



Theology and Literature (1) – Franz Kafka

| Wardlaw, Henry R.

Rev. Henry R. Wardlaw, Emeritus Professor at the Uniting Church Theological Hall, Melbourne, Australia, discusses the relation of Franz Kafka and his writings to the Jewish tradition of faith.

Symposium: THEOLOGY AND LITERATURE (1)

Franz Kafka

Henry R. Wardlaw

To write a piece about Franz Kafka for a journal which is concerned with establishing a bridge between Christians and Jews immediately invites questions about Kafka's relation to these two traditions of faith. It is clear that Kafka was not a Christian. His relation to the Jewish tradition of faith is rather more complicated. His childhood and adolescence were overshadowed by an over-bearing father and his relationship to his father remained an unresolved tension through most of his

short life. As a mature man in his mid-thirties he wrote a letter to his father in which he gives a quite detailed account of this struggle. The letter was never sent to the father, but it does attempt an analysis of the lack of understanding between them.

In his essay on *Moses and Monotheism* Sigmund Freud speaks of Judaism as a religion of the father. Of Christianity he says that having begun as a religion of the Father it finally becomes a religion of the Son. In all of this Freud sees the father-son relationship as somehow standing behind these two religious traditions and Franz Kafka's writing could be taken as a demonstration of this movement from the problem of patriarchal authority to problems of moral and religious authority. We might observe in passing here that the issues that have become central in more recent theological discussions of the limiting and distorting nature of this exclusively male perspective

are never raised by
Kafka, perhaps
because his own
personal experience
provides the
dynamic of so much
that he writes.

In many ways I think
we might say that
the tension which
obviously existed
between him and
his father was a
very powerful
formative influence
lying behind his
most powerful
writing. This might
seem to suggest
that his writing
arose out of some
kind of desire to
justify himself in the
eyes of his father or
even in the eyes of
his readers. but that
would be to
misrepresent the
situation.

Kafka was not
primarily concerned
either with justifying
himself or with
condemning his
father, he is simply
attempting to set out
his own
understanding of
the relationship and
to indicate some of
the effects that his
father"s behaviour
may have had upon
him.

He was certainly not
seeking to make
any final judgement
about who was to
blame for the
tension between
them. He was

simply trying to understand it. In fact Kafka was very hesitant to make judgements or to apportion blame in any human relationship. He once

remarked that human beings can not really make judgements about human affairs. To be in a position to judge one would have to be standing outside the situation, yet being outside the situation means one is in no position to make a judgement. In this I think he is very much at one with certain Jewish thinkers, among them Jesus of Nazareth, though, sadly, it is something that Christians and perhaps Jews too, have been unready to recognize.

Yet Judgement remains a pervasive theme through all that Kafka writes. In 1912 he wrote a story which he actually entitled *Das Urteil* (The Judgement). It was one of the few things he wrote with which he seemed really satisfied and he had no hesitation in having it published.

It is a strange story which centres on a quarrel between a young businessman, Georg Bendemann, and his father. The story begins with the younger Bendemann having just completed a letter to a friend from his past who has moved away and lives now in Russia. The friend has been quite unsuccessful in business affairs; nor has he found a partner in marriage. The friendship between the two has been close, yet in his letters Bendemann has never told the friend about the fact that he has become engaged to a girl of good family, whom he is soon expected to marry. This failure to tell such a seemingly close friend something that is obviously of great importance in his life seems strange to his fiancée and his father regards it as simply wrong-headed. Now, at last, he has written a letter in which the news is broken and he goes off to tell his father of the letter that has been written.

The encounter
between father and

son then develops into an increasingly intense argument, in the course of which the father undergoes a change from being an impotent old man who submits to being tucked up in bed by his son into a gigantic figure, who finally rises up in his bed and pronounces judgement on his son, whom he condemns to death by drowning.

Hearing this sentence of death pronounced, the son hurries out of the house, through the crowded streets to a bridge over the river and jumps from the bridge, murmuring "Dear parents, I did always love you" as he falls to his death.

It is clear that the story is some kind of parable (Kafka himself once described it as "more of a poem than a story"), but how the parable or poem should be interpreted is far from clear. Kafka made several attempts to interpret it but he recognized that his comments by no means exhausted the implications of what he had written.

There were of course autobiographical links. He did live in tension with his father and it is likely that there was some sense of judgement involved in that relationship. Furthermore at the time of writing the story he had himself entered into a relationship that led on to his becoming engaged. Yet the story was not just a dramatic representation of his own situation. To say that it was would be to treat it as a piece of realist story-telling which it certainly is not. It begins like a straight-forward narrative but later on it takes what might be called a surrealist turn beyond the sphere of realism altogether. In fact it takes on something of the quality of a myth, which is communicating something of Kafka's fundamental understanding of human existence and the central place that being brought to judgement occupies in our lives.

It is interesting to put Kafka's story alongside more directly

autobiographical
reflection of the
Scottish theologian
John Baillie who
was a contemporary
of Kafka. Baillie tells
us that he could not
remember a time
when his life
seemed to be his
own to do with as
he pleased. "I was
under orders and it
was from my father
or my mother or my
nurse that the
orders came." But
Baillie never
questioned the
authority of those
who gave the
orders. "For I never
supposed that it
was merely a case
of my father's will or
my mother's will
pitted against my
will; still less their
power pitted against
my weakness."

For Baillie parental
authority is
perceived as
belonging within an
arena of moral
constraint which
gave order to life by
prescribing
appropriate
structures of
responsibility and
lines of conformity
which were
themselves to be
justified in terms of
wider perceptions of
justice. For its
completion this
moral order required
the recognition of a
divine sovereignty
which vindicated the
whole structure.

Kafka's perception of the human scene has a different character. Like Baillie he had grown up with a sense of constraint imposed upon him by his parents, which in his case really meant by his overbearing father. Unlike Baillie, he did not accept this as providing him with a moral arena in which he could live and move and have his being.

Why did these perceptions develop so differently? One obvious way of answering this question is to contrast the overbearing tyrannical character of Kafka's father with Baillie's childhood memories of a father who may have been a bit "straight-laced", but was at the same time gentle and loving. The fact that Baillie's father died while he was still a child may increase the force of this contrast.

This is not to say that the growth of these two different understandings of human life are shaped solely by the different experiences of parental authority. There is also the

difference of social setting, on the one hand Scottish Presbyterianism, on the other central European Judaism.

To call Kafka's perception "Jewish" or "central European" would be too simple however. One could certainly not say that Kafka believed in God in Christian terms nor even in the Mosaic terms of his own Jewish tradition. Whether I thought Kafka believed in God at all is a difficult question to answer.

But when it comes to the divine justice, the divine righteousness, which the religious believer sees as the ultimate measure by which all human lives are to be judged, this does have some place in Kafka's thinking or, perhaps I should say, in Kafka's imagination. The awful significance of that final judgement and the awful sense of responsibility that it creates is even present in the ending of Kafka's extraordinary story of Georg Bendemann.

What are we to make of that ending? It is hard to

find any unequivocal answer. Is it pointing to some kind of necessity - perhaps a moral necessity - laid upon the son to accept the father's judgement? Is it just demonstrating the power of the strong-willed in an essentially lawless world? Neither of these seem to be a satisfactory explanation. If Georg Bendemann is really guilty of something, what is it he is guilty of? To answer that we must consider the important, though absent, figure of the friend in Russia; Russia perhaps representing a wilder world outside the civilizing structures of Western Europe. What is the significance of this figure who stands at the centre of the argument between father and son?

We could read the story as suggesting that the movement into a "Russian exile" was the way which might lead to life, while remaining at home could lead only to death. And it is the futile posturing of the one who lacks the real enterprise of the exiled friend that

finally stands
condemned.

There remains a
question about the
condemnation itself;
whether the
judgement leaves
room for any kind of
salvation or
redemption.
Perhaps the only
hint of this is hidden
within the final
affirmation of filial
love as Bendemann
falls to his death.
There have been
those who can see
in this some hint of
redemption, even
perhaps of
resurrection, in the
acceptance of the
father's verdict.

Of course this is not
to say that Kafka
embraced any kind
of doctrine of
resurrection. Kafka
did not deal in
doctrines. Like the
great Jewish
Rabbis, including
Jesus, whom
Christians name as
the Christ, he told
stories: parables
which quicken the
imagination and
open possibilities
and visions, and
provide intimations
of realities beyond
all doctrinal
formulation. When
all the interpretive
suggestions have
been made and
explored by critics
reviewing this story I
suspect Kafka
would have said

that no one of them
is finally right
though no one of
them is finally wrong
either. All these
things are present in
the story, which is
what makes the
story so rich and so
endlessly
suggestive.

There are those
who see Kafka as a
nihilist who believed
that none of our
value judgements
are more than
perspectival
impositions on
reality. No one of
them absolute,
which might be
taken to imply that
in the end none is
really to be taken
seriously. But this
does not do justice
to the intense moral
seriousness with
which Kafka writes.
Certainly the
situations he
creates are often
laughable. The very
idea of a man
waking up to find
that he has turned
into a cockroach is
surely laughable.
But it may also be
terrifying. It all
depends how the
story is told.

When we turn to
Kafka's larger
unfinished stories,
The Trial and *The
Castle*, we find the
issues of judgement
presented on a
much wider canvas.
The narrative

completeness of the shorter story (or "poem") is replaced by narratives which are not only unfinished but which are perhaps in the nature of the case unfinishable. The concrete figure of Georg Bendemann standing under judgement before his father is replaced by the half-anonymous Joseph K summoned to appear before a tribunal he cannot even find or, in *The Castle*, the even more anonymous K who is searching for the authority that has summoned him to carry out some surveying work. The motifs of authority and of judgement are clearly central in these two stories but where the authority is to be found and when the trial and judgement are to take place seem to be lost.

"Religions get lost as people do". This is a detached remark in one of Kafka's notebooks. He has a story of a count who was due to be holding court. When a group of petitioners come in to present their petition they find not the count but a little schoolboy. The old count is dead and the young one who

ought to be ruling is
at his lessons and
the petitioners
wander off into the
void, not knowing
where to go.

There is a hint in
this story that the
sheer lostness of
humanity may not
be a permanent
state but may in fact
be a moment in
human history:
religions get lost,
but perhaps they
are not always lost.
This might seem to
give some ground
for a more positive
reading of Kafka.
Yet here I hesitate.
This is doubtless a
moment in Kafka's
thought but it cannot
be taken as the only
moment.

Kafka said of
himself that he
vigorously absorbed
the negative
elements of the age
in which he lived.
He had no
hereditary share in
the slight amount of
the positive or of
that extreme
negative which
capsizes into the
positive. "I have not
been guided into life
by the hand of
Christianity –
admittedly now
slack and failing –
as Kierkegaard
was," he writes,
"and have not
caught the hem of
the Jewish prayer
shawl – now flying

away from us – as
the Zionists have. I
am an end or a
beginning."

Kafka did not resign
himself to the idea
that all human life is
absurd, good and
evil being no more
than human
conventions. For
him the issues of
good and evil were
real issues, though
this did not
necessarily mean
that he saw them as
representing the last
word on human
existence. In his
notebooks we find
repeated reflections
on the story of Eve
and Adam in the
primal garden of
Eden. In the course
of these reflections
Kafka says "we are
sinful not only
because we have
eaten of the Tree of
Knowledge, but also
because we have
not eaten of the
Tree of Life. The
state in which we
are is sinful
irrespective of guilt."
Consequently "we
are separated from
God on two sides:
the fall separates us
from God and the
Tree of Life
separates God from
us."

These reflections
lead Kafka on to
distinguish between
two kinds of truth,
represented by the
Tree of Knowledge

and the Tree of Life.
These he calls "the
truth of the active
principle and the
truth of the static
principle." In the
first, Good
separates itself off
from Evil; the
second is nothing
but Good itself,
knowing neither
Good nor Evil. The
first truth is given to
us really, the
second only
intuitively. That is
what is so sad to
see. The cheerful
thing is that the first
truth pertains only to
the fleeting moment,
the second to
eternity."

This takes us
beyond the sphere
of judgement,
beyond that
"endless cycle of
idea and action,"
which T.S. Eliot
says

*gives knowledge of
motion, but not of
stillness;
knowledge of
speech, but not of
silence;
knowledge of words
and ignorance of
the Word.*

Perhaps it is in this
the stillness, the
silence, the Word
that the "cheerful
thing" resides which
he suggests lies
beyond the terrible
uneasiness and the
fear of judgement
which seems to

pervade so much of
his writing.

Note:

All the direct
quotations are from
Kafka's *Blue
Octavo Notebooks*,
edited by Max Brod
and translated by
Ernst Kaiser and
Eithne Wilkins.
Originally published
in *Dearest Father:
Stories and Other
Writings*, Schocken
Books, 1954.
Quoted here from
*The Blue Octavo
Notebooks*, Exact
Books, 1991 (see
pp.37-59). The
quotation from T.S.
Eliot is from
*Choruses from "The
Rock"*.

Rev. Prof. Henry R.
Wardlaw. Born
February 1929.
1948-1955 Studied
at Melbourne
University, [BA
(Hons)] and
Presbyterian
Theological Hall,
Ormond College
1956-1958 Field
Secretary,
Australian Student
Christian Movement
1959-1961
Research Student
Glasgow University,
[PhD 1962]
1962-1963 Minister,
College Church,
Parkville 1964-1976
Professor of
Systematic

Theology,
Theological Hall,
Ormond College
1977-1992
Professor of
Philosophical
Theology Uniting
Church Theological
Hall 1993- Emeritus
Professor. Fellow of
Melbourne College
of Divinity.

Other contributions
to *Theology and
Literature* include:
[Serge Liberman,](#)
[Voices from the](#)
[Corner: A Response](#)
by Veronica Brady
[Antisemitism in](#)
[English Literature](#)
[The Shakespeare](#)
[Case](#) by Jack Opie
[An Alien on](#)
[Wallstreet](#) by
Richard Freadman

Source: [Gesher](#)