

Francesco Albe

**“Wir sind die Vergessenen, uns kennt man schon nicht mehr”.<sup>1</sup> Forgetting  
‘Otherness’ and Disturbing ‘Sameness’ in Elfriede Jelinek’s *Die  
Schutzbefohlenen/Charges (The Supplicants)***



The text of Article 30 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (“All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood”) on the provisional Austrian Parliament building by the Hofburg/Burggarten, Vienna. Photo: Francesco Albe, 2018  
[https://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR\\_Translations/eng.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf) (13.09.2018)

Sie sind vergessen und trotzdem kommen sie da einfach mit daher, obwohl wir sie gar nicht eingeladen haben. Wir brauchen unsre Betten für andre Fremden! Nein, das sind nicht die richtigen Fremden, wieso kommen denn nicht endlich die Richtigen? Die sind uns nicht fremd genug. Wir wollen Fremdere als die! Wir haben ja gar nicht genügend Tassen und Bestecke für die im Schrank!

Jelinek, Elfriede: *Stecken, Stab und Stangl. Eine Handarbeit*. Hamburg: Rowohlt 1997, S. 46.

**Abstract:**

This paper explores the mechanisms of construction of ‘otherness’ at both the levels of language and content in Elfriede Jelinek’s text *Die Schutzbefohlenen* and in its English translation.

Firstly, Jean-François Lyotard’s critique of Hegel and conception of a politics of forgetting will be applied to the text as a productive tool to enrich a post-modern reading. In *Heidegger and the “jews”*, Lyotard introduces the “jews” as the unrepresentable excess of our identity, that unconceivable element which needs to be removed, exterminated, *forgotten* for a sense of unified, pure identity to be secured. Jelinek’s “wir”/“we” in *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, hovering between being and non-being, untimely beyond time and space, dissolving in water into

nothingness, indeed embody the Lyotardian ‘forgotten’ that the West drowns in a desperate attempt to prevent this threat from coming to the surface to be seen, heard and *disturb* the illusion of an identity.

Secondly, the analysis will incorporate a queer perspective by applying Sara Ahmed’s concept of ‘spatial orientation’ and ‘normalisation of directions’ to highlight the way in which the textual references to movements reveal and challenge totalizing ideals of “sameness” and spatial identity (nationalism).

In this respect, the paper pays close attention to linguistic mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion and to the tension/interplay between patterns of unification and fragmentation. These include: alternations of the particles “ein-“ and “aus-” and the personal pronouns “wir”, “Sie”, “du”, “ihr”; the conflation between an all-encompassing divine and bureaucratic authority; play on words in revealing the hypocrisy of democratic ideals.

These aspects are analysed by comparing the text with the English translation (*Charges (The Supplicants)*), highlighting potential translation challenges, gains, losses and the way the two languages use their linguistic and cultural specificities in ‘othering’ and ‘queering’.

Lyotard’s forgotten “jews” and Ahmed’s displaced others emerge as productive elements which, applied to the German and English texts, enhance Jelinek’s disruption of any comforting, unifying pattern of identity and of those grand narratives of freedom and humanity that Europe holds dear, exposing their hidden yet dangerous mechanisms of selective inclusion and oppressive exclusion.

## **Introduction**

Elfriede Jelinek’s text *Die Schutzbefohlenen* was conceived as a reaction to the political turmoil involving refugees which happened in Vienna in 2012-2013.<sup>2</sup> The main event triggering Jelinek’s literary reflection was the ‘Refugee Protest Camp Vienna’ organised by asylum seekers frustrated about their miserable living conditions and the bureaucratically burdensome Austrian and European asylum procedures: in November 2012, a group of them occupied the Sigmund-Freud-Park and Votivkirche in central Vienna, succeeding in bringing their concerns to public attention and polarising Austrian public opinion.<sup>3</sup> In the play, the occurrences in Vienna serve as a springboard to analyse the condition of the foreigner within a host society and to reveal the brutal power dynamics at the basis of Western conceptions of togetherness. The text, while remaining anchored in historical fact, transcends particular events and points to the untimely character of the encounter with ‘foreignness’. In this respect, *Die*

*Schutzbefohlenen* still proves extremely relevant today, at a time when populism is experiencing a surge in Europe and the new Austrian government is again tightening the country's asylum regulations in an attempt to curb immigration.<sup>4</sup> This interplay between universality and particularity is reflected in the subsequent modifications and additions to the original text, which Jelinek amended on her homepage in 2013, 2014 and 2015 in light of the tragedy of Lampedusa and the refugee crisis.<sup>5</sup> The universal relevance of Jelinek's text is also attested by its translation into several languages. In particular, Gitta Honegger's translation *Charges (The Supplicants)*, published in 2016, made Jelinek's work accessible to English-speaking audiences and adapted it to an English-speaking context.

In its conflation of political reality and universal relevance, *Die Schutzbefohlenen* revolves around the 'Other' and is insistently preoccupied with questions of forgetfulness and disturbance, lending itself to both a philosophical, post-modern and queer reading. The following paper will explore the construction of 'otherness' by investigating mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion and the friction between patterns of synthesis and disjunction. To do so, it will firstly apply Jean-François Lyotard's understanding of the forgotten, unrepresentable and unconceivable excess of any conceptions of pure identity ("the jews") to the choral 'wir/we' of the text. In turn, this will highlight the way the voices condemn the 'forgetting of otherness' in the obsession for assimilation in Hegel's and Heidegger's thought. Secondly, Sara Ahmed's conception of orientation will be mobilised in order to analyse how Jelinek's 'wir/we' can also be read as queer disturbances threatening to shatter the illusory harmony of 'sameness'. Thirdly, the clash between 'otherness' and 'sameness' will be analysed in Gitta Honegger's translation, paying close attention to the strategies adopted by the translator to overcome linguistic challenges whilst preserving, intensifying or decreasing the critical and queer(ing) potential of the German text. The integration of Lyotard's 'politics of forgetting' as philosophical critique of Hegel and Heidegger with queer theory proves to be productive in unleashing Jelinek's critique of the underlying hypocrisy of our egalitarian societies, where power interests hide behind the protective shield of a selective equality in which many 'other' voices are silenced.

### **Forgetting 'Otherness': Jean-François Lyotard's "jews"**

'Wir leben. Wir leben'.<sup>6</sup> In *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, a choral 'wir/we' seems to represent the voices of the asylum seekers, the foreigners and the 'others' who are confronted with a silent, unresponsive interlocutor. The addressee(s) seem(s) to embody at times the members of the local (European) host society, at times bureaucrats, businessmen, divine authorities, God.

However, this specific answer to the question of the identification of the stream of voices fails to grasp the complexity of what appears to be rather a polyphonic flow of speech in which no unified individual or collective narrator emerges.<sup>7</sup> The collective ‘we’ (‘wir’) as opposed to an external ‘you’ (‘du/Sie/ihr’) proves unstable and frequently collapses into an ‘I’ (‘ich’) which in turn oscillates between the ‘I’ of the ‘Other’ and that of the interlocutor. The conflation of multiple speech layers combined with the absence of stage directions and of characters in the traditional sense also raises the question of the localisation of the hypothetical speakers.<sup>8</sup> However, all these questions are destined to remain unanswered. As Elfriede Jelinek in an interview with Gitta Honegger has claimed:

It has to be discovered who the speakers are at any given moment. [...] Sometimes it is I who speaks in the *pluralis majestatis*, sometimes it’s an ironical “we”, it’s something the masses appropriate, when everyone actually says “I”, sometimes it is an abstract “I”, so there are many “we’s.”<sup>9</sup>

The result is a dynamic construction of ‘otherness’ through language far from straight-forward and which challenges traditional binary oppositions based on the model ‘I vs you’ and ‘we vs them’. How are then these many “we’s” constructed?

Jean-François Lyotard’s philosophy sheds an interesting light on these processes and on the ambiguity of the ‘we/I’ constructions alternating throughout the text. Indeed, the French philosopher’s work is concerned with the role played by the ‘Other’ in the construction of identity in Western thought. In his essay *Heidegger and “the jews”*, he articulates his position within the philosophical debate on the assessment of Heidegger’s thought in the light of the latter’s active role during the Nazi regime.<sup>10</sup> What emerges is that Heidegger’s philosophy of ‘being’ forgets something: the threat to unitary identity posed by what Lyotard calls “the jews”. “The jews” are different from the Jews. The former refers to a notion disrupting every conception of truth that the West has developed and holds dear, whereas the latter points to the common scapegoat that has become the target for the way the West has been dealing with “the jews”. Thus, “the jews” embody ‘otherness’ as *excess* and impurity of our identity projected onto others, as that incompatible part of our identity that escapes it, threatens it from all directions and with which Western thought is obsessed. The features of Lyotard’s ‘jews’ closely resemble the characteristics of the ‘wir/we’ in *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, encouraging the creation of a parallel between these two entities.

In the words of David Carroll, “the “jews” are situated in the (*non*)*place of an Otherness* that thought cannot think but cannot not think either” (my italics).<sup>11</sup> This non-place mirrors the impossibility of locating Jelinek’s choral ‘wir/we’ in a spatiotemporal continuum. The ‘Others’ are not bound to an identifiable location and inhabit the outside margins (‘welches Land können

wir betreten? *Keins*. Betreten stehen wir *herum*' (my italics),<sup>12</sup> flow into nothingness ('wir aber, ein sprechender Zug *ins Nichts*' (my italics)),<sup>13</sup> are neither here, nor there ('wir sind da, aber wieder nicht da'),<sup>14</sup> paradoxically absent and present at the same time ('wir sind gar nicht da. Wir sind gekommen, *doch* sind wir gar nicht da' (my italics)).<sup>15</sup> This ambiguity also points to the untimely nature of "the jews", "always present, but never here-now"<sup>16</sup>, which echoes the text's ability to transcend the specificity of the Viennese and European historical events, whilst still drawing on them.

As the 'Others' threatening identity, "the jews" necessarily need to be forgotten and dismissed, if the purity and security of a unified sense of self is to be established. In this sense, "the jews" entail a politics of forgetting, in which the forgotten is constantly remembered as that which never ceases to be forgotten through the establishment of a memorial. The memorial, the collective historical narrative of the community, is in direct contrast with the immemorial "jews":

This memorial is [indispensable] to the constitution and the perpetuation of a community governed by this entirely new and unprecedented law of political equality. (...) But as far as forgetting is concerned, this memory of the memorial is intensely *selective*; it requires the forgetting of that which may question the community and its legitimacy (my italics).<sup>17</sup>

"Sehen Sie uns denn nicht?",<sup>18</sup> the imploring chorus asks to an unresponsive audience only to deduce the answer: "[man schaut] nicht wohlwollend, man schaut gar nicht, *man will uns nicht sehen*".<sup>19</sup> The refugees are indeed object of a dismissal. They *cannot* be seen because acknowledging them will mean compromising the uniformity of the community. Hence, they are suppressed, forgotten and, in psychoanalytical terms, relegated to the realm of primary repression. Defence mechanisms are then activated in order to protect consciousness from the destabilising threats of repressed material.<sup>20</sup> These mechanisms find expression in the need to get rid of identity threats by subduing and expelling what has been forgotten, i.e. everything that threatens the community. "Die Vergessenen"<sup>21</sup> appear to be aware of the fact that they will need to be sacrificed for the sake of the security of the self. They will need to be chased and sent *away, out, off* for the safety of the community. 'Otherness' is that which must be *removed*. The insistent repetition of the German particles indicating a movement towards an outside testifies to this destructive, driving force:

Wenn Sie uns sehen, fassen Sie uns! Ergreifen, fassen Sie uns und gewähren Sie *Sicherheit*, eine kleine *Sicherheit* Ihrem Staat, Ihren Mitbürgern, Ihren Nachbarn und schmeißen Sie uns *hinaus*. *Entfernen* Sie uns wie einen Fettfleck. *Entfernen* Sie uns, machen Sie uns *weg*! Retten Sie sich *vor uns*! (...) Wir sind (...) keine Gesellschaft, und nur so können Sie aus sich eine *sichere Gesellschaft* machen, indem Sie uns *entfernen*. *Raus* mit uns! (...) [S]orgen Sie für die Sicherheit und bringen Sie uns *fort*. (...) [J]agen Sie uns *fort*! Schaffen Sie uns *weg*! (my italics)<sup>22</sup>

The forgetting of “the jews” is necessary in order for the world to be thought of in terms of an opposition between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’, where this distinction usually paves the way to xenophobia.<sup>23</sup> The repression of our ‘broken’ identity, of which “the jews” constantly remind us, turns trauma into narrative and uses the apparatus of Western culture to produce as much representation of ‘Otherness’ as possible. In this way, “the jews” are forced into a representational dimension that does violence to their very nature. Representation is inextricably linked with forgetting: the crime against ‘Otherness’ “cannot be represented without being missed, being forgotten anew, since it defies images and words”.<sup>24</sup> With this regard, Lyotard claims that all representations of the Holocaust miss a point in trying to represent the unrepresentable: “[f]or it is not as men, women and children that they [the Jews] are exterminated but as the name of what is evil – “jews” – that the Occident has given to unconscious anxiety”.<sup>25</sup> Thus, every representation will inevitably fall short of grasping the incommensurability of “the jews”, which remain unconceivable. This unquantifiability mirrors the absence of stage directions and references to a unified scheme of representation of the refugees’ voices in the text. It also emerges in the impossibility of understanding and *knowing* the pleading ‘wir/we’: “bitte bemühen Sie sich ein wenig, zu erfahren, *was Sie niemals wissen können*” (my italics),<sup>26</sup> “[d]as *verstehen* Sie nicht. Ich *verstehe* es auch nicht” (my italics),<sup>27</sup> “*verstehen* werden Sie nicht” (my italics),<sup>28</sup> “[n]iemals könnten Sie (...) unsere Gefährdung *verstehen*“ (my italics).<sup>29</sup>

### **From Forgetting to Disturbing: Lyotard’s “jews” and Jelinek’s ‘wir/we’ unsettling**

#### **Hegel and Heidegger.**

The impossibility of a comprehensive assimilation of the ‘Other’ heralds the crisis of Hegelian dialectic. The antagonism towards an alien could be solved through Hegel’s dialectic of relational identity, by which the identity of X is also constituted by what X is not (-X): identity as identity of identity and opposition. Throughout the dialectical movement, what is posited as other (-X, *antithesis*) is recognised as being part of the self (X, *thesis*) by virtue of a constitutive, negative relation and hence subsumed under a unifying entity (*synthesis, identity of X and -X*), in which thesis and antithesis conflate.<sup>30</sup> According to Lyotard, “the jews” point to the inadequacy of the Hegelian system in dealing with ‘Otherness’, since this philosophy needs to forget “the jews” *a priori* for being able to posit a thesis and an antithesis, an ‘inside’ and an ‘outside’. In actual fact, the ‘Other’ cannot be reduced to a sublated antithesis as “it has no identity, no *auto*-that can “formulate” itself into a thesis”.<sup>31</sup> It is exactly this failure of phenomena of homogenisation and integration in appropriating the ‘Other’ which unfolds

throughout *Die Schutzbefohlenen*. God as embodiment of an all-encompassing synthesis (*Aufhebung*) has disappeared (“Es gibt keinen Allaufnehmenden. (...) [N]ichts und niemand nimmt uns *auf*” (my italics)).<sup>32</sup> Patterns of integration are exposed as dangerous mechanisms that elide particularity and destroy diversity. The allegedly harmonious Hegelian synthesis, capable of resolving the antagonism, results in a parodic ‘Menschenkuchen, ein grober Menschenklotz’:<sup>33</sup>

[K]eine einzelnen mehr, ein Menschenkuchen. (...) Von jedem Ding, das man sich vorstellen kann, gibts verschiedene Wesen, wir aber sind grundverschiedene Wesen, die ein einziges Ding wurden, das auf nichts mehr beharrt, das hier verharren muß, denn auseinander reißt uns nichts mehr, voneinander reißt uns nichts mehr fort. (...) Einzelne sind wir aber nicht mehr zu haben, nie mehr wieder, auch wenn man uns einzeln hinaufbringt.<sup>34</sup>

The last sentence in particular seems to suggest the counterproductive implications of the Hegelian synthesis: the singularities of thesis and antithesis (“einzeln”) irrevocably disappear in the plurality of the *Aufhebung* (“wenn man uns einzeln hinaufbringt”). In fact, Lyotard’s and Jelinek’s ‘Others’ cannot be reconciled with the whole and get nullified by it (a “Gruppe, zusammengewürfelt aus Niemanden und Nichtsen”).<sup>35</sup> The only admissible dialectic is one that does not ‘domesticate’ this negation through an affirmative synthesis, as defined by Adorno.<sup>36</sup>

This movement [negative dialectics] affects what cannot be interiorized, represented and memorized [“the jews”]. It affects an affection that is not affected by it, that remains immutable in this movement and repeats itself even in what pretends to surmount, suppress, sublimate that affection [Hegel’s synthesis/*Aufhebung*]. It has no above because it is not under, being nowhere. It is this the way I understand Adorno’s “negative dialectics”<sup>37</sup>

The potential for exclusion embedded in inclusive mechanisms is also reflected in Jelinek’s language. It is often the case that the prefix ‘ein-’, usually indicating a movement of inclusion into a whole and having a positive connotation, is revealed as concealing oppressive constraints: for instance, a speaker’s lapsus compares the process of naturalisation as inclusion into the community of citizens with confinement (“Der Konzernherr hat seine Rolle im *Einbunkern*, ich meine im *Einbürgern*” (my italics));<sup>38</sup> the refugees are not taken *in*, but taken *in custody* for fear they might take *over* (“[Sie glauben], wir wollen Sie *vereinnahmen*, und deswegen *einvernehmen* Sie uns, deswegen werden wir zur *Einvernahme* geführt” (my italics));<sup>39</sup> the inclusive ‘ein-’ becomes the drive of restraint and constriction (“*eingezäumt*, (...) *einzudämmern*, *einzusperren* und (...) *einzuschließen*” (my italics)),<sup>40</sup> unveiling how inclusion is in fact mere *domestication* of exclusion (“*eingezäumt*, *Entschuldigung*, *gezähmt* gehören wir Wilden” (my italics)).<sup>41</sup>

Heidegger’s essentialism also fails to capture the untimely reality of “the jews” by positing the future “as temporality of the possible, thus as ek-stasis and freedom”.<sup>42</sup> However, the resulting

synthesis of temporal modes does not turn out to be universally valid and does not apply to all individuals. *Die Schutzbefohlenen*'s 'wir/we' are excluded from such process and the inaccessibility of Heidegger's thought ('der Denker') is ridiculed:

[W]enn aber die Zeit das dreifacheinige Ganze von Gegenwart, Gewesenheit und Zukunft ist, der Denker, ich kenne ihn nicht, doch er denkt, der Denker, aber den beiden jetzt als zeitbildend nachgewiesenen Modi der Synthese einen dritten Modus anfügt, welchen, welchen? Daß wir bleiben und damit außerhalb der Zeit sind, daß wir aus dieser Zeit wieder herauskommen können?, welchen? (...) [W]enn dieses Denken, Ihr Denken, also der Zeit unterworfen sein soll, dann muß dieser dritte Modus der Synthese die Zukunft ausbilden, machen, bilden, keine Zukunft für Ungebildete, aber für Gebildete auch nichts, nichts für niemand, die Zeit muß die Zukunft also herstellen wie ein Kleid. Und? Und, was jetzt?<sup>43</sup>

In particular, Heidegger's existential possibilities of coexistence are de(con)structed and rather reveal the refugees' impossibilities of 'being' and the failure of creating a way of being together. In the absence of (political) representation of an existence ('*Vertretung* eines Daseins'), that same existence is crushed ('*getreten*'):

Sie verstehen es nicht, aber das wäre die Voraussetzung, eine Seinsmöglichkeit des Miteinander mit uns herzustellen, und das bedeutet, daß ein Dasein das andere *vertreten* können müßte, so. Es ist *nicht vertretbar*, daß wir dauernd *getreten* werden. (...) Wir haben *keine Vertretung*, wir werden *getreten* (my italics)<sup>44</sup>

The impracticability of Heidegger's 'possibilities of being' comes to the surface later on, too.

It is something the voices incessantly repeat:

Zu den Seinsmöglichkeiten des Miteinanderseins, wir sagten es schon, wir wiederholen es jetzt, falls Sie es nicht mitgekriegt haben, gehört unstreitig die Vertretbarkeit des einen Daseins durch ein anderes. Sie wollen sich von uns aber natürlich nicht vertreten lassen, das verstehen wir.<sup>45</sup>

Thus, the refugees are caught between these (im)possibilities of 'being', between 'being' and 'not-being', recalling the ambiguous, escapable nature of "the jews": "fremd, bedürftig (...), so jemand darf hier *nicht sein*" (my italics),<sup>46</sup> "während wir *nicht* mal ein einziges Mal *existieren* dürfen" (my italics),<sup>47</sup> "wir werden *weniger sein*, (...) wir werden *nichts sein*".<sup>48</sup>

Drifting between the margins of 'being', the repressed forgotten disrupts the all-encompassing unity of Western thought. In other words, the irreconcilable 'Other' triggers the incredulity towards metanarratives typical of post-modernism.<sup>49</sup> Metanarratives, as grand frameworks organising knowledge and theorising wholeness and opposition, are indeed incompatible with "the jews", since the latter are unable to fit into a narrative. The discourses on progress and humanity upon which the Occident has based the stable identity of the self since the Enlightenment are vacillating. For instance, the narrative of humanity, enshrined in the freedom and equality of rights established by the Declaration of the Rights of Man has led to the erasure of the particularity of peoples.<sup>50</sup> "The jews" attest to this elision and to the absurdity of a politics of identity based on the grand narratives of inclusion, wholeness, and benefit, initiated by the



Enlightenment and embodied by the Hegelian Spirit. As Hammerschlag points out, “the very category of “the jews” signals after Auschwitz to the impossibility of any unified political *we*, (...) the rupturing of that Enlightenment progressive dream”.<sup>51</sup> This disaggregated *we* resonates throughout Jelinek’s play in a language which destabilises any form of ‘we’. Jelinek’s ‘we/I/you’ (speakers) cannot be pinned down to a unified individual and collective subject, thus shaking the foundations of the idea of collective subjectivity and political consensus. An escape from Hegel and Heidegger appears possible only by embracing “we” as non-identity, as *resistance* to metanarratives of identity nostalgic for the whole, for ‘sameness’.<sup>52</sup> By resisting, “the jews” and the refugees’ voices disrupt, disturb and deviate. Consequently, ‘Otherness’ emerges as a queer disturbance to a normalised order. In the case of Jelinek, disruption occurs at the level of language: “linguistic agitators”<sup>53</sup> inhabit and ‘queer’ the language of identity narratives, unveiling the discordant and fragmented within ‘sameness’.

### **Disturbing ‘Sameness’ – Sara Ahmed’s Queer Orientation**

The term ‘queer’ is here to be understood in a broader sense, as the “open mesh of possibilities, gaps, overlaps, *dissonances and resonances, lapses and excesses of meanings*” (my italics).<sup>54</sup> Hence, the queer reading of a text focuses on the disturbances to established orders and on the disruptions of binary constructs (inside/outside, male/female, native/foreign etc.). Through deconstruction and discourse analysis, it focuses on those subversive mechanisms, “*die instituierte Hierarchien und damit verbunden eindeutige Identitätsmodelle radikal infrage stellen*” (my italics).<sup>55</sup> In this sense, foreignness can be considered as a particular manifestation of ‘queerness’. Within the homogeneous whole of dominant culture (‘sameness’), foreignness represents a moment of disturbance (“Moment der Störung”) and irritation (“Moment der Irritation”) which cultural normativity perceives as a threatening deviation in need of correction.<sup>56</sup> As dissonance, ‘queerness’ disrupts that feeling of harmony given by a uniform totality in the same way as the refugees’ voices in the text ruin the main melody by being *out of tune*. This metaphor can be read in the naturalisation of Yeltsin’s daughter and of the Russian soprano singer Anna Netrebko, both figured in the text.<sup>57</sup> Especially the latter was granted Austrian citizenship solely by virtue of the pleasant sound of her voice. Although similar in their need of becoming part of the national (Austrian) community, the singer contrasts with the refugees, depicted as the very opposite of the polished rigorousness of classical music (“*wir machen Lärm, Streit und Konflikt, wir machen das mühelos*” (my italics)).<sup>58</sup> Belonging is conditional: only those voices conforming to the script dictated by the orchestra of ‘sameness’ and nurturing it (by enhancing its cultural prestige or bringing economic and political

advantages) are allowed into the choir. “Wir/we”, an *irritating* syncope, are again excluded because *not in concert* with the rest:

Daß diese Frau mit uns zusammenklingen darf, na, mit uns nicht, wir dürfen nicht klingen und nicht klagen, wir dürfen gar nichts, nicht einmal hier sein, die Frau aber schon, vielleicht könnten auch wir singen, mit ihrem Klangkörper in Ihrem Klangkörper singen, (...) [D]och diese Frau klingt, sie erklingt, die schöne Verführte, der das Land gleich erlag, sie klingt!<sup>59</sup>

The queer(ing) nature of ‘Otherness’ goes beyond the dimension of sound. The many textual references to the containment of the ‘Others’ flow of interference throughout the play (“die wollen uns hier ja selber ableiten wie Flüsse”, “alles regt sich, alles bewegt sich, um Überschwemmungen, ja, auch die von Menschen wie uns”)<sup>60</sup> discloses the queer potential of *movement* in the text. Queer theorist Sara Ahmed has explored the concept of orientation in relation to the ‘Other’: human constructs such as nation and race appear to be the result of an established orientation of bodies and objects, i.e. accumulation of lines which keep bodies and objects in specific places and point them towards pre-established directions of movement.<sup>61</sup> In particular, perceptions of race and foreignness in relation to spatial orientation (e.g. national identity), are the product of actions “that are repeated, *forgotten*, and that allow some bodies to take up space by *restricting the mobility* of others” (my italics).<sup>62</sup> Jelinek’s ‘Others’ uncover such orientation devices which try to pin them down to a location. These location devices find concretisation in the technological satellite systems (“Border Surveillance stems”, “cooperative positioning systems (VTS/AIS, VMS, and LRIT) und remote sensing observation systems”)<sup>63</sup> employed by Europe to patrol its *external lines*, its borders between inside and outside: “[w]ir sind ja nur gekommen, damit er [ground positioning system] uns *orten* kann, wer auch immer, damit er uns *erwischt*“ (my italics)).<sup>64</sup> Within this framework, ‘queerness’ and ‘otherness’ work by means of deviant lines, whose movements are abruptly ‘normalised’ and blocked by normative culture. The newcomers in the text have no power over their mobility since the dominant framework of orientation controls every *direction*, “selbst die *Richtung* unseres Rückgangs” (my italics).<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, the host culture and its politics of restriction of *movement* are embodied in the mythological gadfly, which effectively blocks the foreigners’ lines directed towards the centre: “ja, eine Bremse, vielleicht ist das die, die uns *festhält*, die uns *nicht reinläßt*, diese Bremse ist schuld!” (my italics).<sup>66</sup> Through its mechanisms of exclusion and suppression of deviating moments, the system’s overall orientation and direction are kept unaltered: “Man darf nichts gegen *die herrschende Richtung* unternehmen” (my

italics).<sup>67</sup> This ‘governing direction’ is what (re)produces the way we are orientated towards ‘Otherness’, something reflected in the metanarratives produced by (democratic) institutions.<sup>68</sup> Jelinek seems to be creating a discordance, a *disorientation* by inhabiting and deconstructing the language and grand discourses of human rights and civil liberties. To do so, she draws on a brochure published by the Austrian State Secretary for Integration featuring a simplistic explanation of the rules for a peaceful coexistence in multicultural Austria.<sup>69</sup> The voices use the same terms and, by means of contrast with reality, ridicule the metaphors and images used. They flow into the language of traditional values ‘orientating’ our cultural identity and ‘queer’ it. They turn ‘Western sameness’ upside down by revealing the hypocrisy of the way it is applied. Unquestioned, traditional meta-narratives linked to the enlightened discourse on humanity (anti-discrimination, equality, dignity, freedom and justice as foundation of our togetherness) are emptied of their validity because unable to do justice to the miserable conditions of refugees and other ‘Others’. For instance, the universality of the principle of coexistence is exposed as faux, since the State selects and discriminates: “er [der Staat] respektiert das Zusammenleben, aber (...) er sagt, wer zusammenleben darf und wer nicht, und dann respektiert er das, aber nur zu einer bestimmten Grenze”.<sup>70</sup> Mocking the pathetic language of the brochure, which compares social coexistence to a swimming competition, the voices sarcastically show how there can be no justice in a society where lives are not equal:

Dieses Fairplay zu leben, daß der eine sterben kann, jederzeit, und der andre auch, nicht jederzeit, sondern zu seiner Zeit, alles zu seiner Zeit, ja, das zu leben ist Voraussetzung der Gerechtigkeit.<sup>71</sup>

Paradoxically, equality as a common foundation of values cannot accommodate everyone, as the basis is too small: “wir sind noch nicht tot und daher gern bereit, auf einem gemeinsamen Fundament zu stehen, falls es nicht zu klein ist”.<sup>72</sup> Freedom is unmasked as a commodity avidly sought after, of which the victims of capitalism can only have leftovers: “Entschuldigung, habe ich mir etwa alle Freiheiten genommen? Aber da sind doch noch welche, die ich vorhin weggeschmiessen habe, die können Sie gern haben!”.<sup>73</sup> In this capitalistic logic, the crisis of religious narratives is replaced by an omnipresent apparatus of bureaucracy and businessmen: God is dead and prayers are now directed towards ‘dem Herrn Präsidenten’,<sup>74</sup> and the ‘Herr, (...) Zahlungsmittelpunkt von vielen’.<sup>75</sup> Acceptance is also based on an unbalanced ‘taking without giving’, as the lines between ‘taking’ (‘etwas nehmen’) and ‘taking away’ (‘jemandem etwas nehmen’) blur: “wir bringen (...) Stärke und Talente entgegen, sie werden aber leider nicht *genommen*. (...). Nur uns wird *genommen*, klar.” (my italics).<sup>76</sup> These cases show how the ‘queering’ of language brings the conflict between inclusive universality and exclusive membership to the surface.<sup>77</sup> Our trusted schemes of orientation are exposed as lies, the

narrative of democratic peace as a comfortable façade hiding the violence of exclusion (“wir werden nichts sein, das ist es ja, was sie wollten und was wir jetzt bekommen. Frieden”).<sup>78</sup> Universality is revealed as an unsustainable contradiction through the disruption (‘queering’) of the *language* of harmony, movement and politics. This raises the question of how the ‘queer’ potential of “the jews” and “wir/we”, unleashed through language, may survive translation into another.

### **‘Othering’ and ‘Queering’: Gains and Losses in Gitta Honegger’s English Translation**

Translation poses the challenge of transposing the text into another linguistic and cultural context, while trying to preserve its stylistic peculiarities. This process of mediation between cultures and languages inevitably results in a compromise, in a hybrid text. The translated work is close to the original but, in its inevitable approximation, it is also a stand-alone creation. As her authorized English translator, Gitta Honegger encountered additional difficulties. Translation is in fact a rather challenging task in the case of Jelinek’s works, since in many of them the German language in all its twists is the main protagonist. *Die Schutzbefohlenen* is an exemplary case of such writing, which Jelinek herself has termed an “obsessive twisting and turning of language to tap it to another meaning”.<sup>79</sup> How can this plurality of meanings be rendered in English? What gains and losses result from Honegger’s strategies?

Language difference inevitably entails a loss of original meaning due to different language peculiarities. The first obstacle that the English language stumbles upon is the rendering of the choral polyphony. The German shifts between different second-person interlocutors (‘Du’/ ‘Sie’ / ‘ihr’) are inevitably subsumed under an undifferentiated English ‘you’, which fails to convey the nuances in register applied to the different addressees of the plea. For instance, the sudden shift from ‘Sie’ to ‘ihr’ and ‘du’ (“wenn *Sie* nichts damit anfangen, (...) ja, *ihr* seid gemeint (...) wer auch immer *du* bist, *du, du*” (my italics))<sup>80</sup> is not registered in the English (“if *you* do nothing with it, (...) yes, we mean *you*, (...), whoever *you* are, *you, you*”).<sup>81</sup> For this reason, the multi-layered complexity of the voices cannot be fully appreciated.

In some cases, the insistent repetition of prefixes and particles gets lost. An example is the hammering ‘-mit’, used in the German text to mock a togetherness that does not really take place (“[alles] lebt vom *Mitreden, Mitmachen, Mitgestalten, Mitentscheiden* und *Mitverantworten*” (my italics)).<sup>82</sup> This accumulation of inclusive mechanisms is diluted in the English rendering: (“everything rests upon *cooperation, participation, discussion, decision making, action taking, policy shaping* and *sharing accountability*” (my italics)).<sup>83</sup> The same is true for the repetition of ‘ein-’: “uns *ein*zudämmern, *ein*zusperrern und schließlich

*einzuschließen*” (my italics)<sup>84</sup> becomes “breaking, jailing and finally shutting us in”.<sup>85</sup> Other wordplays, such as the use of words with the same spelling but different meaning are also lost in translation: for instance, the word ‘Regen’ for rain (“Alles beginnt ja mit einem schlichten *Regen*” (my italics))<sup>86</sup> is turned into the verb ‘move / stir / upset’ (“da müßte man sich ja selber *regen*, aber (...) wir dürfen uns nicht *regen*” (my italics));<sup>87</sup> the English fails to adapt these homonyms: “Everything always starts with *rain*. (...) [W]e are not allowed *to sing*, we are not allowed *to do anything*”.<sup>88</sup> Another homonym that gets lost in translation is the German word ‘Stimme’ (used ambiguously in its double meaning of voice and vote and in the verbal form ‘stimmen = to be right’, which are all spelled out in the English).<sup>89</sup> For the word ‘Bremse’ (simultaneously ‘brake’ and ‘gadfly’ and translated initially only with the second meaning),<sup>90</sup> the translation manages to find a way around the ambiguity of the German original through the double meaning of the word ‘bug’, bringing the insect and the brake together under the image of the car: “that bug – no, not the car – the gadfly has put the brakes on us”.<sup>91</sup> However, in eliding and spelling out, the translation tends to lose the semantic richness that Jelinek harnesses to turn language back on itself. Consequently, some omissions hinder the inherently subversive (‘queering’) potential of Jelinek’s progressions of words and sounds. Emblematic is the progression of “eingezäumt (...) eingezäunt, (...) gezähmt”:<sup>92</sup> by means of slight changes in consonants, it leads from inclusion-exclusion to the type of *domestication* of ‘Otherness’ affecting “the jews”. Although the sense of subjugation is still conveyed, an explicit reference to *domestication* is missing in the translation: “folks like us must be barred, put in bars, no, behind them”.<sup>93</sup>

Notwithstanding these losses, Honegger has adopted strategies that not only adapt but, in some cases, also enhance the processes of ‘othering’ and ‘queering’ activated by language. As Honegger herself states, Elfriede Jelinek granted her “the freedom to change her long chain of intricate word-games into equivalent American-English idioms and colloquialisms”.<sup>94</sup> A “Hershey’s bar”<sup>95</sup> substitutes the “Kindermilchschnitte”.<sup>96</sup> Another example is the use of the expression ‘spoiled rotten’ with reference to the businessman who was trying to acquire the Opel plant through the naturalisation of Yeltsin’s daughter:

[W]ir kriegen Essen geschenkt, gute Gabe, sogar, wenn es *schlecht* ist, *schlecht* geworden, und das regt die Bürger natürlich wieder maßlos auf, daß wir *verdorbenes* Essen kriegen, ist ja klar, gar nichts sollten wir kriegen (...) du hast nicht *schöpfen* dürfen, denn du bist kein *Schöpfer*, nein, deswegen nicht, du hast nicht *schöpfen* dürfen (...) (my italics)<sup>97</sup>

[W]e get food for free (...) even if it’s *rotten*, it *rotted* and, quite naturally, citizens are outraged about us getting *spoiled* bread, we shouldn’t get anything, of course, but you

for once were not *spoiled rotten*, your plan was *spoiled*, because you don't make five-year plans, no, that's not why, you couldn't be *spoiled*, though *rotten* (...) (my italics)<sup>98</sup>

The expression changes the original meaning yet enhances the impact of the German text by creating new associations: 'spoiled' and 'rotten' become features of the avid, capitalist society and of the whole system governed by money and power interests.

The English translation usually makes linkages more explicit, hence establishing a direct connection with the underlying critique. For instance, Heidegger, never mentioned in the German text, appears many times throughout the translation as a cue for the audience.<sup>99</sup> Additionally, Heidegger's thought is made fun of by distorting the philosopher's name: "der Denker"<sup>100</sup> becomes "hide-egg",<sup>101</sup> "that Heidegghead",<sup>102</sup> "that Heidegg-man",<sup>103</sup> intensifying the comical reversal of his philosophy. In similar passages, Honegger amplifies the 'queer' potential of the German language by creating new, daring wordplays: for instance, the link between "Einbunkern" und "Einbürgern"<sup>104</sup> with reference to the process of naturalisation is transformed in the parallel between "ostracizing" and "Austrocizing".<sup>105</sup> Honegger further 'queers' the text by inserting her own commentaries, interrupting the narrative and sarcastically reflecting upon translated language: in *Charges*, with reference to the Franz Schubert subtext, the translator calls the Austrian musician by name and adds, "nonsense, it's all in a song, sorry, Franz, all lost in translation".<sup>106</sup> Moreover, if it is Jelinek's voice that *interferes* in *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, it is instead Heidegger's that further unsettles our certainties about the narrative in *Charges*:

Der Mietling aber, was sagt Gott dazu?, *kann ich jetzt nicht nachschlagen, hab keine Zeit, muß ja schreiben*. Der Mietling aber, so, jetzt schau ich doch mal nach, was der macht. Der Mietling aber, der nicht Hirte ist, des die Schafe nicht eigen sind, sieht den Wolf, ah, super!, das mit dem Wolf können wir gut brauchen, Johannes 10,13, der Mietling aber flieht (...) (my italics)<sup>107</sup>

But the hireling, what does God have to say about that? – can't look it up now, I don't have time, I have to write, – [*And I have to translate!*] – but the hireling – [*What is a 'hireling'?!*] – alright, I will look it up. 'The hireling who is not a shepherd, and not the owner of the sheep, sees the wolf', aha, *wunderbar!* the wolf comes in handy, [*oh, now I see, a pun, punted in translation, hiring = renting in bibliocal German*], the hireling flees (...) <sup>108</sup>

Consequently, the flow of voices is further broken down, with the translator becoming an additional speaker, an extra disturbance. Through these additions, the English 'queers' the German, making the translation an independent work. The language difference becomes a productive and creating force. In an interview with Honegger, Jelinek supported these deviations from her original work: "You [the translator] don't have to use parentheses. Those are your (...) linguistically creative contributions. And sometimes it takes you to a completely different place because it is already embedded in the text."<sup>109</sup> These creative contributions are

exactly what, in modified form, preserve and enhance the (de)construction and disruption of ‘Otherness’ in Lyotard’s and Ahmed’s terms, embedded in Jelinek’s language.

### **Conclusion: Beyond Identity**

Both *Die Schutzbefohlenen* and *Charges (The Supplicants)* adopt respectively German and English linguistic mechanisms that point to the ‘forgetting’ of ‘Otherness’ within homogeneous ‘sameness’. At the same time, language also emerges as a trouble spot where ‘Otherness’, with its heterogeneity, particularity and discordance, disturbs the harmony of ‘sameness’. The polyphonic ‘wir/we’ closely resemble the unrepresentable “jews” and the deviated ‘queer Others’, entities pointing to the broken nature of our reality. Reality cannot be reduced to unity, but it is fragmented, rather ‘queer’. The belief in a unitary, collective subject is not merely an illusion, but a danger triggering discrimination, ostracism and exclusion towards anything threatening to shatter it. Like Lyotard, Jelinek *voices* scepticism towards identity politics based on a selective endorsement of liberal ideas. Like Ahmed, Jelinek seems to see in ‘Otherness’ an important point of resistance against those very politics. The crime that is uncovered is ultimately the Idea of Identity as such, which engulfs and *silences* the ‘Other’. Jelinek’s voices, Lyotard’s “jews” and Ahmed’s ‘queers’ all point away from this orientation scheme, in a *deviant* direction: beyond categorisations, beyond inclusion and exclusion, beyond inside and outside and hence beyond our binary certainties, beyond the comforting lie of our identity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*. In: Theaterheute 7/2014 (Beilage), pp. 3-19, p. 16. For the text passages added after July 2014, see the online version of the text published on the author’s website: Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*. <https://www.elfriedejelinek.com/fschutzbefohlene.htm> (23.08.2018), dated 14.6.2013 / 8.11.2013 / 14.11.2014 / 29.9.2015 (=Elfriede Jelinek Homepage).

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed account of the origin and contextualisation of the text see: Reitani, Luigi: „*Daß uns Recht geschieht, darum beten wir*“. *Elfriede Jelineks Die Schutzbefohlenen*. In: Janke, Pia (ed.): *Jelinek(Jahr)buch 2014-2015*, Wien: Praesens 2015, pp. 55-71.

<sup>3</sup> Cf.: Ataç, Ilker: ‘*Refugee Protest Camp Vienna*’: *making citizens through locations of the protest movement*. In: *Citizenship Studies* 20/5 (2016), pp. 629-646.

<sup>4</sup> Cf.: N.N.: *Austria plans to toughen asylum policy, ease deportations*. <https://www.dw.com/en/austria-plans-to-toughen-asylum-policy-ease-deportations/a-43446419> (09.09.2018), dated 18.04.2018; Cf.: Martens, Catherine: *Austria brings hard-line refugee policy to EU*. <https://www.dw.com/en/austria-brings-hard-line-refugee-policy-to-eu/a-44496290> (09.09.2018), dated 02.07.2018.

<sup>5</sup> Cf.: the symposium organised by the Elfriede Jelinek-Forschungszentrum and the Forschungsplattform Elfriede Jelinek: *Texte - Kontexte – Rezeption: N.N.: Elfriede Jelineks „Die Schutzbefohlenen“ im Kontext der Refugee-Bewegung*. <http://www.elfriede-jelinek-forschungszentrum.com/veranstaltungen/diskussion-die-schutzbefohlenen-2015/> (09.09.2018).

<sup>6</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Cf.: Felber, Silke: *(Un)making Boundaries: Representing Elfriede Jelinek’s Charges (the Supplicants)*. <http://www.critical-stages.org/14/unmaking-boundaries-representing-elfriede-jelineks-charges-the-supplicants/> (10.09.2018), dated 12.2016 (= Critical Stages/Scènes critiques. The IATC journal/Revue de l’AICT).

- <sup>8</sup> Reitani, Luigi: „*Daß uns Recht geschieht, darum beten wir*“ *Elfriede Jelineks Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 60.
- <sup>9</sup> Honegger, Gitta: *Greifvogel. I am a Bird of Prey. In Conversation with Elfriede Jelinek*. In: Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, Calcutta: Seagull Books 2016, pp. 146-200, p. 153.
- <sup>10</sup> Cf.: Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1990.
- <sup>11</sup> Carroll, David: *Foreword. The Memory of Devastation and the Responsibilities of Thought: “And let’s not talk about that”*. In: Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1990, pp. vii-xxix, p. xii.
- <sup>12</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 3.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.
- <sup>16</sup> Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*, p. 20. See also p.23: “The “jewish” affection (...) is outside of space and time, even “historically””.
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>18</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 8.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- <sup>20</sup> Cf.: Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*, pp. 11-13.
- <sup>21</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 16.
- <sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- <sup>23</sup> Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*, p. 23.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.
- <sup>26</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 4.
- <sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- <sup>30</sup> For a thorough account of Hegelian dialectics see: Cf.: Hegel, Georg W. F: *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1977. And also: Cf.: Weiss, F. *Dialectic and Human Experience: The Phenomenology of Spirit*. In: Weiss, F. (ed.): *Hegel. The Essential Writings*. New York: Harper & Row 1974, pp.37-85.
- <sup>31</sup> Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*, p. 45.
- <sup>32</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 4.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8
- <sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>36</sup> Adorno claims that Hegel’s attempt to mediate opposites though his dialectical method leads to a mere domestication of the negation (identity of X and (-X)). According to Adorno, identity remains an enigma, something that exceeds known categories and hence neither X nor (-X), but rather what he calls the non-identical. The non-identical is at the basis of Adorno’s negative dialectics and can be compared to Lyotard’s “jews”. Cf.: Adorno, Theodor: *Negative Dialectics*. London: Routledge 1973.
- <sup>37</sup> Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*, p. 29.
- <sup>38</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 11.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- <sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>42</sup> Lyotard, Jean-François: *Heidegger and “the jews”*, p. 61.
- <sup>43</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 4.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- <sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- <sup>49</sup> Cf.: Lyotard, Jean-François: *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press 1986.
- <sup>50</sup> Cf.: Hammerschlag, Sarah: *Troping the Jew: Jean François Lyotard’s Heidegger and “the jews”*. In: *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 12/4 (2005), pp. 371-398, p. 381.
- <sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 376.
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 397.
- <sup>53</sup> In this way Elfriede Jelinek has termed the composition of voices in *Die Schutzbefohlenen* during an interview with translator Gitta Honegger. See: Honegger, Gitta: *Greifvogel. I am a Bird of Prey. In Conversation with Elfriede Jelinek*, p. 157.



- 
- <sup>54</sup> Sedgwick, Eve K.: 'Queer and Now'. In: Hall, Donald u.a. (eds.): *The Routledge Queer Studies Reader*, Abingdon: Routledge 2013, pp. 3-17, p. 8.
- <sup>55</sup> Perko, Gudrun: *Wissenschaftliche Grundlagen zu Queer Theory als Hintergrundfolie von Queer Reading*. In: Babka, Anna / Hochreiter, Susanne (eds.): *Queer Reading in den Philologien*, pp. 69-87, p. 70.
- <sup>56</sup> Müller-Funk, Wolfgang: *Theorien des Fremden*. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag 2016, p. 18.
- <sup>57</sup> For an analysis of the textual references to events and people cf.: Reitani, Luigi: „*Daß uns Recht geschieht, darum beten wir*“ *Elfriede Jelineks Die Schutzbefohlenen*.
- <sup>58</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 17.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4, p. 13.
- <sup>61</sup> Cf.: Ahmed, Sara: *Queer Phenomenology*. Durham: Duke University Press 2006, pp. 109-156.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.
- <sup>63</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 14.
- <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- <sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.
- <sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>68</sup> Cf.: "Institutions also involve orientation devices that keep things in place". Ahmed, Sara: *Queer Phenomenology*, p. 134.
- <sup>69</sup> Cf.: Reitani, Luigi: „*Daß uns Recht geschieht, darum beten wir*“ *Elfriede Jelineks Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 66. The brochure can be consulted online: Cf.: N.N.: *Zusammenleben in Österreich*. [http://www.staatsbuergerschaft.gv.at/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Broschuere/RWR-Fibel.pdf](http://www.staatsbuergerschaft.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Broschuere/RWR-Fibel.pdf) (13.09.2018), dated 2013.
- <sup>70</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 8.
- <sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- <sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- <sup>77</sup> Cf.: Dahlvik, Julia / Reinprecht, Christopher: *Asyl als Widerspruch – vom Menschenrecht zum Auserwählten?* In: Janke, Pia (ed.): *Jelinek(Jahr)buch 2014-2015*, Wien: Praesens 2015, pp. 43-54.
- <sup>78</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 13.
- <sup>79</sup> Honegger, Gitta: *Greifvogel. I am a Bird of Prey*. In *Conversation with Elfriede Jelinek*, p. 178.
- <sup>80</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 4.
- <sup>81</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*. Calcutta: Seagull Books 2016, pp. 1-2.
- <sup>82</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 12.
- <sup>83</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 46.
- <sup>84</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 13.
- <sup>85</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 51.
- <sup>86</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 13.
- <sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>88</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 49.
- <sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55 and p. 65.
- <sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.
- <sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75.
- <sup>92</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 13.
- <sup>93</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 50.
- <sup>94</sup> Honegger, Gitta: *Preface*. In: Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, Calcutta: Seagull Books 2016, pp. vii-xiv, p. ix.
- <sup>95</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 36.
- <sup>96</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 11.
- <sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.
- <sup>98</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 42.
- <sup>99</sup> Cf.: "I felt I needed to give the reader-audience some cue". Honegger, Gitta: *Greifvogel. I am a Bird of Prey*. In *Conversation with Elfriede Jelinek*, p. 180.
- <sup>100</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 4.
- <sup>101</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 6.
- <sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7, p. 78.
- <sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

---

<sup>104</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 10.

<sup>105</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 36.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

<sup>107</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Die Schutzbefohlenen*, p. 15.

<sup>108</sup> Jelinek, Elfriede: *Charges (The Supplicants)*, p. 62.

<sup>109</sup> Honegger, Gitta: *Greifvogel. I am a Bird of Prey. In Conversation with Elfriede Jelinek*, p. 179.