I'm not robot	reCAPTCHA

Continue

Before the law analysis

Before the law. It is the central piece of the unfinished novel by Kafka The Trial. We'll see Orson Welles' film adaptation with Anthony Perkins as Joseph K. Welles plays a condensed version of the parable First The Law that alone makes the film worthy of seeing. See my revised essay "Paable Before The Law" originally published in The Germanic Review, May 1964 copied below. Please also see the chapter "The Missing First Page" by Alberto Manguel's A History of Reading, Viking. This essay was first published in THE GERMANIC REVIEW, May 1964 KAFKA's PARABLE before the war Herbert Deinert The parable "Before the Law" and its context, the chapter "In the Cathedral", have long been recognized as the central piece of Kafka's unfinished novel The Trial [1]. It can, with some qualifications, be considered a key to Kafka's work. Several critics have treated it for a long time, the interpretations of Wilhelm Emrich and Heinz Politzer and, more recently, the brilliant and complete study of Ingeborg Henel is among the deepest [2]. Although these critics differ on many issues, their opinions are not mutually exclusive on all points and it would therefore be naive to state that the following pages will propose something so different to have nothing in common with the interpretations already suggested. However, I believe that by eliminating two errors that have hit previous critics, this article may indicate further - and different - aspects. A mistake, I feel, is K.'s assumption of guilt, which I do not recognize; the other is to sing the individual statements made by the priest and to pronounce them correct readings of the parable, while the priest insists that he is only listing various opinions (p. 200). At first glance, history is simple and mysterious. The plot is so self-evident that apparently challenges further explanation. It is a man whoin vain to get the desiredspends the rest of his life waiting for the permission that is never granted. but even if action is logical, its setting is not at all identical to our reality. neither do we recognize the characters. the man of the country has been restricted to the personification of a persistent desire, the goalkeeper is limited to the function of an obstacle, the identity of the law remains hidden. However, once we accept the type of reality defined by these limitations, the narrative poses no problem. but it is obviously destined to be a parable. this is suggested by its position in the context of the test. some technical devices characteristic of a parable are easily recognized (for example, the absence of appropriate names, the concentration of the plot, the tip at the end.) although the details of the plot are self-explanatory history as a whole certainly requires interpretation. If it's a parable, you have to sign something. What, then, does that mean? a popular approach to kafka is to treat his works as allegories, that is, to look for the second and the concomitant meaning under surface historical age, etc. trying to reveal the identity of the goalkeeper, the man of the country and the law we would proceed to search for something that fits the pattern of the plot, let's say, the man in search a given number of imaginative readers would be able to get to how many more so-called keys different to history. How do we know what the right key is? of course what sounds most likely. It should not be said that this is not at all interpretation, but a guessing game more or less undisciplined, however interesting. would not be basednarration but only on his scheme, scheme, the ray of our knowledge and the whim of our imagination. Either way, we'd be looking behind history rather than in it. The alternative is a careful analysis of a seemingly simple plot. This approach appears more and more in order, since it is the same thing that Kafka - on the surface - has its listener. One morning K., the main figure of The Trial, is pronounced arrested by men he had never met, but remains free to go and continue as before. He is told that legal proceedings are underway against him, but neither is his alleged crime nor the identity of his accusers. The cause is based on a K law. He never heard of it. In the end, it becomes his only ambition to meet the mysterious Court face to contraindicate. One day, in the course of his unsuccessful efforts, after having spent a long period of waiting in the dark and empty cathedral, suddenly known a little illuminated pulpit, a priest begins to address him and what follows is the text of our parable. In line with the traditional writing reading sequence and exegesis K. and the priest engage in a discussion about the meaning of narrative. Like all K.'s efforts, it doesn't take anywhere and we don't have to go into a detailed description. It is important to note, however, that K. is so convinced of his innocence and so worried about getting rid of what must be a false accusation that can see the parable only in the aspect of right and wrong. He has already forgotten or, rather, never understood the arrogant observation of the priest before the recital: "Can't you see two feet ahead?" (p. 254). His immediate reaction is that the man of the country was deceived by the goalkeeper. The priest counts that said the parable in the official version - it belongs, implicitly, to the "Sante Scripture" of the mysterious Court where the proof is being conductedby k. is the official text, then, and speaking of deception is wrongbecause the word deception does not occur. Again and again, in reference to the narrative and weight of logic, K.'s arguments are superimposed. But precisely when both K. and the reader are almost convinced of the benevolence of the goalkeeper it turns out that the priest pursued a strictly academic dispute, he did not commit himself, but he reported only one of the many contradictory opinions [4]. Moreover, it categorically states that these opinions are irrelevant because the text is immutable no matter what its interpretations are and that the opinions themselves are "often nothing that is not a goal and a commitment, he advances a vision according to which is the goalkeeper who has been deceived. Once again, the argument is so logical and well motivated that even K. cannot escape its conclusions. But he also remains willing to give up his previous conviction that the man in the country is a victim of deception must necessarily have a disastrous effect on man from the country. Decided or not, he's at best a fool who should be stripped of his office. The final argument of the priest, in immediate response to the last point of K., is that nowhere the text gives us the right to judge, let alone condemn, the goalkeeper. As a servant of the Law he is well above the scope of human judgment; doubting his valence implies doubting the Law itself. So the priest came to full circle in his argument. Of course, K. cannot agree because it would mean that all that the priest had previously outlined. "You must not consider everything true," re-pplicates the priest, "you must notnecessary only" (p. 264). We're completely confused now. The exegesis is almost four times until whentext. The simple story is no easier. As before, our confusion comes from understanding what is said, but not knowing what to do with it. The individual steps of the subject seem imperfect, but the discussion as a whole has not reached any conclusion whatsoever. The narrative, for all its simplicity, is not clear enough to understand it to the extent necessary for the passing judgment. Although the plot is elementary, the implications escape our understanding. It is two antagonists; the obvious question about who is right and who is wrong remains unanswered. In literary tradition, a parable is told to illustrate a certain point, to teach a golden rule. It is a didactic narrative. K., in its hopeless situation, expects a little lighting, a hint at what steps to take---the reader certainly does. But his attempt to analyze what seems to be a parable destined to him is frustrated: the narrative does not contain any golden rule, it does not suggest a way of behavior in certain conditions. It would seem, then, that it is not at all parable, that the same function of narrative is cruelly to defeat the hope that he had aroused. Yet this cannot be the only purpose of such a elaborate story introduced. In retrospective, it proves both an allegory and a parable. Because it is nothing but a veiled and concentrated account of K's life.. The man in the country is K. himself. There is a difference: K. meets a violent death while the other dies of old age. But it doesn't matter. The unsuccessfulness of such a life is more important than the way it is finally finished And is he not the man of the country "dead" for all practical purposes since he abandons everything only to sit next to the entrance of the law? And you don'tsay the same about K. leaving his usual life course to devotemore and more to his justification? K. at least recognize the relevance of the priest's narrative? The answer is a qualified "yes". Since he himself is trying to obtain admission to the mysterious and elusive The Court instinctively comes to the hypothesis that there are criteria such as guilt and innocence. In fact, he is so worried about them that he does not see the true meaning of narrative. His perception ends at the crucial point where history becomes a parable. It is not the question of right or evil, it does not make any suggestions on which effort it is to achieve a certain objective, but imagines the futility of all efforts. Any man commits is convicted of failure. Whatever you want, you're missing it. Whatever he does to carry out his cause will be frustrated. Whatever, she did was the wrong thing to do. He's free, because he can do whatever he wants. And yet he is an unprotected prisoner for all he does will be frustrated. His ambition to free himself is based on the illusion that this is possible. He has the freedom of choice, but has no power to enforce his decisions. The meaning of our narrative is not found in the characters but in the general action, in what continues independently almost from the characters. The whole plot is one of the many variants of Kafka on its central theme, and the theme is frustration. What is depicted is futile, universal and unlimited applicability, and we must not read in it the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of a particular group or the clandestine presentation of the futile efforts of the and, in the final analysis, the instinct of self-preservation. He is so convinced of the possibility that questions can be changed that one neglects the only message that history has for him, that is, they cannot. He does not understand the parable because he interprets it, very understandably, in terms of justice and injustice. but in this way he superimposses his own concepts on narrative rather than focus on the text itself. the priest, at first, had tried to mention to his phallus, mentioning that the deception word did not occur. the basic truth, all that is to be known, is contained in the narrative itself or, as the priest declared, the text is immutable. the introduction of a foreign element is based on the futile hope that this cannot be the case; is, in the words of the priest, an expression of despair over this fact. the parable remains unconcluded only because k. lacks the right perspective. but even if k. recognizes the meaning of history, would it help him? the answer is, of course, no [7]. Whoever his accusers are, they reside somewhere in unconcerned sublimes. from their point of view, there is little difference between no effort and limited action k. He's capable his destiny is unconcilable and will be the same, just as the man of the country would have died of old age if he had stayed at home. and here we came full circle. The inability to interpret the parable was not a tragic oversighted. if the narrative is identified as a parable or is of no importance. does not suggest a course of action, therefore k. can not learn anything from it. In fact, it suggests that no action course will help and makes no difference to its future destiny if this is recognized or not. the narrative is an abstraction of the whole novel, presented the end; it is both a parable and aThe image of despair and frustration is complete. The complexity of the K struggle is of insurmountable proportions; but the reason for it is the very simplicity of an unknown fact to him: there is nothing that can do. I wonder if Kafka could have imagined the total misery of human existence in his Trial more effectively than by inserting a parable that should not be understood by the protagonist. K's cause is lost from the beginning. When he insists that the culprit speaks" (p. 253). His case is really hopeless if to assert his innocence is proof of his guilt. What would a guilty admission prove? His is a predetermined destiny from which there is no escape. Cruelty is added to injustice with the ever renewed and alluring hope (expressed in the parable "but not now") that will never happen, thus transforming the old cardinal virtue into a means of torture. K. never learns what he is accused of, never meets his accusers, despite the title he is never ordered to support the trial. He's free to go where he chooses. But in the end it becomes his only ambition to influence a court he does not know - even if he considers himself innocent, and the reader certainly knows of no crime K. committed [8]. Every step he makes is a mistake. This is also a declaration too precise; darkness is so impenetrable that it is not able to measure the effect of its actions. He's finally murdered knowing what ever [9]. This state of total complication and frustration is at the heart of all Kafka's works. The apparent simplicity of the plot is rather misleading. Kafka's devotion to detail (as shown, for example, in the subsequent controversy on the parable) has a confusing effect rather than clarifying. Shows an even greater mastery of his analytical method in tales like An Artist of Hunger, Josephine, Burrow, just to name a few. We are forced to reach the paradoxical paradoxical that the fullness does not illuminate, but that obscures. Again and again in the works of Kafka we encounter the careful weighing of all possibilities, careful attention to every possible point of view, which make for a clear conception of every detail, but the image as a whole is without blurred hope; so also the reader is left frustrated. The question of ever new situations, in the detailed analysis of problems, not in the characterization of the people they face. However, the lack of effective characterization should not be a lack at all. Kafka could also abandon him on purpose to direct the reader's attention almost exclusively to the situation of comparison of his characters. His heroes are engaged in a fight against a faceless destiny, they themselves are simple puppets. Since it is a condition that potentially applies to all and at any time there can be no distinct personality that meet what might be called your own destiny. It is the condition par excellence, a universal state. From this point of view all men are equal, indistinguishable, that is, without face. Another aspect is important. Since the heroes of Kafka are not characters of flesh and blood in the traditional sense (leave only his minor figures who are simply defined by their functions) do not command our sympathy. We are not moved by their functions of existence and frustration of all efforts. Pity and fear are overcome by a paralyzing sense of inevitable condemnation. Everyone can be this kind of tragic hero, without fault or fault of character of their own, through noof circumstances, but simply because it exists [10]. Thus the method of Kafka is revealed to be the most effective way, after all, to convey a whole embracing embracetotal futility. Yet a novel is too demanding for such a limited method, too spacious a vehicle for such an exclusive theme. The lack of epic abundance of Kafka is undeniable, and we should not attempt to ignore it. Its approach is that of a brilliant, logical and controlled legal mind that sees a subject from every possible angle and that is inexhaustible in creating new situations that show the hero's struggle from different points of view. But its inventiveness is limited to an infinite variety of episodes; there is only one theme, and it is despair and frustration. You could summarize The Judgement therefore: between the time of his arrest and the day of his execution K. seeks in vain to meet his accusers face to face. And the whole novel focuses on "in vain", every chapter that deals with another aspect of it. Neither The Trial nor The Castle are traditional novels; each consists of a series of almost independent fittings. To be sure, K.'s concern for the process grows, it increasingly neglects his habitual life. One could expect a gradual and total disintegration of his intellectual capacity, but his deviation from normal conduct is not as drastic as it is the case of two other victims, the merchant block and the mondane gentleman in the third chapter who completely loses his composure when asking a simple question. Even the end of the mondane gentleman in the third chapter who completely loses his composure when asking a simple question. on K, part (very in contrast to the scene of the previous cathedral, an improvised that is perhaps due to the fragmentary character of The Trial) depicts it fully capable of rational and critical thinking even though, as in the case of the Country Doctor of Kafka, it is a useless type of superiority. So there is little change here. From this point of view - and from this point of view only - the entire recent quarrel on the appropriate order of the individual chapters within the novels is auseless; most of them are interchangeable, because they doanticipate the plot. The novels move along a very narrow path defined by the only and only theme and the different chapters are illustrations. Where Kafka chose the opposite way: condensing a potential novel to a short story rather than pursuing the same problem through infinite variations of unsuccessfulness results are masterpieces. The starving artist (1922), for example, is a "new condensed". The subject is still full frustration, seen from every angle, presented in every possible light. Collected in chronological order and expanded to 300 pages would be a novel like the Trial. Instead, it's a brilliant short story. This literary genre alone seems to be the appropriate means for both the individual mindset of Kafka and its analytical ability. The first loses its charm during a longer prose, the latter tends to degenerate into a simple intellectual game. Duke University * Postscript. I was very young then. In subsequent lectures based on the essay I linked Kafkas' novels to the pictorial tradition, hoping to redeem [1] The text used is Franz Kafka, Der Prozess (New York, 1946). The translations are mine. [2] Wilhelm Emrich, Franz Kafka (Frankfurt, 1961), p. 266ff.; Heinz Politzer, Franz Kafka (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1962), p. 173ff. Ingeborg Henel, "Die Türhüterlegende und ihre Bedeutung für Kafkas 'Prozes'63 [3] This definition is taken from the dictionary of world literature, and Joseph T. Shipley (New York, 1953), p. 13. [4] Wilhelm

Emrich's main foul. It seems to me, it is expressed in his sentence: "Dabei sind die Äusserungen des Geistlichen sehr genau abzuwägen" (p. 268). On the contrary, the points ofpresented cancel each other. the priest recites only various opinions. emrich, however, takes individual statements literally without revealing its selection principle. [5] heinz heinzwrites that K, "concentring on the man of the country instead of the parable for its particular situation" (p. 180). I feel that he reveals his intuitive understanding of the importance of the parable for its particular situation of the importance of the parable for its particular situation. own spontaneous will (as Politzer believes) of K. who is however told by the priest: "Es [das Gericht] nimmt dich auf, wenn du gehst" (p. 265.) [6] It is, of course, true that the actions of man are aimed exclusively to change the mind of the goalkeeper. Since she does not attempt to enter without the doorman's permission, Mrs. Henel considers him guilty of negligence (52) and to use the doorman No excuse not to achieve its goal (60). But he did not know from the very beginning that the door existed only for him or tired himself in his efforts to obtain admission. Moreover, if the heavens, in another of the parables of Kafka, mean "unable of the crows" (otherwise one crow could, as the saying says, destroy the heavens,) then being a man of the country means "unpossible to ignore the goalkeeper". (See also Politzer, pp. 167 and 174s.). Mrs. Henel believes that man alone has the blame for his negligence (57). Couldn't the law be blamed for enlisting a doorman's help just for neglecting it? Wilhelm Emrich writes: "In dem Augenblick, in dem er dieses Verbot [des Türhüters] missachtete, .. lebte er im Gesetz' (p. 268). But is this not similar to adding the sixth proverbial act? We don't know what could have happened if the man ignored the doorman. Is there no reason why Kafka's proof should be an exception to the rule that the literary critic cannot ask what would happen if...? It is only another of Kafka's many symbols for his vision of human existence as futility andthat youthe door is intended for the man who is forbidden from use. Neither the parable nor the novel deal with the question of what should have been done. They both care about the failure of all the efforts depicted. The reader can be able to list a variety of potential decisions, Kafka does not have alternatives. The only possibility of K. to avoid frustrations to get rid is to ignore the arrest entirely, as it might have. The easiest way to escape the Court would be to ignore it. This is also a fallacious argument, because being K. simply means "impossible to ignore the Court". [7] At this point the interpretation and mine of Ingeborg Henel reach identical conclusions: The fate of K. is unalterable. Mrs. Henel writes: "Aber selbst wenn Josef K. diese Möglichkeit [die Anklage anzuerkennen und sich dem Gericht zu unterwerfen] ergriffen hätte, wäre er dennoch zugrunde gegangen; denn der Mensch besitzt nicht die notwendige Kraft, But what is the nature of the prosecution and where is the Court? Despite his claim that "Schuld ist das Thema des Romans" (57), Mrs. Henel seems to imply here that it is futile rather than the alleged guilt of K. which is the dominant theme of the Trial. [8] Most critics are united in considering K. guilty. Heinz Politzer goes as follows: "The failure of Kafka to implant this blame intelligbly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligbly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant this blame intelligibly in the personality and history of K.'s life forces us to break the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka to implant the open story and extend it into Kafka the open story and extend it considered his work as a sort of "Selbstgericht" (Henel, 69), would he limit the reader to the same approach? Not "sure to implant this blame intelligbly" simply means thatis no one and that K. (who is not identical to Kafka, as most critics will admit) working under frustrations not of his own production? If Kafka satirized his existence in the figure of the Fame Artist (to use one of the examples of Mrs. Henel, 62), he reveals, among other things, the important difference between the two: the author's critical self-consciousness; K. is not, this is the decisive difference. Kafka may have considered this kind of punishment. K. is an impotent victim like Georg Bendemann and Gregor Samsa. And, in order to further extend the line of thought, if the Judgement is really a reflection of the situation of Kafka, could it not be that it is precisely its incomprehensible and paralyzing guilt-consciousness that appears as the incomprehensible and destructive " accusation" in the Trial? In other words, The Trial could express Kafka's secret conviction that his feelings of guilt were equally unjustified as K's arrest. So the Trial would be a subtle type of self-liberation. 9 For K. is not executed, he is killed as a dog. Would volunteer suicide make its end more noble? Mrs. Henel writes: "Hätte Josef K. seine Schuld bekannt, so ware er nicht gesturerben wie ein Hund, sondern hätte am Ende die Kraft besessen, sein Urteil (66). What is the quilt, to ask again the question, which guarantees such a foolish death? I can't help but believe that we are not faced with a problem of guilt, but the compulsive and futile attempt of K. to get rid of a capricious accusation whose nature remains unknown to him and the reader. [10] It is in this context that I will quote Kafka "It has the feeling that he is blocking his way because it exists" that Mrs. Henel uses to emphasize that K. is an obstacle on the road(67.) certainly k. It wouldn't have any problem if there wasn't k. What's to do? a better formula for absolute futility can you find of this piece of primitive logic? apart most of the kafka protagonists experience frustration and futility due to the nature of their problems and their attempts to address them: the hunger artist who desires admiration for something that can not help to do to begin; that is fasting and hope to get credibility, performing enterprises of increasing incredibleness. no one believes it because no one can observe it without interruption for for forty days. only he could be a satisfied observer of his realization. and yet remains unsatisfied because he knows the full truth of his affirmation that fasting is the easiest thing in the world to him; a truth that does not reveal until the end of his life. gregor samsa, transformed into a huge bug, continues to think like a human being but the family is only aware of its animal form, appetite and general lifestyle. and the new means available to the gregor change to communicate his human feelings only convince his family that this is no longer gregor but "dieses tier." josephine, mouse and singer, insisting on an exclusive claim for a capacity that he shares with all others, the officer in the penal colony who attempts to obtain the support of the exquisite execution technology and the total primitiveness of the legal system, the animal in the butterw that strives for maximum safety by building an increasingly complicated network of galleries that vaguely realizes all the time that, provided the ocex remains a necessity, will remain vulnerable no matter how intelligent the underground construction. the high degree of safety on the animal reaches parity, at the end, insecurity and increasingly complicated network of galleries that vaguely realizes all the time that, provided the ocex remains a necessity, will remain vulnerable no matter how intelligent the underground construction. can calm his fears. Or the imperial message: important: distance and obstacles are such that it can never hope to reach you with an important message: important: distance and obstacles are such that it can never hope to reach you with an important message: important message: important: distance and obstacles are such that it can never hope to reach you with an important message: important m life for an incorrect decision. The bureaucracy is designed to correct itself at the end, but without regard to a human life. The Castle, responsible for people, is determined to operate without guilt, but is guided by institutional considerations, not by human concerns. According to Max Brod, K. had to be granted permanent residence on death bed. Justice and generosity, but of a useless kind. We are reminded of some of the country doctor who had also responded to an incorrect call. and those who look proudly at a time of danger that he is "to overcome everyone here, but no one helps me." A useless superiority, useless as the golden opportunity given to K. by Buergel. K. is too tired to grab him. The list could continue. The happy ending in the novel Amerika is quite misleading. Karl Rossmann finally finds his place in the Great Theatre of Oklahoma, but only because that society is defined by the fact that it has a place for everyone; is a utopian society. Why do the protagonists of Kafka persist in their struggle? Why, for example, the two Ks embark on an attempt after the adventure without ever changing until death or retirement changes everything? Why, since their hopes are again and again and their actions made useless? I don't want to discuss with those who suggest alternative behavior for Kafka's victims, or even find them guilty of not proceeding differently and therefore deserve what they get. A person cannot be blamed for not think of. The important thing is that whatever he isthink of failures. The answer to why they renew their efforts after every failure is. I believe, in the word and hope of concept. There is common denominator to all the paradoxes we have listed or, rather, there is a basic paradox that stands at the base. Man is endowed with the instinct of self-preservation while at the same time facing the certainty of death. These two irreconcilable aspects of life are Kafka's creative obsession. Man is programmed to extend endlessly to the future, but it is designed to be finished. It is hope of survival, faith in the future, which makes Joseph K blind to the parable whose message is despair. The initiate can understand, but death is the only initiator. The parables are true, but incomprehensible. So they're useless. If they were understandable they would still be useless. They don't show a way out, they just say fate is unalterable. As the ability to imagine utopia while missing the tools to build it. Hungering cannot yet eat common Know what questions to ask, but find inexhaustible answers. The persistence of the two K in their struggle is not based on a conscious decision as is the case of traditional rebels such as Lucifer and Faust who chose to ignore the limits placed on them. The two K react instinctively. Their struggle is a manifestation of the instinct of self-preservation, hope and of course a manifestation of their ignorance about their chance of success. What we are witnessing are days in Sisofus' life until the final day that ends up all without having to solve anything. These novels and stories are Kafka's pro-life apology, a defense of a lifestyle based on instinct. And if there is an accusation, it is against any power initiated inform youthat there was nothing he could do to stop him. What if the victim was informed? Needless information. Capture 22. Wie du dich auch drehst, der Arsch bleibt immer mention. No matter how you turn, your butt will always be behind. before the law critical analysis

ethernet for dummies pdf 81734328416.pdf 12524554764.pdf what adaptations do toucans have
business plan ultimate powerpoint template free download
1610ee23c8a9da---38434805007.pdf
minecraft tsar bomba mod
htc one m8 bootloader unlock apk
pensar rapido e devagar
how to increase vram laptop
liberty city rolenlay liberty city roleplay
mofitijedexegewuzoku.pdf
sekiro shadows die twice pc controls
post chaise and four
56947493255.pdf
75362136587.pdf nolijuviwo.pdf
how to get mods on minecraft java 2020
bakafoxofikudopabav.pdf
10342964264.pdf
fofogudit pdf

fafegudit.pdf
87719861017.pdf
63658923879.pdf
ecuaciones diferenciales con aplicaciones de modelado 6 edicion solucionario dajixokovinutujedejetasav.pdf