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Abstract

This paper explores the general historical context and one particular theoretical context of modern depictions of Angelo Soliman, a court moor who lived in Vienna from 1755 to 1796. The historical context encompasses what we know of Soliman’s biography, his biographers and their research processes. The theoretical context encompasses Frantz Fanon’s application of psychoanalysis to the black man in his book *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952). These contexts inform an analysis of two modern theatrical depictions of Soliman: Ludwig Fels’ play *Soliman* (1991) and Andreas Pflüger and Lukas Holliger’s comic opera *Der schwarze Mozart* (2005). The changes these two authors make to Soliman’s biography and the ways in which they depict Soliman’s victimization within larger racist discourse are being analyzed. This analysis shows that the same exoticizing impulse that led to the exhibition of Soliman’s remains after his death in 1796 still seems to be present in racial discourse in the German-speaking world today, although in a different form.
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Introduction

Literature by white Germans/Austrians about historical or mythical figures of color occupies a conflicted political and artistic position that is seldom addressed in criticism. But modern works by white German-speaking authors about figures of color are inherently political texts that weave a complex web of identity issues and, either implicitly or explicitly, project the modern race-conscious German/Austrian experience onto the past. It is therefore important to contextualize modern depictions of historical figures of color to avoid misinterpretation.

This paper will contextualize two modern textual depictions of Angelo Soliman, a black African man who lived and worked in Vienna during the latter half of the eighteenth century. The first chapter provides a general outline of eighteenth century discourse on race and of the position of black individuals in Enlightenment-era Europe. The two main sources of information for the first chapter are Peter Martin’s *Schwarze Teufel, Edle Mohren: Afrikaner in Geschichte und Bewußtsein der Deutschen* (2001) and Katharina Oguntoye, May Opitz and Dagmar Schultz’s *Farbe Bekennen: Afro-deutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte* (1986). While many other books on Afro-German issues have been published during the recent explosion in post-colonial studies, Martin’s volume concentrates on the pre-colonial period, an era not commonly covered in detail by recent works on Afro-German issues. Martin’s study is also one of the most exhaustively researched resources on the conceptualization of Africa and Africans in the German-speaking world. Oguntoye’s *Farbe Bekennen* is a seminal work in this field that, while it does not concentrate solely on the pre-colonial period, contains a detailed sketch of the evolution of the idea of race from the Middle Ages to the present. At the
time of its publication, *Farbe bekennen* was a revolutionary look at blackness and the consequences of otherness in the German-speaking world, and it helped establish the Afro-German women’s movement in Germany.

The second chapter explores the scholarly work of Soliman’s three biographers in detail. Soliman’s first biographer Karoline Pichler’s brief biography was published in 1808 in a compilation dedicated to proving the educability of black men. Wilhelm Bauer, Soliman’s second biographer, published his *Angelo Soliman, der hochfürstliche Mohr: ein exotisches Kapitel Alt-Wien* in 1922. He expanded upon Pichler’s biography through careful research and more contextualization. Soliman’s third biographer is Monika Firla, who has built upon Bauer’s considerable contributions through even more detailed research and creative work on Soliman. She has published multiple contributions (1993, 1996, 2001, 2003) and has collaborated with Bert Gstettner, choreographer of Vienna’s TANZ*HOTEL Studios, on a dance piece reflecting Soliman’s life story entitled *Angelo* Soliman (1996). Gstettner’s piece is not within the scope of this paper because it is a mainly visual depiction of Soliman instead of textual.

The third chapter will outline Frantz Fanon’s psychoanalytical description of the colonization of the black male psyche in his 1952 book *Black Skin, White Masks*. Fanon, though writing in the 1950’s about issues of coloniality, provides his conception of the black male psyche as it must exist in a white society where no black voice exists and the collective unconscious is ‘white.’ His model is applicable to Soliman because it describes the colonization of the black male psyche that occurs as the black male individual is acculturated into European society and then realizes he must exist as the phobogenic other in the culture he has taken for his own. The defining moment of this
crisis is self-objectification, a moment of psychic self-mutilation that is visible in artistic interpretations of Soliman’s life. Even though many post-colonial theorists have elaborated on Fanon’s ideas, *Black Skin, White Masks* remains a seminal work in post-colonial theory and is unique for its wide applicability. Other post-colonial theorists such as Homi K. Bhabha have concentrated on the colonized individual’s culture of origin in tandem with the colonizing culture, a scenario that does not apply to Soliman’s situation and makes it difficult to apply those theorists’ work to an analysis of Soliman in modern artistic depictions.

The fourth chapter investigates Ludwig Fels’s 1991 play *Soliman* and Lukas Holliger’s libretto for the 2005 opera *Der schwarze Mozart* in light of the information presented in the three previous chapters. Ludwig Fels’s *Soliman* premiered in 1991 as a cooperative project of the Bregenz Festival and Vienna’s Volkstheater. Lukas Holliger wrote the libretto and Andreas Pflüger the music for *Der schwarze Mozart* in 2004, it was published in 2005 and the opera was first performed in January of 2006 in Switzerland at the Kaserne Basel. It will be performed again in December of 2006 in the Theater am Stadtgarten in Winterthur, Switzerland. Although Soliman has been featured in many artistic portrayals, the scope of this paper includes only the texts of comparatively well-known contemporary theatrical depictions. Soliman has appeared as a main character in one play aside from that of Fels: Conny Hannes Meyer’s *Angelo Soliman oder Die schwarze Bekanntschaft* (1983). Meyer’s play is not addressed in this paper to allow room for more contemporary pieces, although little has been published in the way of criticism of Meyer’s piece.
This paper explores colonization on an individual level: the role of the black man in the European psyche and how this role affects individuals, namely Angelo Soliman in artistic interpretations of his life. An exploration of Fels’s *Soliman* and Holliger’s *Der schwarze Mozart* can help chart changes or similarities between the Enlightenment and modern conceptualization of blackness. The following guiding questions help to identify these changes and similarities. On what parts of Soliman’s life or death do the authors concentrate? Does Soliman come forth more clearly as a victim or a social agent? Do the authors perpetuate the phobia of blackness by exoticizing Soliman or do they offer new models of understanding?
Chapter 1: Race in Eighteenth Century Europe

Race Theory and Discourse in the Enlightenment Era in Europe

The concept of ‘race’ was first used in reference to human beings in 1684 by the medical doctor and writer François Bernier, as part of an effort to establish a system of racial characteristics (Martin 196). Bernier’s attempt and the many attempts that followed to classify humans into categories defined by biological characteristics were, according to Peter Martin, a response to new problems and intellectual currents in society after the Thirty Years’ War. The growing status and power of the middle classes, the changing view of religion, the new importance of international commerce and slavery, the deepening importance of individualism and the explosion of scientific knowledge and experimentation all contributed to the eighteenth century mania for classification (Martin 196-97). The idea of the Great Chain of Being had been carried over from the Renaissance and still heavily influenced the way intellectuals thought about their surroundings. The Chain of Being, with kings on top, was made up of layer upon layer of lower beings falling below the European (Martin 198-200). Researchers were constantly seeking ‘missing links’ in the Chain, for, as Leibniz wrote, \textit{Natura non facit saltum}, or “die Natur macht keine Sprünge” (Martin 203-04). As a result, researchers were also constantly debating the exact location of the middle level between human and animal, and new geographical and biological discoveries in Africa led many to draw similarities between apes and black Africans and to locate black Africans as the missing link (Martin

\footnote{All quotations in German can be found translated into English by the author of this study in Appendix.}
Explorers and even natural scientists reported on apes in Africa that kidnapped and violated young black women or that pursued human and ape females with equal fervor (Martin 208).

The Enlightenment preoccupation with classification had predictable results: the detailed physical study of biological subjects, human and animal, with emphasis on measurement and comparative anatomy. The eighteenth century was the period when anatomical theaters reached a level of popularity heretofore unseen, and the pseudoscience of physiognomy dominated conversations about race. The new discourse on race and biological determinism reflected the middle classes’ efforts to gain cultural capital over and above that of the aristocracy (Martin 196). Martin points out that the racial attributes of black Africans as they were portrayed in popular enlightened opinion were the exact opposite of middle class virtues. Black Africans were said to be lazy, promiscuous, hedonistic, ugly and soulless: “So [sollten] die afrikanischen Schwarzen mit ihrem vermeintlich ‘affenähnlichen’ Körper schon bald das genaue Gegenteil europäischer Bürgertugenden [repräsentieren]: Sie wurden als faul, geil und genußsüchtig hingestellt, häßlich und ohne jedes Genie” (Martin 220). The boundaries between the scientific and the political were blurry. Exhibits of ‘cannibals,’ ‘pygmies’ and ‘Hottentots’, fascinated the European public (Martin 221). The question of the line between human and animal fascinated leading minds, such as that of Carl Linné, the Swedish biologist who published *Systema Naturae* in 1735, a work in which he proposed an all-encompassing system of classification for plants and animals. The human being is included in the order of primates alongside apes, not set apart. Linné divided the species *Homo sapiens* into six different varieties: *Europaeus, Asiaticus, Americanus, Afer, Ferus*...
and Monstrosus (Martin 226). Johann Friedrich Blumenbach took the next significant step in the formation of race theory as it existed in the nineteenth century in his well-known book *De generis humani varietate nativa* (1775): he separated *Homo sapiens* into five races, four of which were aesthetic deviations from the Caucasian norm. Blumenbach was careful to emphasize that his ordering of the races was based on aesthetics, not actual biological difference: years of research had convinced him that there was no evidence for the biological inferiority in terms of intellectual capacity of non-white races (Martin 228). The third significant name in the development of race theory is Samuel Thomas Sömmerring, comparative anatomist and the proprietor of the first anatomical theater in the German-speaking world starting in 1779. As a result of his extensive experience in autopsying cadavers of many races in his anatomical theater, Sömmerring published *Ueber die körperliche Verschiedenheit des Mohren vom Europäer* (1784). In this book, he discussed the question of which race, that of the white European or the black African, resembled apes more closely. His conclusion was that the black African is closer to the ape in terms of anatomy and lags behind the white European in terms of brain size, but he was careful to add that black Africans were certainly still human beings and not apes (Martin 230).

The debate over the relative beauty and intelligence of the races raged on into subsequent centuries, but the synchronic view of eighteenth century race discourse given here helps one more carefully and accurately read literature on and from the Enlightenment, and also helps one hone one’s understanding of the place of black Africans in European society and consciousness.
The Figure of the Court Moor

Researchers in the field of Afro-German studies, Katharina Oguntoye, May Opitz and Dagmar Schultz, trace the significant change in attitudes toward black Africans in the German-speaking world from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment through its correlation with a linguistic change: the changing meaning of the word *Mohr* and the introduction of the word *Neger*. In the Middle Ages, the word *Mohr* denoted non-whites with non-Christian religious beliefs, usually black African Muslims (19). Since these moors were often also important partners in commerce, there was no negative connotation to the word. In fact, many international commerce companies had moors as their insignia, and some still do—perhaps the most popular being the Sarotti chocolate company.

However, it is also important to keep in mind the Christian color symbolism that influenced discourse on difference, in which black was the color of evil and sin. In medieval descriptions of witches and sorcerers, the color black is always present. Several sources in literature of the time contain white characters who are marked with black skin to signify their deviation from societal norms, such as Hartmann von Aue’s version of *Iweinlegende*, written around the year 1200 (19).

In the eighteenth century, the word *Neger* came to be used alongside *Mohr*. *Mohr* meant an individual from North Africa, or ‘white’ Africa, an area with a comparatively longstanding cultural tradition from the perspective of Europeans. *Neger* denoted an individual from sub-Saharan Africa, or ‘black’ Africa, an area seen as wild, brutal and uncivilized (20).
While a cohesive pseudo-scientific race theory did not exist until the nineteenth century, the Enlightenment was a period of gradual restructuring of the European conceptualization of Africa. Peter Martin traces this change along the same lines as Oguntoye et al. The European idea of Africa in the Middle Ages was a seductive place of high culture, but during the course of the eighteenth century, Africa came to be seen as an underdeveloped and uncultured land of barbarians. The cultivated *Mohr* was supplanted by the wild *Neger* (81). Also during the course of the eighteenth century, people of color came to be seen as status symbols for those who could afford them. By the end of the century, no respectable court would be without at least one exotic, foreign-looking servant, messenger or porter. Noble houses bought such individuals from Belgian, Dutch and Portuguese trade companies which acted as middlemen in the market for slaves. Once the ‘court moors’ reached their new home and workplace, their technical status as slaves was of little practical importance. They lived as free subjects under their rulers, were dressed in luxurious clothes and held positions where they could be exhibited to visitors (136). Many were chambermaids and personal servants. Some court moors were tutored in languages, music and other subjects. However, none was allowed to keep his or her original name; instead they were given names like Apollo, Caesar, August, Socrates, Amsterdam, Kopenhagen, Donnerstag or Saturday (Kleßman 238). Most court moors arrived at court as young children, and most could not remember from where in Africa (or Asia or the Americas) they came. They were part of the estate of their ruler

---

2 Court moors were often depicted in portraits of nobility, such as in Antoine Pesne’s *Wilhelmine von Preußen und ihr Bruder Friedrich* (1715) and in Nicolas de Largillière’s *Bildnis der Comtesse de Ruppelmonde mit schwarzem Pagen* (1707).
and were given as gifts and bequeathed in wills. Marriage was, in most cases, impossible: it was difficult to find a suitable marriage partner, as interracial marriage was almost never an option, and most court moors had time-consuming duties that restricted them from raising a family (Martin 147). Despite such restrictions on personal autonomy, court moors were in general a materially privileged group. Although they were technically slaves and were therefore usually not paid a salary, they lived on the estate without cost and their clothing, food, medicine, pension and sometimes education costs were paid by their ruler (139).

Perhaps the two most famous and exceptional court moors of the eighteenth century were Anton Wilhelm Amo (ca. 1700-1753) and Angelo Soliman (ca. 1721-1796). Amo came from West Africa as a slave to Wolfenbüttel. As the young charge of the Duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, Amo had access to an excellent education. He eventually completed a program of study in Halle and Wittenberg and became a professor of Philosophy in Jena before returning to his place of birth in Africa. Angelo Soliman was a personal servant to the Count von Liechtenstein in Vienna from 1755 to 1768, and lived in Vienna financially independently from 1768 to his death in 1796. Soliman was a member of the social and intellectual elite in Vienna, where he was taken into the same Masonic lodge with Mozart, Haydn and other famous figures. Although it may be tempting to take Amo’s and Soliman’s stories as representative of the biographies of court moors, they are not. The levels of freedom and education enjoyed by Amo and Soliman were unmatched by any of the other court moors of whose existence we have evidence. The next chapter explores Soliman’s biography in detail to develop a historical context for an analysis of modern texts that refer to Soliman.
Chapter 2: Soliman’s Biographers

Karoline Pichler (1808)

Soliman’s first biographer was Karoline Pichler, who contributed a brief biography of Soliman to Henri Grégoire’s *De la littérature des Nègres* (1808). Henri Grégoire was a French cleric and abolitionist who began work on his book *De la littérature des Nègres* in order to prove through concrete examples that black Africans are capable of the same levels of sophisticated thought and education as are white Europeans. While writing in Paris in 1807, Grégoire met the anatomist Franz Joseph Gall, who told Grégoire about Angelo Soliman (Bauer 14). Through several contacts at the Viennese court, Grégoire was able to get in touch with a “Frau von Stief” (of whom very little else is known), who researched Soliman’s life and career through interviews with his friends and family. Frau von Stief then gave all of her research to the well-known author and translator Karoline Pichler, who assembled it into a short biography in German (Bauer 14). This biography appears in French translation as chapter five of Grégoire’s *De la littérature des Nègres* (1808). Grégoire’s book had already been published in German by 1809, still including Pichler’s fifth chapter. The text can also be found in volume twenty-four of Pichler’s collected works.

Pichler’s biography of Soliman\(^3\), although short and although there is no mention of any sources other than Frau von Stief, contains a relatively detailed description of his

\(^3\) The text of the biography remained unchanged through all of its publications and republications, except for the fact that it was translated into French to appear in Grégoire’s book.
early childhood in Africa: Pichler claims he came from a land called Pangusitlang, where he was the son of the king. His name was Mmadi Make, and at the age of seven, he was stolen by a neighboring nation and sold into slavery. The separation was very traumatic for the young boy, according to Pichler, and Soliman could never sing the songs of his homeland without the deepest emotion. After a brief time herding camels in a location not precisely specified, young Mmadi Make was sold again, this time to the household of a Marquise in Messina on the island of Sicily. There, he learned to read and speak Italian, and, during a period of severe illness, he was baptized Angelo Soliman. His first name was an homage to Angelina, a black African woman who worked in the household and was very kind to him. The Turkish influence evident in his surname was to denote his exotic non-European background. From that time, Pichler writes, Soliman always celebrated the day of his baptism, September eleventh, as his birthday.

Pichler reports that after a short time, Fürst Johann Georg Christian Lobkowitz, a friend of the Marquise and an Imperial General for the Austro-Hungarian Empire, began pressuring the Marquise to give him the young African. The Marquise finally consented, and Soliman went with his new master to Transylvania in 1739. In the service of Lobkowitz, Soliman purportedly learned to write German in seventeen days along with other scholarly achievements, and accompanied Lobkowitz into battle many times against the Ottoman army. Soliman was much respected for his bravery.

When Lobkowitz died in 1755, he willed Soliman to the Fürst Joseph Wenzel von Liechtenstein in Vienna. At Liechtenstein’s court, Soliman was the very picture of kindness to the unfortunate, Pichler relates. He often acted as advocate for those submitting requests to the sovereign. In 1768, Soliman secretly married Magdalena von
Christiani (née Kellerman), a widow from the Netherlands. When the Fürst learned of the clandestine marriage, he released Soliman from his service and expelled him from the palace. Soliman bought a small house in the inner city of Vienna and lived there with his wife and their only daughter Josephine, born on December 18, 1772, spending most of his time tending their small garden. In 1774, two years after the death of Fürst Wenzel von Liechtenstein, his nephew and heir Fürst Franz Joseph von Liechtenstein invited Soliman to live in the Liechtenstein palace again in order to oversee the education of his sons. Soliman moved to the palace with his family, and his wife died there in 1786. Soliman himself died of a stroke in 1796.

The final paragraph in Pichler’s biography describes Soliman as follows: “[S]eine Züge waren bey Weitem nicht so sehr von unseren Begriffen über Schönheit entfernt, als die Züge der Neger sonst zu seyn pflegen. […] Sein Gemüths-Charakter war von Natur nach der Weise seines Vaterlandes aufbrausend und heftig; desto schöner, desto verehrenswürdiger war die stets gleiche Heiterkeit und Sanftmuth seines Betragens, eine Frucht mühsamer Kämpfe und manches Sieges über sich selbst” (Pichler in Bauer 117-18). Pichler is also careful to emphasize his piety, his intelligence, his extensive knowledge of history and his linguistic achievements, but ends her biography by characterizing his mode of dress: “Seine Tracht war immer die vaterländische, eine Art von Türkischer weiter Kleidung, meistens blendend weiß, wodurch die glänzende Schwärze seiner Haut noch vorteilhafter erschien” (ibid.). Pichler’s biography, while a valuable source for later Soliman researchers, omits two very important events in (and

---

All Pichler quotations are taken from the text as it appears in the appendix to Monika Firla’s 1993 reissue of Wilhelm Bauer’s *Angelo Soliman, der hochfürstliche Mohr: ein exotisches Kapitel Alt-Wien* (orig. 1922).
after) Soliman’s life: his membership in the Viennese Masonic Lodge *Zur wahren Eintracht* (For True Harmony) and the exhibition of his stuffed and mounted skin in the *Hofnaturalienkabinett* (Imperial Museum) in Vienna.

**Wilhelm Bauer (1922)**

Soliman’s second biographer, Wilhelm Bauer, included these events in his longer, more encompassing chronicle published in 1922 in Vienna, *Angelo Soliman, der hochfürstliche Mohr: ein exotisches Kapitel Alt-Wien*. Bauer, the son of the historian and philologist Adolf Bauer, was a scientific journalist with wide-ranging interests and training in archaeology. In addition to referencing Pichler’s biography of Soliman, Bauer also sought out other sources, such as Masonic records, Fürst Liechtenstein’s financial records and the comprehensive list of marriages that occurred in St. Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna. Through such exhaustive research, Bauer added great detail and perspective to the historic picture of Soliman.

In contrast to Pichler’s biography, Bauer’s biography does not offer a concrete version of Soliman’s African background. Bauer discusses several different possibilities (including Pichler’s version), but leaves them as such⁵. One of Bauer’s most important contributions is his identification of several visual representations of Soliman. In most of these paintings the human figure plays only a peripheral role, secondary in one case to a horse, but Bauer describes and reproduces on the title page one engraving featuring Soliman in the Turkish outfit described by Pichler. Johann Gottfried Haid was the

---

⁵ According to Bauer’s sources, although he does not say which, the ethnic group from which Soliman came was called Magni Famori, another name for the Galla ethnic group. Bauer hypothesizes that Soliman could have come from the Horn of Africa, home of the Galla and northerly enough that the Spanish slave
engraver, and he based the piece on a painting of Soliman by Johann Nepomuk Steiner. The painting itself has been lost, but there are two engravings that have survived. Both have the following caption: “Angelus Solimanus, Regiae Numidarum gentis Nepos, decora facie, ingenio validus, os humerosque Jugurthae similis. In Afr. in Sicil. Gall. Angl. Francon. Austria onnibus Carus, fidelis Principum familiaris” (Bauer6 75), or, “Angelo Soliman aus dem königlichen Geschlechte der Numider, ein Mann von schöner Gesichtsbildung, grossem Verstand, an Gestalt und Gesicht dem Jugurtha ähnlich; in Afrika, Sizilien, Frankreich, England, Franken, Österreich allen teuer, ein treuer Hausgenosse von Fürsten” (ibid.). Bauer estimates the painting was commissioned and completed sometime between 1750 and 1760, while Soliman was in the household of Fürst Liechtenstein. Although Pichler writes that Lobkowitz willed Soliman to Liechtenstein when he died in 1755, Bauer counters that Lobkowitz died without a will, and puts the date of Soliman’s change of household sometime earlier than 1755 (75).

Bauer’s investigation of Fürst Liechtenstein’s financial records also yielded clues to Soliman’s lifestyle: the records refer to him as “der hochfürstliche Mohr” and outline the purchases made for him, for example, an embroidered coat in the Turkish style and a ceremonial saber for a royal wedding. Bauer interprets these purchases to mean that part of Soliman’s purpose in the court was to act as a fashion accessory and exotic status symbol for Liechtenstein. However, Soliman is not mentioned in any of Wenzel Liechtenstein’s other financial records, i.e., it appears he drew no salary while a member

---

6 All quotations from Bauer come from the 1993 edition of his biography.
of the household. But Soliman does appear in the financial records of Wenzel Liechtenstein’s heir, Franz Joseph Liechtenstein, as receiving a yearly salary starting in the year 1774. From this, Bauer concludes that the anecdote of Soliman’s dismissal from the Liechtenstein household as a result of his clandestine marriage in 1768 and his subsequent re-acceptance by the Liechtenstein heir in 1774, as claimed by Pichler, is true (56).

One of the most fascinating and fruitful documents Bauer consulted for his biography of Soliman was the record of marriages at St. Stephen’s cathedral in Vienna. The documentation of Soliman’s 1768 marriage to Magdalena von Christiani is written, unlike all the other marriage documentation, in Latin instead of German. In Bauer’s German translation, it reads “Der Wohledle Herr Angelo Soliman, Mohr in Diensten des durchlauchtigsten Fürsten Wenzel von Liechtenstein, geboren in Afrika von nichtkatholischen Eltern; er selbst ist Katholik und ledig [...] Mit der wohledlen Frau Magdalena Christiano, Witwe nach dem Anton Christiano, Sekretär bei der Gräfin Harrach. Sie hat Zeugen für den Tod ihres Gatten beigebracht [...] Zeugen: Franz Gottwald, Sekretär beim Fürsten Wenzel Liechtenstein [...] Karl Freiheit, Universitäts Fechtmeister [...] Seine Eminenz der Cardinal selbst erteilte mündlich die Dispens vom dreimaligen Aufgebot7. Beide legten freiwillig in Gegenwart der genannten Zeugen einen Eid ab. Der Gatte beschwor ausserdem, dass er kein Sklave sei. Dies bezeuge ich auf mein priesterliches Wort und gebe meinen Segen. Der Chormagister.”

On the margin of the record book, next to the record of Soliman’s marriage, is

7 “Threefold banns: notice of an intended marriage, given three times in the parish church of each of the betrothed” (Webster’s Dictionary).
written: “Getraut am 6. Februar vom Chormagister. Diese Ehe darf auf Befehl Seiner Eminenz des Cardinalerzbischofs niemandem mitgeteilt werden” (Bauer 56). Bauer draws several conclusions from this document. First, the marriage was obviously intended to be a secret. The archbishop exempted the couple from the requirement of announcing their intentions publicly, and even went so far as to forbid the church functionaries from telling anyone of the marriage (56). The fact that the documentation is in Latin is further evidence in favor of this conclusion (56). Secondly, Bauer speculates that the Archbishop’s comment in the margin may have also functioned to avoid uncomfortable questions about a marriage between partners of different races. Thirdly, Bauer concludes that Soliman did not really have any idea of his place of birth, or at least no more specific an idea than “Africa.” This is part of the reason Bauer rejects Pichler’s very concrete description of Soliman’s early childhood (57).

Bauer’s scrutiny of Masonic publications did not yield as many details as might be hoped. Soliman entered the newly-founded Masonic Lodge Zur wahren Eintracht in the year 1783, despite his decidedly unusual and ambiguous position in Vienna society. While not a slave, he was also not compensated monetarily during the years he spent in Fürst Wenzel Liechtenstein’s household. His entry into the Lodge Zur wahren Eintracht must be seen as rejection of Soliman’s role as a dependent and an affirmation of his importance in the intellectual circles of Vienna.

The final biographical element that Bauer adds over and above Pichler’s account is the treatment of Soliman’s remains. On November 21, 1796, Soliman died of a stroke. His body, on the order of Kaiser Franz II, was skinned, and his skin was stretched over a wooden figure meant to imitate that of the living Soliman. He was exhibited prominently
in the Hofnaturalienkabinett for ten years in a feather belt and crown, with necklaces of white glass beads and snail shells, in a room with stuffed tropical birds and animals, according to documentation from the Vienna Academy of the Sciences (Fitzinger in Bauer 83). After ten years, Soliman’s remains were moved to a less visible part of the museum that could be visited only with the accompaniment of a curator. His remains were destroyed in a fire during the 1848 revolution.

The documentation from the Vienna Academy of the Sciences identifies Soliman as “eine in der Residenz allgemein bekannte aber auch geschätzte und sehr geachtete Persönlichkeit,” and, oddly, claims “die Schönheit seiner feingeschnittenen Gesichtszüge sowie auch die Zartheit und Ebenmässigkeit seines Baues…erregten in dem Kaiser den Wunsch, denselben auch der späteren Zukunft zu erhalten und durch den Künstler auf sorgfältigste Weise präparieren zu lassen, um ihm einen Platz in seinem neu gegründeten Museum anzuweisen” (Fitzinger in Bauer 83). The speed with which Soliman’s remains were preserved leads Bauer to conclude that the Kaiser had begun planning for Soliman’s death and subsequent preservation long before it actually occurred (85). The documentation of the Vienna Academy of the Sciences also notes that Soliman’s family was actively involved in the process, but, as Bauer’s excerpts from the 1796 records of the court police office show, this was not the case. Bauer found three entries in the records that show Josephine Soliman petitioning for the consignment of her father’s remains for proper burial. The archbishop himself even wrote a letter on her behalf to the same effect, but Soliman’s remains stayed where they were until their accidental destruction (86-89).
Bauer’s contribution to the body of knowledge about Soliman is invaluable, but Monika Firla has afforded the most nuanced and exhaustively researched corpus of work on Soliman’s life and social significance so far. She annotated and reissued Bauer’s 1922 biography in 1993 with several additions: the text of Karoline Pichler’s 1808 biography, a list of important personal and professional events in Soliman’s life, and an introduction discussing the weaknesses of Pichler’s and Bauer’s characterizations of Soliman as well as the racial politics of the Enlightenment. In 2001, Firla published a short text exploring Soliman’s own possible role in the treatment of his remains, titled Verkörpert uns Soliman? Oder: Hat er seine Haut selbst gespendet? Eine Provokation zu STATION*CORPUS. Then, in 2003, in a booklet titled “Segen, Segen, Segen auf Dich, guter Mann!” Angelo Soliman und seine Freunde Graf Franz Mortiz von Lacy, Ignaz von Born, Johann Anton Mertens und Ferenc Kazinczy, Firla published the results of intensive archival research concerning Soliman. She reproduces in full and analyzes letters from his Masonic brothers and military colleagues that shed light on his position within Viennese high society⁸.

It is interesting to note that during the course of her research on Soliman, Firla’s interpretation of Soliman’s agency in his own life has shifted significantly. Her earlier work depicts Soliman as a victim of larger societal forces and racist discourse, while her later work (i.e. after 1996, when she collaborated with Gstettner on the dance piece

---

⁸ Firla unearthed Soliman’s death mask at the Rollettmuseum in Baden bei Wien and organized a special exhibit around it, and she collaborated with Bert Gstettner of TANZ*HOTEL Studios in Vienna on a modern dance piece about Soliman (Angelo*Soliman, 1996).
Angelo *Soliman*) concentrates on his agency within his social environment and his accomplishments.

In her introduction to the 1993 reissue of Bauer’s 1922 biography, Firla explores the role of court moors in eighteenth-century Europe, relates the circumstances surrounding Pichler’s and Bauer’s biographical writing on Soliman, and, most importantly, interprets Soliman’s position within Viennese society. She writes,


Firla’s strong criticism of the social system that, as she says, “determined” the boundaries and possibilities of Soliman’s life is clearly visible. She also criticizes the exoticism that commodified and restrained him.

In her 2001 text *Verkörpert uns Soliman?*, Firla added a greater measure of depth to her perspective on Soliman. She discusses the manner in which he was exhibited, i.e.,
in a diorama with stuffed exotic animals from the Americas, and points out that the Hofnaturalienkabinett contained several other stuffed Africans in addition to Soliman. Then Firla introduces the possibility that Soliman himself could have willed his body to science, giving his own remains to the scientists who prepared them for exhibition. She writes that this act would have been no different from the countless ways people of color have had to (and still have to) change their bodies and their demeanors to fit the dominant worldview and survive in their social environment (Verkörpert 3). She points out that many of Soliman’s closest friends and intellectual peers were members of the avant-garde within the natural sciences and organizers of anatomical theaters. According to Soliman’s estate records, two of these intellectual peers (and Masons in the lodge Zur wahren Eintracht) were present when the will was read: August Veit(h) von Schittlersberg and Rudolf Vetter. They appear on the list of the heirs and the faithful (Verkörpert 6). Firla indicates that they may indeed have been heirs, but to Soliman’s remains instead of his possessions. She reasons that Soliman may have kept this particular part of his will from his daughter Josephine on purpose, to spare her pain, which would explain her repeated attempts to recover his body from the museum. Another possible explanation would be that perhaps Soliman had not foreseen that his remains would be exhibited in quite such a lifelike way, and Josephine was the only one who knew of his specific expectations (Verkörpert 15).

Firla also explores new dimensions of the existing writings on Soliman to give credence to her working thesis: for example, she finds in Pichler’s biography two

---

9 Bauer quotes the list of heirs and faithful: “H. Doktor Veith wie Dr. Vetter welcher die Zeitungsblätter einlegte” (Bauer 70), and openly admits to being puzzled by this entry. Firla hypothesizes that it refers to
possible hidden references to the exhibition of Soliman’s remains, which Pichler never overtly mentions. First, Pichler characterizes Soliman as follows: “Sein Wort war ihm unabänderlich heilig, und was er nach reifer Überlegung beschlossen hatte, war durch keine Überredung mehr zu erschüttern” (Pichler cited in Verkörpert 15). This description could refer to his decision to will his remains to science. Second, Pichler does not end her biography with Soliman’s death, but rather with a description of his appearance: “Seine Tracht war immer die vaterländische, eine Art von Türkischer weiter Kleidung, meistens blendend weiß, wodurch die glänzende Schwärze seiner Haut noch vorteilhafter erschien” (Pichler cited in Verkörpert 16). While the clothing Soliman chose to wear was not actually of his fatherland, it was the aesthetic he preferred in life. Firla theorizes that Pichler’s choice to place this sentence at the very end of the biography could have been in protest against the manner in which he was exhibited in Vienna, an uncomfortable detail known to all Viennese readers, but which also need not be revealed to the uninitiated, perhaps for fear of undermining the progressive purpose of Grégoire’s volume, i.e., to prove by examples that black men could be brought up to the same level of civilization as white men (Verkörpert 16).

Firla ends her short text by turning her investigative and accusing eye on the reader herself: she claims the the most oft-told detail of Soliman’s life is what occurred after his death—the scandalous devaluing of a human life and the reduction of its importance to the physical aspect. But, Firla inquires, what exactly are modern biographers and their readers doing except perpetuating that process? By concentrating

---

10 The full text of Pichler’s biography appears in the 1993 reissue of Bauer’s biography on pages 112-18.
on that detail in favor of Soliman’s human achievements, one further objectifies him and relegates him to the cabinet of wonders, exceptions and exotics (Verkörpert Firla 20).

Monika Firla’s most recent work about Soliman is a slim volume entitled “Segen, Segen, Segen auf Dich, guter Mann!” Angelo Soliman und seine Freunde Graf Franz Moritz von Lacy, Ignaz von Born, Johann Anton Mertens und Ferenc Kazinczy (2003). In it, Firla gathers all the known facts about Soliman’s relationship with Count Franz Moritz von Lacy, a military colleague, Ferenc Kazinczy, a personal friend from Vienna, and Ignaz von Born and Johann Anton Mertens, both Masonic brothers of Soliman. She also publishes a letter to Soliman from Mertens (published previously in 1996), a letter to Soliman from von Lacy (newly unearthed by Firla in the state archives in Vienna), a letter from Soliman to Kazinczy (found in a collection of letters already published by Istvan Fried but heretofore untranslated from Hungarian) and details from von Born’s 1792 biography that had possibly been collected by Soliman. In this publication, Firla carries out her challenge to the reader of her 2001 Verkörpert uns Soliman? by concentrating on Soliman’s life and achievements instead of the fate of his remains. The letters Firla reprints all indicate the high level of respect Soliman had earned from his colleagues and friends.

**Soliman in Other Publications**

Soliman’s biography also appears in several volumes published in the past fifteen years: Dietmar Grieser includes a brief biography of Soliman in his 1994 work Wien: Wahlheimat der Genies, a collection of biographies of artists and great minds who made Vienna their adopted home. Grieser’s chapter on Soliman appears to be taken entirely
from Pichler’s and Bauer’s works, although it is more reductive than either one and outdated in its terminology\textsuperscript{11}.

Peter Martin includes Soliman in his 2001 volume *Schwarze Teufel, edle Mohren: Afrikaner in Geschichte und Bewußtsein der Deutschen*, a work encompassing a wide range of Afro-German and Afro-Austrian figures, as well as the evolution of race theory and race relations in the German-speaking world\textsuperscript{12}. Biographical information on Soliman now also appears on the *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung* website, courtesy of Monika Firla.

\textsuperscript{11} Grieser attributes Soliman’s fame to his exotic looks and actually refers to Africa as a dark continent.
\textsuperscript{12} Martin also mentions that the character Monostatos in Mozart’s *Zauberflöte* (1791) is likely based on Soliman, and that Robert Musil included, as he puts it, a character of no small importance named Angelo Soliman in his opus *Mann ohne Eigenschaften* (Martin 240).
Chapter 3: Fanon’s Psychoanalytical Model of the Black Male Psyche

The life and death of Angelo Soliman raise many questions: how does one characterize Soliman’s hybrid position in Viennese society that shaped him as a highly intellectual individual and simultaneously presented him as an object of curiosity? What assumptions can be made about Soliman’s own internalization of Enlightenment social and intellectual mores? What does the contemporary treatment of Soliman’s biography in scholarly and artistic interpretation indicate about modern prejudices and race politics?

The scholarly work of Frantz Fanon, namely his 1952 book *Black Skin, White Masks*, can help find possible answers to these questions. Although Fanon concerned himself with the psychology of the black man under the stresses of colonization and coloniality—a much later phenomenon than concerns Soliman—some of his conclusions are also valid for discussing Soliman’s construction of his own identity and the way modern artists have portrayed it. Many of the erroneous ideas about race that Fanon critiqued were spawned during the Enlightenment: the idea that five races exist, four of which are merely stages of deviation from the Caucasian norm, for example, from which the pathologization of blackness springs. The idea that people of color are biologically and measurably inferior to whites, with reference to an array of biological statistics such as brain weight, is also an Enlightenment idea. These pseudoscientific hypotheses, which came to be treated as laws, were born in the eighteenth century and later were used to justify imperialism and slavery. However, race theory was an influential area of study that informed the thought of the Enlightenment’s major minds, and it is therefore appropriate to explore the possibility of Soliman’s acceptance of race theory. Monika

---

13 See also my remarks on pages 7 through 9 in the Chapter 1.
Firla explores the extent to which Soliman may have internalized a pathologized view of his own physical self in response to the intellectual discourse of his peer group. She emphasizes, “Daß Soliman durch seine von mir unterstellte Körperspende sich selbst rassistisch diskriminierte, ändert am Skandal der Ausstopfung nichts, sondern macht ihn nur noch schlimmer. Zynisch formuliert war Soliman jedoch sehr ‘modern’” (Verkörper Firla 19). Fanon’s work helps tease out the full import of Firla’s words. He describes the process by which a black child internalizes a ‘white’ attitude: “The black schoolboy…identifies himself with the explorer, the bringer of civilization, the white man who carries truth to savages—an all-white truth. There is identification—that is, the young Negro subjectively adopts a white man’s attitude” (Fanon 147). Again, even though Fanon’s interpretation takes place in a colonial context, this process of internalization would seem to apply to Soliman as well: taken as a small child from his family and thrown into an alien environment linguistically and culturally, the young Soliman would have had to choose between rejecting or accepting his new world. As we know from Pichler’s biography, Soliman was tutored when he lived in Sicily as a child, and learned Italian. In the next few years of his life, Soliman mastered the speaking, reading and writing of six languages altogether. Fanon does not underestimate the importance of linguistic mastery. “A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language….Mastery of language affords remarkable power” (Fanon 18). Yet with the power afforded by linguistic mastery, Fanon writes, there comes also an implicit acceptance and internalization of the world implied by that language. Not only does the man possess the world, but the world also possesses the man. Fanon expresses his indignance at the necessity of this acceptance:
“...the black man should no longer be confronted by the dilemma, *turn white or disappear*; but he should be able to take cognizance of a possibility of existence” (Fanon 100).

Fanon describes the form this psychic necessity takes in his reaction to a train trip during which he realizes the depth and breadth of the gulf separating him from the white passengers surrounding him. “On that day, completely dislocated...I took myself far off from my own presence, far indeed, and made myself an object. What else could it be for me but an amputation, an excision, a hemorrhage that spattered my whole body with black blood? But I did not want this revision, this thematization. All I wanted was to be a man among men” (Fanon 112). Fanon’s psychic self-mutilation is a strategy to cope with the larger trauma of the conflict between his own self-image and the image white people have of him. This is the central conflict of Fanon’s treatise, and a conflict that Soliman must surely have also faced. Fanon writes, “…the individual who *climbs up* into society—white and civilized—tends to reject his family—black and savage—on the plane of imagination […] In this case...the family structure is cast back into the *id*” (Fanon 149). Fanon’s characterization of the racialization of the parts of the self mirrors Pichler’s description of Soliman’s character: “Sein Gemüths-Charakter war von Natur nach der Weise seines Vaterlandes aufbrausend und heftig; desto schöner, desto verehrenswürdiger war die stets gleiche Heiterkeit und Sanftmuth seines Betragens, eine Frucht mühsamer Kämpfe und manches Sieges über sich selbst” (Pichler in Bauer 117-118). While it is possible to attribute Pichler’s biologically deterministic view to personal beliefs or the dearth of sources of information on Soliman, it is also important to remember that Pichler’s biography was published only eleven years after Soliman’s death.
and in a progressive volume on the achievements of Africans, and so must be taken to be at least partially representative of “enlightened” European attitudes on the subject. Perhaps even Soliman himself would have rendered his struggle against himself in the same way. If Soliman can be assumed to have identified with the attitudes of his white European masters and companions, he can also be assumed to have experienced, on some level, a similar psychic amputation to the one Fanon outlines.

Fanon’s work seems to provide an almost perfect framework for interpreting Soliman’s life and artistic depictions of Soliman’s life because of his description of a black man’s internalization of a worldview that demonizes black people. “Moral consciousness implies a kind of scission, a fracture of consciousness into a bright part and an opposing black part. In order to achieve morality, it is essential that the black, the dark, the Negro vanish from consciousness. Hence a Negro is forever in combat with his own image” (Fanon 194). Fanon sees the process of internalization as an amputation, a self-objectification, a bloody and forcible vivisection of the organic whole of the psyche.

Aside from describing the effects of life in a white world on the black man, Fanon also describes the function of the black man in the European psyche. “For the majority of white men the Negro represents the sexual instinct (in its raw state). The Negro is the incarnation of a genital potency beyond all moralities and prohibitions… The Negro is taken as a terrifying penis” (Fanon 177). According to Fanon, the black man acts as a phobogenic object in the eyes of white Europeans because he symbolizes the biological, the purely sexual, and in fact becomes a penis symbol. Fanon argues the black man’s position as sexual symbol also locates him directly in the white European id, and therefore not only functions as a source of anxiety but also becomes a symbol of evil and
ugliness. He is careful to indicate that ‘Negrophobia’ is a condition resulting from a denial of sexual desires and the projection of these desires onto the other, the black man. “The white man is convinced that the Negro is a beast; if it is not the length of the penis, then it is the sexual potency that impresses him. Face to face with this man who is ‘different from himself,’ he needs to defend himself. In other words, to personify the Other. The Other will become the mainstay of his preoccupations and his desires” (Fanon 170). The white European psyche, while repressing the frightening caricature of the black man into the id, is also preoccupied with this figure for the same reasons that brought about its repression. “Jung consistently identifies the foreign with the obscure, with the tendency to evil: He is perfectly right. This mechanism of projection—or, if one prefers, transference—has been described by classic psychoanalysis. In the degree to which I find in myself something unheard-of, something reprehensible, only one solution remains for me: to get rid of it, to ascribe its origin to someone else” (Fanon 190). By associating sin, sexuality and vice with the black man, the white European psyche could more effectively distance these repressed wishes from its consciousness. Yet an analysis of Soliman’s biography and works of art based on that biography must also take into account that this colonial psychoanalytical approach is anachronistic in some ways. While the colonial propaganda that cast black Africans as violent dogs or unsophisticated children was still a century away when Soliman died in 1796, the Enlightenment was the crucible of the misguided empiricism of race theory that gave birth to that propaganda. The pathologized other’s appearance in anatomical theaters and museums as an object of study to assist white Europeans in better understanding themselves is evidence enough of the applicability of some of Fanon’s ideas to precolonial times.
Through Fanon’s psychoanalytical lens, the violence under the surface of Soliman’s everyday existence in Europe becomes clear as it is depicted by Ludwig Fels and Lukas Holliger whose work form the basis of the following chapter. As Monika Firla claims, many modern artists tend to focus on the gruesome use made of his remains, and yet one must view Soliman’s life and achievements in the light thrown on them by the everyday psychological violence that reached its climax in the exhibition of his skin. Austrian artists Ludwig Fels and Lukas Holliger focus on the personal toll these achievements may have taken on Soliman and render their own interpretation of Soliman’s life that are only loosely based on the historical information given in his biographies.
Chapter 4: Soliman Portrayed in Modern Austrian Theater

Ludwig Fels’s *Soliman* (1991)

Fels’s play takes considerable artistic liberties with the known facts of Soliman’s biography. In his play, Soliman serves a Count von Lakomy who fires him for marrying Magdalena. Von Lakomy had been one of many suitors vying for Magdalena’s hand prior to her marriage to Soliman, and he is incensed that she chose his black servant over him. He convinces his friend Baron Schippani to take Soliman into his service and allow him to live on his estate. Von Lakomy will then visit as often as possible and try to seduce Magdalena. Schippani agrees on the condition that he may have access to Magdalena once the intrigue has succeeded.

Soliman is also the subject of a plot between Kaiser Franz II of Austria and his court painter Tauterer. The Kaiser has requested that Tauterer paint Soliman, and, fearing that the status-conferring exotic specimen will die, has also requested that Tauterer stuff and mount Soliman’s skin once he is dead. This plot eventually leads to Soliman’s murder at the end of the play. Soliman’s only ally other than Magdalena is Leo, the black African zookeeper at the Imperial Palace at Schönbrunn. He is the only person who understands Soliman’s anger and loneliness in Viennese society. All these characters come together in the final scene at the Schönbrunn Zoo, where, in a burst of confused violence, Leo kills one of the lions, the Baron stabs Leo, and Tauterer kills Soliman by severing his spinal cord, leaving only a very small wound so that Soliman’s skin may be easily removed and stuffed.
It is productive to structure an analysis of Fels’s work into two categories: white characters’ reactions to Soliman and Leo, and Soliman’s and Leo’s reactions to the social world of Vienna. The white world of Vienna in Fels’s play embodies almost perfectly Frantz Fanon’s ideas about the function of the black man in a psychoanalytic schema: first, according to Fanon, the black man is a phobogenic object, a symbol of the penis, the biological, the sexual, and as such, corresponds to the white European’s id and calls up anxieties related to repressed desires. Soliman’s position in Vienna also reflects another tendency noted by Fanon: an educated black man will be seen either as an exception to black stereotypes or as a substantiation of those stereotypes.

In terms of Soliman’s and Leo’s own psychological survival mechanisms in Vienna, Fanon’s model of psychic self-mutilation is particularly apt, and is even carried out physically in the final scene of the play. The image of a caged animal is developed throughout the play as a metaphor for Soliman’s and Leo’s isolated and limited position within Viennese society, as well as for the repressed id of the play’s white characters, and the protective shell Soliman and Leo have to adopt to exist in Vienna.

Fels’s play opens with a dark stage. Soliman and Leo are standing there, but only become visible as they powder their faces and hair white. The audience sees them for the first time, silently acting out their adoption of, as Fanon has put it, a white identity. But, as the audience soon sees, taking on a white identity also means that Soliman and Leo must step outside themselves and objectify themselves in the same way their white compatriots objectify them. For example, in response to Leo’s complaints about his living conditions, Soliman points out to Leo that he is not beaten, and so his condition is comparatively comfortable. Leo replies, “Nein, ich werde ausgelacht! Das ist fast
schwerer zu ertragen! Sogar der Kaiser lacht und befiehlt, mich gut zu füttern… Und das Schlimme ist: ich lache zurück” (Fels 23). This is exactly the psychic self-mutilation that Fanon describes as the black man’s necessary reaction to the realization that white Europeans do not see him as part of their social group, even though he has internalized the same values. Leo has adopted the same attitude that pathologizes him, and interacting with other (white) people forces him to pathologize and objectify himself.

The Baron and the Count represent the powerful white Austrian male, presented in the play as a figure of privileged and normalized status. Everything not white, Austrian or male is pathologized: defined as a deviation from the white norm and sometimes viewed in a scientific light. The Baron’s children, at dinner with Soliman, express the pathologized position of the Other in their detailed questions about Soliman’s body: “Weint er Blut, Vater?” “Wieso hat Herr Soliman weiße Zähne?” (Fels 36). The rhymes that children call out to Soliman on the street express this same phenomenon. “Mohr, Mohr, Mohr,/ du hast ein schwarzes Ohr,/ einen dicken Bauch,/ schmutzig ist der auch” (Fels 47). The comments of passersby upon seeing Leo evince this pathologized view of the other as well. “Wissen möcht ich, ob auch sein Scheißdreck Schwarz ist.” “Wollen wir nachschaun: vielleicht ist sein Arsch weiß” (ibid.). Fels evokes the brutal nature of this ‘scientific’ interest by emphasizing the intrusive and inappropriate quality of the comments.

The Count and the Baron, in the first scene of the play, establish the boundaries of normal as white, male and Austrian. The Count, upset that Soliman has ‘stolen’ Magdalena from him, will only drink white wine if the discussion must be of the “Negro.” The Baron remarks jokingly that, “[Weiber] passen gut zum Wein, und
schwarz sind sie nur zwischen den Beinen” (Fels 10), making a connection between
the otherness of the black African and the female. Then the Count, after having driven a
Hungarian whore from their table in a tavern, tells the Baron, “...wer weiß, vor welcher
Krankheit ich Sie gerettet habe! Vor der ungarischen Pest. Vor der slawischen Syphilis,
der türkischen Diarrhöe…” (Fels 12). In the dominant white Austrian male worldview
exemplified by these two central figures, otherness blights all beings without the
dominant color, gender and nationality. Even touching these members of the other races
or the other gender can damage the integrity of the dominant white male.

The separation between white and non-white, and male and non-male, appears in
the very first spoken words in the play, in a children’s rhyme that may be translated in
two different ways. “Die Neger sind schwarz, die Neger sind braun./ Sie hassen die
Männer, sie lieben die Frau” (Fels 9). Depending on variations in intonation and word
stress, the second line means either “They hate the men, they love the women,” or “The
men hate them, the women love them.” If the audience interprets the line to mean the
latter, then it prefigures the pathologization and repression of non-whites, non-Austrians
and non-males later in the play. Fanon’s description of the black man as sexual symbol is
here in miniature: the terrifying phallic symbol of the black man terrifies the
intellectually-oriented white male by corresponding to repressed desires and attracts the
supposedly illogical and physically-oriented female by the same token. At the same time,
the children’s rhyme corresponds with the Count’s and the Baron’s definition of
otherness that extends beyond skin color.

Even though otherness is demonized and pathologized, the play’s white male
characters also feel themselves drawn to it. The phallic symbol of the black man is an
aspect of the ideal of unlimited virility described by Fanon, and the white male
characters are driven by a wish to possess it. The Count, fantasizing about seducing or
raping Magdalena, says to the Baron, “Ich habe noch nie eine Frau gehabt, die es mit
einem Neger hatte” (Fels 14). Unable to acknowledge his repressed wish for the
boundless sexual energy he attributes to Soliman, the Count can only touch it indirectly,
through his planned seduction of Magdalena. The issue of Soliman’s sexuality haunts the
Count and preoccupies him. He says to the Baron, “Kein Affe würde den Beischlaf mit
einem Menschenweibchen verweigern, wie gewiß ist, daß ein Neger es mit jedem
Schwein triebe, wenn es der Sau nicht grausen tät. […] Die Neger sind Tiere. Sie lecken
ihren Schweiß, damit sie noch geiler werden” (Fels 14-15). It is highly ironic that the
Count attributes sexual deviancy to Soliman, because he himself possesses the very same
sexual desires and preoccupations that he uses to label Soliman as deviant. In the
twentieth scene, the extent of the Count’s sexual fantasies and desires is revealed when
he offers payment and verbal encouragement to a bear handler to force his bear into
sexual contact with a prostitute, an event that the Baron promptly attributes to Soliman.
“Der Anblick unsres Solimans macht alle Weiber zu Huren” (Fels 57).

The Count is continually searching for proof of Soliman’s rampant sexual desires
and prowess, even to the point of harassing Magdalena for details of her married life.
Magdalena says to Soliman after their dinner with the Baron, interrupted by the Count,
“[Der Graf] hat dir nicht verziehn, daß ich für ihn nicht zu haben war. Ach, ich hätte
ihnen sagen müssen, daß du drei Mal am Tag dein Bedürfnis befriedigst und mich sieben
Mal in der Nacht nimmst” (Fels 42). Magdalena dismissively characterizes the Count’s
hunger for the unbounded sexuality they attribute to Soliman. But despite his own sexual
voracity and deviancy, the Count longs to exact revenge on Soliman for the—as he perceives it—threatening sexuality that has empowered his former servant to “steal” Magdalena. Fanon outlines this very same phenomenon in his analysis of the black male as a phobogenic figure for white Europeans. “Still on the genital level, when a white man hates black men, is he not yielding to a feeling of impotence or of sexual inferiority? Since his ideal is an infinite virility, is there not a phenomenon of diminution in relation to the Negro, who is viewed as a penis symbol? Is the lynching of the Negro not a sexual revenge?” (Fanon 159). Ironically, it is exactly Soliman’s status as biological symbol and therefore social inferior that makes it impossible for the Count to revenge himself by the normal route, a duel. He is forced to think of another way, and decides to symbolically castrate Soliman by cuckolding him.

As Soliman becomes a symbol for the Count of repressed sexuality, he also becomes a symbol of ugliness, and of the anxieties that lead to the repression of sexuality. Fanon writes, “The Negro is the genital. Is this the whole story? Unfortunately not. The Negro is something else. … The black man is the symbol of Evil and Ugliness” (Fanon 180). Fels’ audience sees this tendency in the often-obscene rhymes the children of Vienna sing at Soliman and Leo. The rhymes parody everything Soliman and Leo do: the Magdalena of the children’s rhymes is a sexually aroused woman clinging to Soliman’s leg and “[sie] leckt [ihm] ab den Dreck vom schwarzen Leib” (Fels 32). The Soliman of the children’s rhymes is a “ein reger Tunichtgut mit schwarzen Augen, die als Licht im Arschloch taugen” (Fels 33). The rhymes define Soliman’s position in Viennese society as a symbol of repressed sexual desires and unmentionable physical processes associated with these desires.
The court painter Tauterer takes a different approach to alterity than that taken by the Count. Instead of projecting prodigious sexual prowess and desire onto Soliman, Tauterer casts him in the role of a great exception to the stereotypes about black men, although in the process he only substantiates the stereotypes. He consistently compares Soliman with Leo and casts Leo as the embodiment of the black male stereotype: an ape without intellect (Fels 26). Tauterer admires Soliman’s aesthetic appeal and exotic look, an admiration that quickly reveals itself to be just as invested in objectification as the contempt the Count shows for Soliman. “Vom Sklaven zum Kunstwerk. Welch Karriere!” (Fels 19). Tauterer sees Soliman not as an individual, but as raw material to be turned into something of value, a work of art. He tells the Emperor, who has commissioned a painting of Soliman as well as the preservation, mounting and stuffing of his skin after he is dead, how he conceptualizes the process of painting the court moor: “Das Innerste nach außen gemalt. […] Jedes Haar Relief. Jede Pore Ornament. Sein Gesicht wird sein, über das Ebenmaß hinaus, eine Landkarte der Gefühle der Menschheit” (ibid.). The artist is always trying to shape Soliman into something more exotic and manipulate his image into a distorted version of what a “moor” should be.

Tauterer is intrigued by Soliman’s hybrid position as exotic symbol and acculturated individual, and he wants to exploit that contradiction in his depictions of Soliman. “Sehen Sie, ich möchte Sie als Soldaten malen, Soliman, wie Sie vielleicht einem lachenden Türken den Säbel ins Herz stoßen. Die Damen der Gesellschaft lieben Helden, die gegen Heiden keine Gnade kennen. Ich male Sie in Blut und Feuer, Soliman!” Soliman replies, “Warum, wenn ich das fragen darf, malen Sie mich nicht so wie ich bin?”, to which Tauterer responds, “Dann sähen Sie nur Ihrem Freund [Leo]
ähnlich! Dann holte ich mir lieber einen Affen und setzte ihm einen Helm auf den Kopf!” (Fels 26). From the painter’s perspective, if Soliman is not a great exception to the animalistic stereotypes of black men, then he can do nothing but substantiate them. But Tauterer’s intention to paint Soliman as a Christian soldier fighting the expansionist Ottomans, even though an accurate depiction of his earlier military career, plays on Soliman’s hybridity in an ironic way. Such a depiction would be almost comically ironic: one heathen killing another in the name of an alien religion. The court painter’s casual remark, “[d]ie Damen der Gesellschaft lieben Helden, die gegen Heiden keine Gnade kennen” (Fels 26) only serves to underscore Soliman’s alterity. Even as Tauterer exults in Soliman’s exceptional nature and appearance, the painter’s perspective is still mired in stereotypes. “[Soliman] ist unzweifelhaft ein Angehöriger der menschlichen Rassen, anatomisch sowohl als auch anthropologisch, aber seine Augen: blicken wie aus einem Käfig” (Fels 64). The exoticism with which Tauterer views Soliman exposes the contradictions in his artistic gaze: he pretends to respect Soliman but actually sees in him only a fascinating specimen. It appears as if Fels extrapolated Tauterer’s attitude from the historical documentation from the Vienna Academy of the Sciences that identifies Soliman as “eine in der Residenz allgemein bekannte aber auch geschätzte und sehr geachtete Persönlichkeit.” The same documentation rationalizes the exhibition of his remains: “die Schönheit seiner feingeschnittenen Gesichtszüge sowie auch die Zartheit und Ebenmässigkeit seines Baues…erregten in dem Kaiser den Wunsch, denselben auch der späteren Zukunft zu erhalten und durch den Künstler auf sorgfältigste Weise präparieren zu lassen, um ihm einen Platz in seinem neu gegründeten Museum anzuweisen” (Fitzinger in Bauer 83).
Soliman’s hybrid position in Viennese society stems from the fact that he has been acculturated in a society with a deep phobia of blackness and has at least partially also internalized this phobia. This situation leads to the psychic amputation Fanon describes, the moment of self-objectification that makes it possible for a black man to function in a white European environment as a European cultural agent. Fels’ Soliman even sees his own name as a dimension of his alterity. “Soliman. So heißt niemand dort, wo ich herkomme, und so heißt niemand hier!” Magdalena replies indignantly, “Ich!” (Fels 32). Soliman’s name mirrors his hybrid position and the psychic wounds he must inflict upon himself in order to exist in Vienna. Like Soliman, the name really belongs in neither Africa nor Europe. It is a fabricated idea of foreignness, drawing attention to Soliman’s origins not as they are, but as Europeans think they are. His name locates him squarely within European culture by virtue of its conspicuous inauthenticity, and yet also locates him on the margin of European culture by virtue of its conspicuous foreignness. Soliman’s name mirrors Fanon’s description of the position of the educated black man in Europe as an object of curiosity and simultaneous exception to and substantiation of black stereotypes. The name also mirrors the damage Soliman has had to wreak on his own psyche by stepping outside himself as Fanon did and making himself an object. The name he calls his own is not his own, but the name given to an object by someone else. However, in a simple, surprising exclamation, Magdalena explodes the vicious circle that has trapped Soliman. With her indignant “Ich!” Magdalena accepts him for the person he has made himself. His name, previously the marker of his difference, becomes a marker of acceptance through his marriage to Magdalena. By taking on his name, Magdalena has assisted Soliman in self-actualization. Their relationship is the eye of the storm in the
play. Magdalena is the only person in Fels’ play who does not see Soliman as an object, but rather as an individual.

But it is important to delve deeper into the mechanism of the marriage presented in Fels’ play. Has Soliman only been able to overcome the process of subjugation reflected in his name by subjugating someone else (Magdalena) and recapitulating the objectifying act of naming? This is an uncomfortable question to ask, because the audience only sees Soliman comfortable and confident when he is with his wife. Her obvious devotion to him stands in stark contrast to the Count’s contempt for him and Tauterer’s haughty and overbearing admiration of his aesthetic. The audience’s liking for Soliman stems from his mostly graceful manner in dealing with a society that objectifies him, and yet Soliman’s own internalization of the same tendency to objectify is right under the surface of his scenes with Magdalena. When she asks if he loves her, Soliman replies, “Wie ein Mann eine Frau.” She presses him for a more complete answer, and he says, “Deine Liebe rettet mir das Leben” (Fels 28). Magdalena’s willingness to subject herself to him acts as proof of masculinity in the eyes of the Count and perhaps in Soliman’s eyes as well, and quite literally frees Soliman from the emasculating servitude he has heretofore been enduring as a servant in the Count’s household.

Fels’s play reflects Fanon’s ideas on the victimization of the black man in Soliman’s life. But Fels avoids focusing on an important point: Soliman was an integral figure in Vienna’s intellectual life, and his achievements remain unseen in Fels’s theatrical world. Fels concentrates on the impossibility of a normal existence and an unscarred psyche for Soliman and deliberately alters Soliman’s biography to deflect attention from his successes in negotiating his position as Other. The most glaring
omission is Soliman’s masonic ties, which indicate the respect he had garnered from his intellectual peers. Fels chooses to concentrate instead on Soliman’s victimhood and the ways in which the values and fears of white Europe colonized his psyche. Fels’ interpretation of Soliman corresponds closely with Fanon’s psychoanalytic model in which the black male represents repressed sexual desires for white European males, a situation leading to the fear and attraction the Count and the Baron feel toward Soliman. Even Fels himself might be said to indulge in this exoticizing process by depicting Soliman only as a victim and object of racism.

Andreas Pflüger and Lukas Holliger’s Der schwarze Mozart (2005)

Lukas Holliger’s comedic three-act opera Der schwarze Mozart approaches Soliman’s story from a different point of view than that of Fels’s play. Holliger juxtaposes Soliman’s ghost with a young black man in modern Vienna, Patrick Lope. Patrick studies macroeconomics and works as a bartender. When one of his customers, a skinhead, chases and threatens him drunkenly, Patrick is saved by Mirjam Metzger, the proprietor of a tourist-trap concert series in which the players wear eighteenth century costumes and play eighteenth century music. She employs men to dress as Mozart and sell tickets to foreigners on the plazas of the inner city. Patrick takes a job with her as a Mozart impersonator and they immediately fall in love. However, soon after settling into his new job and, as Mirjam seems to think, also his new identity, Patrick finds himself unhappy and tries to leave Vienna. Before he can get to the bank to clean out his account, he is forced by a strange conspiracy of circumstances into the museum in Mozart’s birth house, where he stumbles through a glass and finds Mozart and Soliman
playing billiards in the Masonic Lodge *Zur wahren Eintracht*. Soliman relates his biography and Patrick reveals his secret desire to be a musician just before being arrested for supposed vandalism. Soliman visits him in prison and gives him a flute, telling him to play well and he will need no other alibi. Patrick is a flute prodigy, as it turns out, and bewitches everyone who hears him. After a meteoric rise to fame, fling with a talk show host (Claire Gynt) and sudden realization of the emptiness of celebrity and of the fact that Mozart was playing through him the entire time, Patrick is taken for his own double and probable murderer. As Mirjam begins a relationship with Patrick’s skinhead attacker from the first scene on the condition that he dress and act exactly like Patrick, Patrick himself runs from the police. The skinhead is arrested as the false Patrick, and the real Patrick and Mirjam take up their relationship again. Patrick attempts to publicly reveal the fact that he still lives, but no one believes he is the real Patrick Lope. On advice from Mirjam, Patrick begins spending his days standing in Madame Tussaud’s wax museum as an exhibition of himself, and soon spends his nights there, too, playing billiards with Mozart and Soliman.

Although Holliger’s opera is a comedy, many of the same themes and questions appear in it as in Fels’s tragedy *Soliman*. Holliger depicts a main figure who has, like Fanon, internalized the values of the enlightened European society in which he lives. However, this means something different than it meant for Fanon: Patrick studies macroeconomics and has a very modern faith in self-determination and the irrelevance of the past and in the ability of the individual to self-actualize in the face of other people’s stereotypes. Just before leaving her, he says to Mirjam, who has fled from the problematic present into an idealized version of the Enlightenment, “Zieh endlich dein
Korsett aus, du kannst nicht atmen! Was habt ihr alle gegen die Gegenwart?”

(Holliger 7). He criticizes the skinheads who threaten him for their concentration on the past and their refusal to live in the present. It is Mozart who points out to him that the eighteenth century and the twenty-first century are not so different; human nature does not change. Soliman then tells Patrick his life story as a cautionary tale. The reality of individual identity differs from other people’s perceptions of that identity, and the empty image of the individual, whether in the form of stereotype or idealization, can threaten to supplant the individual itself. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon discusses the gap between a black male individual’s own self-image and the way he is perceived by white society, and he then outlines the consequences of that gap: the psychic amputation that occurs when the black man realizes that he is the Other in the white European schema he internalized as a child. Holliger explores a similar gap, but on a more universal scale. Fame, as Patrick discovers, consists of the creation of an image with no relationship to reality. His proliferating doubles are taken for authentic until no one, not even Patrick, can make the distinction anymore between himself and an image of himself. At their first meeting, Soliman welcomes Patrick to the lodge with, “Willkommen im Club der Freidenker! Willkommen zwischen den Stühlen der Welt. Entfremdet durch Denken, Talent oder Aussehen. Bewundert als Exoten.” Mozart adds, “So sehr ein Fremder mit Talent salonfähig werden kann, so sehr wird ein Salonfähiger mit Talent ein Fremder” (Holliger 11). As Holliger’s Mozart indicates, instead of directly addressing the alienation of the black man in white European society, Holliger addresses the alienating effect of fame through the parallel stories of Patrick and Soliman. Both stories illuminate the exoticism that dogs the celebrity Other in European society, and both
stories conclude when the individual himself has been replaced by his own empty image, quite literally in Soliman’s case.

After his debut as a flute prodigy, Patrick quickly becomes a commodity to be sold by jaded Viennese and bought by enthusiastic tourists. Ironically, it was Soliman who gave him the flute that led to his commodification. The process of commodification begins with reproduction heaped upon reproduction, copy heaped upon copy of the original. While Patrick sits with Claire, his new girlfriend and the host of a popular talkshow, and the two watch themselves on television, the four, i.e. the two Claires and the two Patricks, sing four different parts to form a quartet. The interview Claire and Patrick watch together goes differently than Patrick remembers it and he accuses Claire of having meddled with the recording. Patrick and his media images appear to be acting independently. No one recognizes Patrick for himself on the street, either: “Der wahre Lope ist grösser!” “Nicht so schwarz!” “Viel europäischer.” “Einer wie du und ich” (Holliger 26). The white passersby project their own characteristics onto the Patrick Lope they imagine, because they admire his talent and see him as a great exception to black stereotypes, and therefore less “black” than he really is. Yet Patrick is all the more loved for his exotic looks: fans call him the black Mozart and Claire herself introduces him on her show as the “schwärzeste und faszinierendste Mozart aller Zeiten” (Holliger 17).

Patrick’s doubles continue appearing. The skinhead who had earlier threatened to kill Patrick dresses up as the black Mozart and takes money from tourists in exchange for playing their initials on the flute. Mirjam sees him and they begin a relationship that is predicated on the skinhead’s near-perfect mimicry of Patrick’s mannerisms and mode of
dress, even though Mirjam knows he is not Patrick. “Nicht die Augen aufreissen, das macht Patrick nicht. Du musst ihm immer ähnlich sehen, immer seine Mimik treffen, dann lieb ich dich” (Holliger 23). Even Claire Gynt, after seeing that Patrick is no longer interested in celebrity and realizes that he has taken up an interest in cooking, reacts by mistaking him for one of his doubles. “Das ist nicht Patrick Lope, das ist ein Double. Ein Einbrecher. Ein Verrückter. Mein echter Mann ist verschwunden. Entführt.” The police officer arrests Patrick with the rationalization, “Sie hat recht. Kein Patrick Lope würde kochen, statt zu komponieren oder goldene Stimmgabeln überreicht zu bekommen. Wer immer Sie sind, ich verhafte Sie im Namen des Volkes wegen dringenden Mordverdachts am Patrick Lope” (Holliger 21). Indeed, Claire is right. Patrick is guilty of the murder of one of his doubles. The murder begins when Patrick watches himself with Claire on television and experiences a sudden, jarring alienation from his image on the screen. Is this what he looks like in the eyes of the adoring public? Ironically, Patrick’s attempt to exterminate all the empty, false images of himself leads to his complete withdrawal from society in the form of a wax statue of himself, his own double. After the skinhead’s arrest for Patrick’s murder, Patrick goes to the police station to prove that he is living and that the skinhead is innocent, but he is merely told, “wir haben hier jeden Tag verrückte Doubles. [...] Der richtige Lope trägt keine Jeans, der Richtige ist elegant, und er komponiert. Ununterbrochen” (Holliger 25). In danger of being taken for another double and therefore potential murderer, Patrick decides to hide in Madame Tussaud’s wax museum. Here, he finally finds peace. “Nur als Puppe ist man frei. Ich kann hier stehen, meditieren, mein Schatz bringt mir gebratene Hähnchen. Ich singe mir im Kopf unsterbliche Melodien vor. Was willst du mehr? Ich bin ein Künstler, und das
ist mein Elfenbeinturm” (Holliger 27). Patrick’s decision to become a reproduction of himself and thereby eliminate the question of authenticity echoes the exhibition of Soliman’s remains after his death. Patrick addresses Mozart and Soliman in his final lines in the opera: “He! Ihr Billardspieler? Könnt ihr mich sehen? Was habe ich gesagt? Ich habe es geschafft! Es war eigentlich ganz einfach” (Holliger 28). Patrick had earlier rejected Mozart’s and Soliman’s offer of sanctuary in the spiritual limbo of the Masonic Lodge in favor of defining and asserting his own place within Austrian society. Patrick refuses their invitation to join them in hiding on the premise that he is not a coward, but a fighter. “Wenn du ein Kämpfer bist, was war dann Soliman?” Mozart asks (Holliger 22). Holliger’s Mozart means to say that, regardless of how hard Patrick fights, he cannot change the way he is viewed. He cannot prevent the substitution of an image for the real person. Patrick believes he is different from Soliman because he has chosen his fate, but he is just as immobilized in the face of society’s concept of him as was Soliman, and has ended up in the same place: an exhibit in a museum.
Conclusion

In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon defines the role of the black man in the European psyche as phobogenic. Both Ludwig Fels and Lukas Holliger acknowledge this tendency toward a phobia of blackness, and both explore the process of self-objectification that, according to Fanon, European-acculturated black males undergo: Fels’s Soliman powders his face white in the very first scene, attempting to take on a white identity. Holliger’s Soliman and his counterpart Patrick Lope both end up as exhibits, images instead of individuals. Colonization on an individual psychological level characterizes the existence of both versions of Soliman, but this tendency is not limited to the Enlightenment-era figures in these plays. Monika Firla’s insistence on privileging the living Soliman and his accomplishments over the dead victimized Soliman is a rejection of the phobogenic and colonial attitude of Europeans toward black men. In contrast, both Fels and Holliger seem to concentrate on Soliman’s victimhood rather than his active role in shaping his own life. In Fels’s *Soliman*, the title character’s accomplishments are glossed over. In Holliger’s *Der schwarze Mozart*, Soliman appears as a ghost who foretells and witnesses his modern counterpart’s fate that mirrors his own. From this exploration, one might conclude that the position of black individuals in the European psyche has not become less problematic, but rather Europeans have become more self-conscious about defining it. The same exoticizing impulse that led to the exhibition of Soliman’s remains after his death in 1796 still seems to inform racial discourse in the work of Fels and Holliger. In order to more fully explore this tendency, more research would be needed on other modern depictions of Soliman such as Conny
Hannes Meyer’s *Die schwarze Bekanntschaft oder Angelo Soliman* (1983) or Bert Gstettner’s *Angelo* Soliman (1996).
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Appendix:

Author’s English Translations

of all German Quotations
Page 5: “Nature makes no jumps” (Martin 203-04).

Page 6: “In this way, with their so-called ‘apelike’ bodies, black Africans were supposed to have represented the exact opposite of European middle class virtues: they were depicted as lazy, sexually promiscuous and hedonistic, ugly and without a soul” (Martin 220).

Page 13: “His features were not so far from our concept of beauty as the features of Negroes tend to be […] His character was, in the way of his fatherland, quick-tempered and violent; but all the more lovely and honorable as a result were the constant pleasantness and gentleness of his behavior, which were the fruit of strenuous struggle and triumph over himself” (Pichler in Bauer 117-18).

Page 13: “His dress was always that of his fatherland, a kind of Turkish clothing, usually of a blinding white, against which the shining black of his skin appeared to even better advantage” (ibid.).

Page 15: “Angelo Soliman, of the imperial race of the Numids, a man of beautiful features, great intellect, similar in shape and face to Jugurtha; dear in Africa, Sicily, France, England, Frankish lands, and Austria, a true member of the households of princes” (Bauer 75).

Page 16: “The noble Angelo Soliman, moor in the service of the Fürst Wenzel von Liechtenstein, born in Africa to non-Catholic parents; he himself is Catholic and unmarried […] With the noble Magdalena Christiano, widow of Anton Christiano, secretary to the Count Harrach. She has brought evidence of the death of her first husband […] Witnesses: Franz Gottwald, secretary to Fürst Wenzel Liechtenstein […] Karl Freiheit, university fencing master […] His Eminence the Cardinal himself verbally issued the dispensation for the threefold banns. Both parties gave their oaths freely in the presence of the named witnesses. The husband also swore he is not a slave. This I verify on my priestly word and give my blessing. The choir authority” (Bauer 56).

Page 16: “Married on February 6 by the choir authority. By the order of His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop, this marriage may not be revealed to anyone” (ibid.).

Page 8: “one of the most well-known, treasured and well-regarded personalities at court” (Fitzinger in Bauer 83).

Page 18: “the beauty of his finely-defined facial features as well as the delicacy and symmetry of his build…excited the wish in the Kaiser to preserve these same qualities for posterity and to have them carefully prepared by an artist to assure him a place in his newly founded museum” (ibid.).

Page 20: “The general legal and social conditions under which Soliman had to live and which determined his existence deserve special attention. It throws an especially cheerless light on the so-called Enlightenment of the eighteenth century when one clarifies that a person could, perfectly legally, buy another person and then present this person to someone else as a gift against his will, because he was a highly desirable fashion accessory, indeed, that this person, viewed by his ‘owner’ as a sort of ‘living commodity,’ could marry only secretly, was driven from thirteen-year-long service as a result, and after his death, against the will of his daughter but on an order from the Kaiser, stood for ten years in the Hofnaturalienkabinett half naked in a fantastical costume open to the gaze of any and all” (Firla’s introduction to Bauer 21).
Page 21: “His word was unchangeably holy, and what he decided after much deliberation would never be taken back” (Pichler in Verkörpert Firla 15).

Page 21: “His dress was always that of his fatherland, a kind of Turkish clothing, usually of a blinding white, against which the shining black of his skin appeared to even better advantage” (Pichler in Verkörpert Firla 16).

Page 25: “That Soliman discriminated against himself racially through the presumable donation of his own body changes nothing about the scandal of the stuffing and exhibition of that body, but rather makes it even worse. To formulate it cynically, Soliman was very ‘modern’” (Verkörpert Firla 19).

Page 26: “His character was, in the way of his fatherland, quick-tempered and violent; but all the more lovely and honorable as a result were the constant pleasantness and gentleness of his behavior, which were the fruit of strenuous struggle and triumph over himself” (Pichler in Bauer 118).

Page 31: “No, but I’m ridiculed! That is almost more difficult to bear! Even the Kaiser laughs and orders that I be fed well… And the worst part is, I laugh back” (Fels 23).

Page 32: “Does he cry blood, Father?” “Why does Mr. Soliman have white teeth?” (Fels 36).

Page 32: “Moor, moor, moor, you’ve got a black ear, a fat stomach, and he’s dirty, too” (Fels 47).

Page 32: “I would like to know if his excrement is also black.” “We’d like to see: perhaps his ass is white” (ibid.).

Page 32: “Women go well with wine, and they’re only black between the legs” (Fels 10).

Page 33: “…who knows from what sickness I’ve saved you. From the Hungarian plague. From the Slavic syphilis, the Turkish diarrhea…” (Fels 12).

Page 33: “The Negroes are black, the Negroes are brown, they hate the men, they love the women,” or “the men hate them, the women love them” (Fels 9).

Page 34: “I’ve never had a woman who has done it with a Negro” (Fels 14).

Page 34: “No ape would refuse to sleep with a human female, as sure as a Negro would do it with every pig if it didn’t horrify the sow… Negroes are animals. They lick their sweat to become more aroused” (Fels 14-15).

Page 34: “The gaze of our Soliman makes all women into whores” (Fels 57).

Page 34: “[The Count] has not forgiven you for the fact that he could not have me. Oh, I would have had to tell him that you indulge your desires three times a day and take me seven times every night” (Fels 42).

Page 35: “licking the dirt from his black body” (Fels 32).

Page 35: “ne’er-do-well with black eyes that look like light in an asshole” (Fels 33).

Page 36: “From slave to work of art! What a career!” (Fels 19).

Page 36: “The innermost painted to the outside… Every hair relievo. Every pore an ornament. His face will be, beyond its harmony, a map of the sensibilities of mankind” (ibid.).

Page 36: “You see, I would like to paint you as a soldier, Soliman, perhaps as you thrust your saber into the heart of a smiling Turk. Women of society love heroes who know no mercy for heathens. I will paint you in blood and fire, Soliman!” Soliman replies, “Why, if I may ask, will you not paint me as I am?”, to which
Tauterer responds, “Then you would only resemble your friend [Leo]! Then I might as well get an ape and put a helmet on his head!” (Fels 26).

Page 37: “[Soliman] is undoubtedly a member of the human race, anatomically as well as anthropologically, but his eyes: they gaze as though from a cage” (Fels 64).

Page 37: “one of the most well-known, treasured and well-regarded personalities at court” (Fitzinger in Bauer 83).

Page 37: “the beauty of his finely-defined facial features as well as the delicacy and symmetry of his build…excited the wish in the Kaiser to preserve these same qualities for posterity and to have them carefully prepared by an artist to assure him a place in his newly founded museum” (ibid.).

Page 38: “Soliman. No one has a name like that where I come from, and no one here has a name like it either.” Magdalena replies indignantly, “I do!” (Fels 32).

Page 39: “As a man loves a woman” (Fels 28).

Page 39: “Your love saved my life” (ibid.).

Page 41: “Take your corset off already, you can’t breathe! What have you all got against the present?” (Holliger 7).

Page 42: “Welcome to the club of free-thinkers! Welcome to between the chairs of the world. Alienated through thought, talent or appearance. Admired as exotics” (Holliger 11).

Page 42: “The extent to which an outsider with talent can become socially acceptable is the same as the extent to which a socially acceptable person with talent will become an outsider” (ibid.).

Page 43: “The real Lope is taller!” “Not so black!” “Much more European.” “Someone like you and me” (Holliger 26).

Page 43: “blackest and most fascinating Mozart of all time” (Holliger 17).

Page 43: “Don’t open your eyes so widely like that, Patrick doesn’t do that. You must always look similar to him, always imitate him, and then I will love you” (Holliger 23).

Page 43: “That is not Patrick Lope, that is a double. A burglar. A crazy person. My real husband has disappeared. Kidnapped” (Holliger 21).

Page 43: “She’s right. No Patrick Lope would stand here cooking instead of composing or receiving golden tuning forks. Whoever you are, I arrest you in the name of the people under strong suspicion of the murder of Patrick Lope” (ibid.).

Page 44: “we have crazy doubles coming in here every day…[but] the real Lope doesn’t wear jeans, the real Lope is elegant and he composes without pause” (Holliger 25).

Page 44: “Only as a doll is one free. I can stand here, meditate, my darling brings me roast chicken. I sing eternal melodies to myself in my head. What else do you want? I’m an artist, and this is my ivory tower” (Holliger 27).

Page 44: “Hey! You billiard-players! Can you see me? What did I say? I’ve done it! It was actually quite easy” (Holliger 28).

Page 45: “If you’re a fighter, then what was Soliman?” Mozart asks (Holliger 22).
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