowledge that in order to avoid apprehension, he must, at least in some instances, deny the very semiotic processes which haunt him.

Two objects which figure prominently in the discovery of the identity of the murderer are coins and newspapers, objects which recurrently receive Bloch’s attention. But in their case, Bloch carefully avoids attaching to either its significance as a clue. Rather, he attempts to make of them ordinary objects, which have nothing to do with the way in which the Vienna police perceive them. As though trying to affirm the possibility that these objects may be construed simply as objects in their usual sense, Bloch tests alternative interpretations to the ordinary. Following the method of a tax official, he tries to see objects in terms of their financial worth but finds that when he asks how much a juke box costs, the proprietor thinks he wants to buy it and cannot understand Bloch’s insistence upon knowing the price when he has no interest in acquiring it. Rejecting the usual sequence of numbers, Bloch begins counting at two but discovers that under the new system he endangers his life each time he crosses the street without making allowances for the first car. Bloch appears to be pleased that neither of these approaches proves valid, and once, when he attempts to match the indications on a street map with the realities of the city, he is delighted to discover that in one instance they do not correspond. But Bloch is ultimately unable to deny that the police are decoding these same objects in a quest that will end in a front page headline containing the name of Josef Bloch.

The anxiety occasioned by anticipation, suggested by the novel’s title and reflected in Bloch’s behavior, is in fact a key concept at both the semiotic and narrative levels. By its very nature each system of signification—be it of images, gestures, objects, musical sounds, etc.—is anticipatory, depending on a common “language” to reveal meaning. It is the recognition of this fact which causes Bloch to stop in mid-sentence, convinced that the other person already knows what he is going to say, and to feel a sense of unnaturalness or pretense in the presence of language. Bloch even contends that he knows a moment beforehand that the phone is going to ring or that a customs guard is
about to knock on the guesthouse window. As Handke attempts both to dramatize and to upset conventional expectations, Bloch finds himself watching not the hawk circling the field, but the spot on the field toward which the hawk is presumably going to dive; not the drop running down the outside of his glass, but the spot on the coaster it will probably hit; not the dog running toward the man in a field, but the man; not the ants approaching a crumb of bread, but the fly perched atop the crumb.

It is in the closing pages of narrative that the novel’s searches terminate, not arbitrarily but as coincident with which are analogous to Bloch’s own climactic search for what might be called “semiotic sanity.” The dumb boy missing in the border town where Bloch is staying is discovered drowned, and after a meticulous piecing together of clues, the Vienna police have only to name the murderer of Gerda T. The images of closure suggested by the goalie’s cage and the closed border come together in the final scene to complement Bloch’s capture, but the image suggested by the dumb boy, now dead, and by Bloch’s own inarticulateness, seem to dissolve as Bloch’s anxiety finally finds verbal expression, which may, after all, have been his quest throughout.

Whether Bloch comes to any permanent reconciliation with language must be left an unanswered question, but the final pages of the novel may well suggest the emergence of a man who has assessed, rejected, reinvented, and finally affirmed the “normal” semiotic processes of life. For a man so hypersensitive to language, Bloch is curiously inarticulate throughout the novel. Although occasional mention is made of conversations in which Bloch takes part and a few references to lines of dialogue in those conversations appear, the only instance of an extended conversation in which Bloch participates and speaks directly comes in the novel’s final pages when, moments before the police search is complete, Bloch explains the psychology—or, rather, the semiotics—involved in a soccer goalie’s anxiety to a salesman watching the game. In this conversation, Bloch is more articulate than anywhere previously in the novel, volunteering comments on the soccer crowd’s behavior and the strategies of the game, and particularly of the goalie. And although he listens as acutely to his own sentences as he might to those of another speaker and feels as though the conversation is being had for the benefit of a third party, Bloch speaks with authority of the goalie’s anxiety, watching as the goalkeeper stands perfectly still and receives the penalty
kick directly in his arms. Placing the responsibility of interpretation upon the reader, Handke leaves us uncertain as to whether Bloch will be apprehended or not, but sensing that Bloch now finds solace rather than irritation in his sudden flow of words.

That the reader is finally left with the task of interpretation is, of course, a perfectly appropriate conclusion to a novel which has been analyzing the process of interpretation throughout and gradually transferring the responsibility to the reader, who for Handke has always been as much a creator of a novel as the author himself. In fact, if any anxiety remains at the end of the novel, it is on the part of the reader, who, if brought successfully to the level of consciousness toward which Handke has been manipulating him, is now as sensitized as Bloch to the fragile nature of his relationship to the world and to the semiotic processes which inform his every response. The reader has shared with Bloch the misunderstandings, incomprehensions, frustrations, and irritations of failed communication. He has witnessed the continuing transformation of ordinary objects into signs. And in the particularly significant moment during which Bloch sits in his room observing objects, and the words on the printed page of the novel change to images of those objects, the reader has found that regardless of whether Bloch thinks his reception of those objects is immediate, he himself (i.e., the reader) is unconsciously naming each outline. It may well be that the “normal hero” of Handke’s novel is not Bloch after all, but the reader.

_Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter_, then, may indeed leave the reader with the same uncomfortable feeling he has after reading Kafka, who, of course, was a major influence in Handke’s writing and life. In an early essay, “Ich bin ein Bewohner des Elfenbeinturms,” Handke lists Kafka as one of the authors who has changed his consciousness of the world; (17) one of Handke’s short stories, “‘Der Prozess (für Franz K.).’” (18) is an abbreviated version of Kafka’s novel; and in _Das Gewicht der Welt_, Handke speaks of reading (undoubtedly re-reading) Kafka’s diaries while confined to a hospital bed. (19) But if Handke’s novel has points of contact with Kafka, they would seem to rest not in the metaphysics which have come to surround Kafka’s work but, rather, in the direct experience of the text which both writers achieve. When Handke’s novel is viewed as an inquiry into the normal semiotic processes of experience, it becomes clear that the haunting quality of _Die Angst des Tormanns beim Elfmeter_, the illusive
behavior of its protagonist, and the sustained perplexity of its reception are "Kafkaesque" only to the extent that Handke, like Kafka, is seeking the significance of meaning itself in the mysterious world of language.
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